

collection also is that I objected to the preamble. I admitted it was perfectly in accordance with the rules, but I submitted that if we got the unanimous consent of the House this amendment could be considered as added to the bill without going back to committee. I understood we had the unanimous consent of the House to that course, and it was under those circumstances I submitted the amendment.

Mr. McMASTER: That is right.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the amendment were adopted the bill would have to be re-committed. That is the rule.

Mr. McMASTER: Do you rule, Sir, the bill will have to go back into committee? Because, I may say that my recollection is precisely the same as that of the hon. member for West York. It was on that understanding that unanimous consent was given to the introduction of the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: Just before six o'clock the hon. gentleman rose to move his amendment and asked the unanimous consent of the House to proceed with the expectation that a vote would be taken without any further debate. Am I right in that statement?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Yes.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think I am right. I must rule in my own favour.

Mr. SHAW: I rise only for a moment to point out that I propose to vote against this amendment. I propose to vote against it for two specific reasons. First of all, if the amendment is carried the whole matter is referred back to committee of the Whole with the result that this bill will not—amended or unamended—receive the consideration of this House this session. That I think is abundantly clear. Secondly, I object to the amendment because it proposes that in the event of one party being found guilty of adultery, then automatically by operation of law that guilty party is prevented from re-marrying. Now, my suggestion this afternoon was that I would be prepared to leave to the sound discretion of a court, or leave to parliament, the question as to whether or not a person found guilty should be prevented from re-marrying. For these two reasons, Mr. Speaker, I propose to vote against the amendment.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure): I do not wish to give a silent vote on this matter. I am sorry that the hon. member

for Brome (Mr. McMaster), who is always very interesting but who conjured up all kinds of difficulties as to this proposed legislation, did not give an insight into the system which exists in the province of Quebec where he was brought up and lived and whose conditions he knows full well. Quebec to its credit has the lowest record of divorces of all the provinces of Canada, with the exception probably of Prince Edward Island. In that province we have a system of judicial separation, which is recognized under the British law and which exists, I think, in Ontario as well. The parties appeal to the court for one reason or another. They are separated and judicial alimony is provided for the wife and children. Then after the lapse of a few months better feeling prevails. They get back together, and they go on as they had originally started.

Mr. BOYS: Does my hon. friend understand that there is any system of judicial separation in Ontario?

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): I understand so.

Mr. BOYS: I must dissent from that view; there is no such law in Ontario. Of course the parties themselves may enter into an agreement for a separation; but there is no practice in Ontario whereby a judicial separation is granted.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): I stand corrected. However, a system exists in the province of Quebec. In some years we have very few cases of the kind. When the parties do come before the court there is a ruling that the woman is entitled to so much alimony for herself and the children. At the end of a few months, perhaps even at the end of a few weeks, the parties get back together again and thereafter live in perfect harmony. I am going to support the amendment because it tends to reduce the number of divorces, but I will vote against the third reading of the bill because it opens the door to granting divorces in greater number. I have been a consistent opponent of divorce from the very first day I entered this House. May I say en passant that some objection was taken that the hon. member for Lotbiniere (Mr. Vien) did not register a protest every time a divorce bill was passed. When I first entered the House twenty-five years ago divorce bills were always carried on division, and entries to that effect was made in the official minutes. We have never assented by our silence to the passing of divorce bills and I do not intend to do so to-night. As I say, I