

true, but the Minister of Justice completely overlooks the practical difficulties in the way. He fails to realize that a woman is frequently almost entirely without funds for this purpose. She has to come a long distance, she has to incur great travelling expenses, she has to pay the Senate, \$210, I think, as a preliminary payment, and she must be represented by a lawyer before the Senate committee. Yet the Minister of Justice is content to call that "equality," where a woman, from financial consideration alone, is utterly unable to meet the requirements which he praises so highly.

Mr. McMASTER: But which he does not like.

Mr. SHAW: Quite so. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the purpose for which this bill was presented for the consideration of parliament. I want now to consider the purpose which my hon. friend (Mr. Vien) has in mind in presenting his amendment this afternoon. First of all he introduced an entirely new proposition, a proposition not related to the question of equality at all. However, I am not suggesting that his amendment is out of order. The hon. member opposed the bill on its second reading when the principle was established by this House. Now in order to accomplish his purpose and to put the bill out on the street, he is introducing another controversial subject which is not directly related to the issue raised by the bill, and seeks in that way to accomplish by an indirect method what he was not able to accomplish directly. It is strange that the hon. member, in this year of grace 1925, finds his bosom surging with the necessity of abolishing divorce completely. He has been a member of this House for at least eight years. Hundreds of divorce bills have passed the House in that time. I have looked through the record of the hon. member, and never on a single occasion has he presented an amendment here to accomplish this purpose in any particular instance whatsoever. It is strange that he should now—

Mr. VIEN: My hon. friend is not fair in his statement, although I am sure that he wishes to be. He will recall that in the De Martigny case I not only opposed the divorce in the House but I fought it in committee. On that occasion I was severely criticized. I was called a bigot and a narrow-minded man because of my opposition to that divorce. Furthermore my hon. friend knows well that it is the practice for all Roman Catholics in this House to abstain from voting on these bills. They do so because they know that these bills will be

adopted by the vast majority of members. While on my feet I wish to remind my hon. friend that the purpose of my amendment this afternoon is absolutely consistent with my attitude in the past. The amendment has been submitted on the present occasion because my hon. friend's bill is the first general law dealing with divorce that has ever been introduced into this parliament. Other legislation in the past had to do with special cases.

Mr. SHAW: I give the hon. gentleman the credit for having opposed one divorce decree out of the many that have been passed since he became a member of this House.

Mr. VIEN: My hon. friend is not right even there.

Mr. SHAW: I have my hon. friend's own statement as authority.

Mr. VIEN: My hon. friend will allow me to correct him there. He knows well that the hon. members of the same religious faith as myself constantly oppose the granting of divorces, and we abstain from voting for bills of divorce when they come before the House.

Mr. SHAW: I was not speaking about the opposition of the hon. gentleman to any particular bill whether shown openly or in the method which he suggests. What I did say was that for the first time in his parliamentary career he has presented an amendment to this House—

Mr. VIEN: My hon. friend will allow me to correct him again.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. VIEN: The correction I wish to make is to state that this is the first time any law of general application on the subject of divorce has been presented to parliament to my knowledge by any hon. member.

Mr. SHAW: I want to correct my hon. friend right there. In 1919 a general divorce bill was presented to this House.

Mr. CASGRAIN: And we voted against it.

Mr. SHAW: My suggestion is that on that occasion the hon. gentleman did not seize the opportunity afforded him to present the amendment which he now proposes to this bill designed to put women on a parity with men so far as divorce is concerned.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I was a member of this parliament at the time. I opposed the bill and it did not reach second reading.