

Mr. McMASTER: They might. I know some parts of Canada where licenses are granted to any respectable person who comes in, practically as a matter of course, with little or no inquiry as to their right to marry. I would say this: If the man believed honestly that he had the right to be married, he would probably so state. I think there is real danger in that regard.

Mr. NEILL: Will the hon. member not consider the other and worse case of the divorced man who is remarried in England and then comes here and is prosecuted for bigamy?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: He could not be.

Mr. NEILL: Yes, under the amendment as originally introduced, which contained the words, "in Canada or elsewhere."

Mr. DUFF: I think we had better have this discussion in camera.

Mr. McMASTER: Then there is the case of the woman who has been unfaithful. Perhaps she has been married to someone she did not love, and perhaps she has met someone that she did love. I am not excusing her, but such things have happened. Are you going to condemn her to a life of celibacy, or are you going to force her, if she has no economic equipment for this world, into perhaps the only way in which she could earn her livelihood? I am afraid that instead of being a proposition to defend the purity of the home and the family, the amendment of the hon. member for West York is more likely to encourage concubinage and immorality. The Minister of Justice has said this will prevent collusion. Why will it prevent collusion? It will only prevent collusion if people ask for a divorce because they had a desire to marry again. It is quite possible that they might wish to marry again. It may be possible that they are so sick of living together and that one has misbehaved so much that it is only right there should be a divorce, and I cannot see that collusion will be obviated by this resolution of the hon. member for West York.

The Minister of Justice says that he wishes to prevent the remarriage of the guilty party because, though that is only half a remedy, half a remedy is better than no remedy at all. I do not think it will conduce to morality or purity or to the sanctity of the home and the establishment of the family to have this resolution pass.

Then what confusion we will create in Canada between those who have been divorced [Mr. Boys.]

up to this date and who have remarried, and those who are divorced after this time. There again there will be room for all sorts of confusion. I think on the whole that however much we may admire the reasons which led the hon. member for West York to introduce this legislation, taking humanity as it is, it would be wiser for us, and I say this with all respect to the member for Brandon (Mr. Forke), to think of that phrase of the founder of religion who said in regard to a sinful woman, "He that is without sin among you let him cast the first stone."

Mr. D. W. WARNER (Strathcona): It seems to me that every member of the House is already convinced regarding this matter. It is unfortunate that we had any amendments at all, in my opinion. All we want to do by the bill that we have before us is to give justice to those who are not now getting justice. I do not think we need have any amendments or further discussion. I think we could vote yes or no on this question now and settle the matter. We do not need to complicate it with any amendments. Justice is all we want and I would like to see the vote taken.

Mr. R. A. HOEY (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I rise not to take part in the discussion, but to obtain from your Honour a ruling on the procedure that is to be followed. I understood when the House rose at six o'clock that the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) had obtained the unanimous consent of the House to have this amendment attached to the bill without referring the bill back to the committee, but I notice that the preamble of the amendment, which I hold in my hand, would suggest that the bill, if the amendment is carried, will go back to the committee, and that is the point I would like your Honour to clear up.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before six o'clock I read the draft of the amendment which had been handed to me, but it lacked at the beginning the phraseology which is used generally with such amendments. If hon. gentlemen will remember I took the phraseology from the amendment just defeated and then read the draft handed me by the clerk. I now hold the amendment with the phraseology that I borrowed from the other amendment. It is attached to the draft embodying the principle of the amendment moved by the hon. member for West York. The amendment the hon. gentleman has in his hands now is the real amendment.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My recollection is entirely the same as yours, Sir, but my re-