

tional association, the adult education movement and many other worthwhile bodies in Canada who are doing so much good and who are conducted by people who have at heart only the welfare of this country.

I can assure my hon. friend that I shall carry on, on this front, an offensive which, I trust, will meet with the approval of all hon. members.

Mr. REID: Following up what was said by the hon. member for Vancouver East, let me say I agree that there is no more appropriate section before us than the present one. Speaking for the people of British Columbia, I can say they have felt for a long time that something more should be done than has been done in the past. So far as my opinion goes, there is no section in the bill concerning which the minister has been more vague. Certainly he has not taken the members of this committee into his confidence at all, but has spoken only in generalities.

He has painted a very nice picture. He will do certain things for these people, and then there will be an appropriate and beautiful ceremony. Everything will be fine. That is all very well, of course, and they are most pleasing generalities. But after this measure passes, the House of Commons will not have much chance to know what takes place. It will rest with the minister and his officials.

The minister has not taken members sufficiently into his confidence. He should tell us what he has in mind, because, knowing him as I do, I have no doubt he has given some thought to what type of ceremony, what kind of education and what kind of test will be given these people, so that they will know more about the country before they are given certificates.

People come to Canada from thirty-six different countries, the political philosophies of many of which are entirely different from those held by hon. members. Has the minister given any thought to what is done in the United States? Over there they outline what a man must know before he is given a certificate of naturalization.

Mr. MARTIN: I have tried to explain that, and I have said we are going to carry out the same procedure; if not, better.

Mr. REID: In the United States it is in their act.

Mr. MARTIN: No.

Mr. REID: We are only giving the minister power to do what he likes.

Mr. MARTIN: No; the hon. member made that statement earlier, and it is not correct.

[Mr. Martin.]

Those regulations were not included in the act when it was passed. They were supplemented years later.

Section stands.

At six o'clock the Speaker resumed the chair and the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

MOTION FOR SECOND READING OF CERTAIN DIVORCE BILLS

Mr. RALPH MAYBANK (Winnipeg South Centre)—(for Mr. Boucher) moved the second reading of bill No. 37 for the relief of Marie Evelyn Dormer.

He said: Mr. Speaker, there are two other bills of the same sort if you desire to take them at the same time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Maybank moves the second reading also of bill No. 48, for the relief of Margaret Ruth Weir Allan, and of bill No. 18, for the relief of Juliana Edmonda Isabella Ferdinanda Becquaert de Beaujeu.

Mr. MAYBANK: I desire to say a few words with reference to these bills before they are given a second reading. So far as I am concerned I am in favour of a general divorce law and I am in favour also of these particular laws being passed at this time. But I am not favourable to the procedure which we have followed since, I think, time immemorial and, speaking on the second reading of these bills, I desire to place on record my views.

As every person knows we have substantially the same divorce law across Canada except in one province, and it is the same divorce law that is administered in the senate of this parliament when these matters are considered there. There is no general divorce law in the province of Quebec. It has developed since some time past that whenever adultery is committed in the province of Quebec and the outraged husband or the outraged wife wants to do anything about it, he or she comes to the parliament of Canada and asks the parliament of Canada to pass a special law, among all the other statutes with which it has to deal, giving her relief as it is called, in the event of a female spouse coming forward, from continued association with her adulterous husband. That occurs one hundred times, two hundred times, three hundred times a year—not the adultery, may I say in reply to a query from behind me, but the applica-