an action for divorce, and the court of the province in which she has acquired such domicile shall have jurisdiction. That is the whole gist of the enactment. The deserted married woman may acquire a domicile of her own with no real intention of making it permanent, but for the restricted purpose of commencing divorce proceedings and getting a divorce. The substance and essence of the proposed enactment is: a deserted married woman, in order to get a divorce, may acquire a domicile wherever she pleases to go, and the court of the province so selected shall have jurisdiction.

I have pointed out that it is utterly opposed to all the principles of British law that the mere presence and application of the complainant should give jurisdiction to the court she selects, when the person to answer is not present at all. See what the court is doing. The court is, at her instance, summoning this absent man, who may never have been domiciled within its territorial jurisdiction, who is not then there present, who may be in a distant part of the world. Without a particle of jurisdiction over him, but simply because his wife is then temporarily resident within its jurisdiction, the court summons him to appear before it to show cause why his wife should not put him away.

It seems to me this Bill might very much better have been entitled, "A Bill to facilitate divorce." It is more than facilitating it. In another place the Minister of Justice contemptuously referred to it as a Bill that would make Canada a second Reno. I think he might readily enough have gone far beyond that and have described it as a Bill to make Canada into a dozen or half-dozen independent and separate Renos. See what this Bill contemplates as the thing that will very likely take place. Take the case of a woman who was born in Ontario and was married and has lived all her life with her husband in this province. If the husband separates from her—"deserts" is the word used here—perhaps because he wants to go to some other part of Ontario to live, or because he is seeking employment and thinks he can get it better away in the northland of Ontario than in the southern portion, and his wife does not agree with him and will not go along, but exercises her indubitable right to do as she pleases within her own house, and stays at home while he is in the north, she may say after two years that he has deserted her. Perhaps he has not contributed to her support; he may not have been able to do so. She needs no longer to go to the tribunal for the Province of Ontario which has jurisdiction. All she has to do is to pack her trunk and go to Winnipeg. The day after she reaches Winnipeg she says, "I select Manitoba for my domicile under this statute, and I am entitled to begin proceedings in the courts of Manitoba to divorce that wandering husband of mine." Although the courts of Manitoba have no jurisdiction over him in other matters, this Bill, if it becomes law, gives them complete jurisdiction to decree divorce. But suppose the lady fails in her Manitoba suit: she has the right to proceed to Saskatchewan and try her luck there, and next to Alberta, and then to British Columbia; and failing in all those jurisdictions she may come east and do the same thing in each of the Maritime Provinces. That sort of thing, it seems to me, is worse than Reno.

But that is not all. Under this Bill, if it becomes law, it would be perfectly possible for two suits for divorce to be pending simultaneously, one in the province selected by the husband, where his home is, and the other in the province selected by the wife, where she had gone to reside. And the two divorce suits, of course, would not necessarily have the same result. In the one there might be dismissal, and in the other the granting of the decree. In such a case I do not know what the status of those two persons would be, and I do not suppose that situation has ever been considered by whoever it was that put this Bill upon paper.

The honourable gentleman from Moose Jaw (Hon. Mr. Willoughby) said the other day, I think, that the Senate was already committed to the principle of this Bill. I would respectfully take exception to that. I think it is going too far to say that because the Senate, or the House of Commons, nine years ago passed a measure of similar character—a measure which did not become law, and which never has been the law of Canada—that the House which passed that abortive piece of legislation is committed to the principle of it. For my part, honourable gentlemen, I was not a member of Parliament in 1920, and I respectfully decline to be in any way bound by what either House of Parliament did at that time if the other House and His Excellency did not concur in it.

But from my point of view the measure which was under consideration in 1920 is much less objectionable than this. It says nothing whatever about the jurisdiction of a court in a province other than that in which the matrimonial domicile of the spouses has been established. It provides, it is true, that the wife may, under certain circumstances, ac-