

Point of Order—Mr. Paproski

BUSINESS OPPORTUNITIES SOURCING SYSTEM

Question No. 637—**Mr. Stewart:**

With reference to the answer to Question No. 128, in the fiscal year 1983-84, what amount was budgeted for the Business Opportunities Sourcing System?

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion): For the fiscal year 1983-84, an amount of \$240,000, non-salary dollars, was budgeted with an allocation of nine person-years.

CRIMINOLOGISTS, SOCIOLOGISTS, STATISTICIANS AT
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICEQuestion No. 649—**Mr. Howie:**

In the current fiscal year, are any (a) criminologists (b) sociologists (c) statisticians employed by the Department of Justice and, if so, how many and, in each case, how many were so employed in each of the last two fiscal years?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): The number of criminologists, sociologists and statisticians employed by the Department of Justice in the current and two preceding years is as follows:

	Criminologists	Sociologists	Statisticians
1981-82	3	3	2
1982-83	3	2	2
1983-84	4	2	2

[*Translation*]

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: The questions enumerated by the Parliamentary Secretary have been answered. Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

POINT OF ORDER

MR. PAPROSKI—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT BY MR. COLLENETTE

Hon. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton North): Mr. Speaker, Ministers usually make statements in the House and you have called Statements by Ministers. The Minister is in Toronto making statements to the ethnic cultural community about the amount of money he is going to be giving out for advertising to the different communities. Why would he not make it here in the House? This is the place for making statements—

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member has made his point but it is not a point of order.

● (1240)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

DIVORCE ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice) moved that Bill C-10, an Act to amend the Divorce Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

He said: Mr. Speaker, to rise to support second reading of amendments to the Divorce Act, the first amendments since 1968 and, in fact, the most fundamental we have ever had to our law of divorce in Canada, is not a happy task. It is, rather, an onerous and painful duty. I believe the subject of marriage breakdown is one which many people in Canada would wish not to have to deal with. Indeed, we all wish that the reality in our country was not such that this is a matter which we are now required to consider. We are told that the estimate is that there is about a 40 per cent chance for any marriage entered into now to end in divorce.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, the concept of the family and the sacredness of marriage are deeply rooted in our society. As a government, we are entirely in favour of protecting and supporting this institution in Canada. For instance, our policies on the tax system, family allowances, the Canada Assistance Plan in relation to day-care and employment all indicate the Government's strong support for the institution of marriage and its preservation in Canada.

As for the causes of marriage breakdown, they are many: financial problems, urban overcrowding, housing shortages, increased mobility in our society owing to the search for employment and career development, changes in the traditional roles of men and women and finally, the emphasis on individual rights.

Mr. Speaker, marriage breakdown is a fact, and the Divorce Act is not intended as preventive but as curative legislation, aimed at organizing the legal status of people whose marriage has already broken down.

I also would like to make the point that the Divorce Act in its present form is destructive rather than constructive, and that it should be changed in order to promote as much as possible, reconciliation of the parties, in the hope of avoiding a divorce.

[*English*]

If this set of amendments to the law of divorce were likely to have the effect of undermining the institution of marriage in our society, we as a government would not be putting them forward. As I indicated, this law of divorce has to deal with a social fact. The social fact of marriage breakdown is occurring for broad social causes, for reason, entirely independent of the