

mind with home and ability to cherish home—the mark that divides the people into superior and inferior. Wandering tribes have no fixed habitation, and hence they cannot cultivate the solid virtues, such as citizenship, patient and continuous labour, and the setting up of steadfast institutions.

Again. We had a war, and in the fiery crucible of that tremendous struggle much that was vain, much that was unworthy was shrivelled up. It is not necessary to delineate the heroism or the horrors of the war, nor to point out right or wrong; but at a time when fathers and sons were offering their lives, and mothers and daughters were enduring the sorrows that were infinitely harder to bear, the Canadian home was at its highest and noblest. It was a sanctuary from which went faith, fortitude and sacrifice and devotion to preserve the home against our embattled enemies. Its atmosphere was pure and rarified, and our people were on the heights amid death and wounds and the roar of arms. Are we going to let the divorce evil invade our homes, which are the foundation of our institutions. The opportunities for material gain have led away our people to cut down the forests, ravish the mines and impoverish the soil, to get rich quick. We are doing everything with the regrettable result that unseemly customs and opinions have been allowed to spring up and prosper. Of these, divorce is the greatest and most menacing.

Where, Mr. Speaker, are the Dominion Alliance, the Anti-Cigarette League, the Anti-Betting League, the Methodist Alliance, the Women's Christian Association, the Referendum Committee, the Social Service Council, and similar organizations, which have for so many years subjected the country to an orgy of moral uplifting, and who have striven for salvation by statute, to legislate the people into holiness? Will the evil that strikes at the root and foundation of the nation, the morality of the home, which is a thousand times worse than anything battered and hammered by our moral uplifters, go unchallenged in an attempt to get legislative sanction? Is it possible that the only squeak we may get from the uplifters will be for them to tell us that we may go to hell if we buy a newspaper on Sunday, that we may go to hell if we bet fifty cents on a poor old sorrel horse that has the heaves, but that there is nothing wrong in having a Madame X on Monday and a different Madame X on Thursday? What is the taking of a drink, the smoking of cigarettes or attending a horse race, compared to the breaking up of a Christian home?

[Mr. Fournier.]

In closing Mr. Speaker, let me say that divorce is an unstable thing. It is the essence of unrest and irritation and impermanence, it stands for discontent; and therefore it should not prevail in our land—unless, indeed, our people have permanently deteriorated; unless they have morally taken a long step back; unless they can no longer be aroused by appeals to their fondest recollections; unless they have ceased to love and reverence home, sweet home.

Mr. A. M. CARMICHAEL (Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, I would like to express publicly my disapproval of what I consider to be an evil in our national life, namely, the divorce evil. Perhaps it is not a disease, but in my estimation it is certainly a national social evil. I have listened with much interest to the remarks of the hon. member for West Calgary (Mr. Shaw). I think he is perfectly fair in the arguments he has put forth and I do not doubt his sincerity in endeavouring to rectify what appears to be a wrong as between the two sexes in that there is not an equality of grounds upon which they may both stand in our four western provinces. I found my mind assenting to his arguments on the grounds of fairness and reasonableness. I was also an interested listener to the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Fournier) and I find my heart assenting to the sentiments to which he gave expression—and I am rather of the opinion that our heart sentiments are more weighty and of more consequence than our mere mental assent; therefore I find myself agreeing very largely with the arguments of the hon. member for Bellechasse.

I can understand, Mr. Speaker, that there are certain cases where perhaps not divorce but annulment of marriage is advisable. Cases have come under my personal observation in which the annulment of the marriage contract is advisable and remarriage permissible. Such cases are very rare; non-consummation of marriage is perhaps the only reasonable ground for that course. We do have such cases in our national life. Outside of these my own opinion is that there are also a great many cases where incompatibility of temperament or for other reasons two cannot agree and it is necessary that they should separate. In such a case I think separation should be allowed, but it should be a judicial separation and should not carry with it the right to marry again. Or, if we choose to grant a bill of divorce, as we have done so many times since I have been in this parliament, we should amend our legislation in such a way as to take away the right to remarry.

The hon. member (Mr. Fournier) made mention of legalized adultery. Mr. Speaker,