

*Dissolution of Marriage*

I remember reading in an American magazine some time ago that divorces were granted for many reasons, for instance, because of overcooked eggs at breakfast. Let us broaden the act and then we shall see pretty things.

With regard to reference made to the Bible earlier by a member from Alberta to prove that Christ sometimes permitted adultery, I suggest that if Christ recognized adultery as a ground for divorce, why did he say: "Whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband committeth adultery"? This is definite evidence that Christ does not accept divorce.

That is why I am of the opinion that our procedure does not enable us at the present time to increase the number of divorces in Canada. And I repeat that if we find that procedure offensive, let the province of Quebec be given back its right to legislate and minorities will be treated very well in Quebec as they have been in the past.

It would be advisable to know the opinion of the hon. members opposite, the Liberals, who do not dare to take sides in the matter, those people we consider however as good fathers, who are supposed to have the faith, those people who want to continue their happy pleasure-seeking life, their excessively materialistic life, and live among children who would never have the chance to know their fathers and mothers. Those children have the right to have a good father to give them sound advice and a mother to take care of their daily problems. Those children would keep a well-balanced mind. In case of sickness, madness or other serious cases, gentlemen, do as we do in Quebec—practise continence. It enables us to lead a better life.

And this reminds me of a man whom you have seen here for quite a while, as member for Bellechasse; I mean the late lamented Hon. Louis Philippe Picard, a good Liberal, who had at least a dozen women friends in Canada and who had about as many when he was abroad. Besides, the Liberal party was so much ashamed of him that, one day, the Right Hon. Louis St. Laurent said: "If at least this man were presentable."

In our province, Mr. Speaker, we do not ask for annulment of marriage, but only for separation from bed and board. Divorce petitions which would be submitted to a Quebec court, through an amendment to the British North America Act, are now sub-

mitted to the Senate, so that our hon. senators may have something to do. On the other hand, this brings us to realize that divorce is a disaster.

(Text):

**Mr. R. J. McCleave (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works):** Mr. Speaker, first of all we should be grateful to the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) for solving one of the puzzling problems of the day. Up until the moment he stood up in this debate this afternoon some of us had wondered what N.D.P. stood for. In my case, I thought possibly it stood for no discernible principles, but now I see it stands for no divorce permitted. Was ever such an arrant case of blackmail presented to any group of adult citizens in the House of Commons, that unless parliament took such and such action citizens would be deprived of the rights to which they were entitled by long constitutional practice? I put it to you, Mr. Speaker, that we have stood this nonsense from the hon. member for Timiskaming and his partner in this matter for more than a year. But how long can society put up with an affront such as this? We have two men putting a gun to the heads of citizens outside this house and saying that unless parliament bends itself to their will they will deny these citizens their remedy.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order; I would suggest to the hon. member that he come back to the principle of the bill.

**Mr. McCleave:** I was about to do so, sir, having disposed of the hon. member for Timiskaming. I point out that his approach to the problem of divorce contains all the fallacious thinking, all the errors that have accumulated during the 1930's which he is trying to bring into the 1960's. This approach has been a signal failure for some 30 years or more in solving the problem of divorce.

Let me make it plain that I am in favour of divorce reform. I have given this subject a great deal of study. May I say, with some modesty, that in my case I have given it thoughtful study. I did not simply clip from this English statute or that Swedish act or something that has happened in Europe or one of the states of the United States of America, remedies to solve the divorce problem. The hon. member has suggested here, as he has suggested before, that if one adds all these extra grounds for divorce this will automatically cure the problems which are such a headache to law officers today. I say, sir, that this is a fallacious view. If you add these extra grounds, and some of them are very reasonable grounds—they are grounds upon which divorce reformers have agreed