

Spencer,	Sutherland,
Stansell,	Tolmie,
Steedsman,	Warner,
Stewart (Argenteuil),	Wilson,
Stewart (Humboldt),	Woodsworth.—73.
Stirling,	

PAIRS

(The list of pairs is furnished by the chief whips.)

Messrs:

Mr. Fontaine.

Mr. Johnston.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I beg to move the amendment which is now in your hands, Mr. Speaker. We have already discussed the subject fully and as every hon. member has made up his mind upon it we might as well dispose of my amendment now. I do not want to move the amendment out of committee; I should like the House to consider this as an amendment moved in the House on the third reading, so that the bill will not be in any way impaired. The amendment is as follows:

In any case where a divorce is granted by an act of parliament or by the decision of any court in Canada or elsewhere, no person so divorced and found guilty of adultery shall have the right to marry again during the life of the other spouse, any other person, and any divorced person so found guilty of adultery upon so marrying again may be proceeded against and adjudged guilty of bigamy and subject to the penalties for such crime made and provided as fully and completely as if such divorce had not been granted.

Every order or judgment and every act of parliament granting a divorce on the ground of adultery shall contain an express declaration that the guilty party shall not be permitted to marry again except as above provided.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is on the amendment.

Mr. VIEN: May I suggest to the hon. member that he should add to the amendment the words, "domiciled in Canada," because we cannot legislate for any except those who are domiciled in Canada.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is understood.

Mr. H. C. HOCKEN (West Toronto): Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that the House is likely to be guilty of a piece of legislation that has been ill considered. I have no sympathy with divorce and no desire to assist any guilty party, but there is another side to this question that the House ought to consider carefully before they vote upon it. The proposal of the amendment is that the guilty party shall not be allowed to marry again, and to a certain degree I sympathize with that idea. But if we put that upon our statute books the result will be an increase of illegitimate children in this country that will be more deplorable than the remarriage of divorced per-

sons. If a man has been found guilty of cause sufficient for divorce you cannot stop him from living with some other woman if he wants to, and if there are illegitimate children, those children will know of it as they grow up and it will be a very great detriment to their character and to their whole outlook in life.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understood from the remarks of the mover of the amendment that the vote might be taken at once, and I put it by leave of the House, but as I understand further discussion will take place I will therefore call it six o'clock.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. HOCKEN: Mr. Speaker, just before the House rose I had risen to delay action on what I consider to be a very important piece of legislation. I had no intention of getting into the discussion, and when the amendment was defeated I think it should have been left there, because introducing anything further at this time simply confuses the issue without giving parliament sufficient opportunity to consider what we are really doing. I was surprised, Mr. Speaker, to find the hon. member for Lotbiniere (Mr. Vien), by inference at least, approving of divorce. Perhaps if he were here he would say that he did not approve of divorce, but I submit that when any man undertakes to discuss a bill on divorce and places limits here and there, assists materially in preparing a bill on divorce, he is inferentially approving of divorce.

Mr. VIEN: No.

Mr. HOCKEN: I would think it would be much more consistent for any member of this House who does not believe in divorce to refrain from taking any part in framing a divorce bill.

Mr. VIEN: Will my hon. friend allow me an explanation on that? The second reading having been voted on, and the sentiment of the House having been manifest in respect of the principle of the bill, we accepted the inevitable, and we tried to apply such a corrective as would render it acceptable, by changing divorce into a mere separation.

Mr. HOCKEN: The hon. gentleman's explanation may satisfy him, but it will hardly satisfy any logical mind, because if I did not believe in divorce under any circumstances, I certainly would not share in the respon-