

*Divorce*

port this bill are just as bitter against divorce as they are, but we do not think you can cure an evil by hiding it or keeping it out of sight. I think it is possible by proper teaching, through the education of our young people to follow the cardinal virtues of human life, honour, justice, truth and righteousness, to bring about a greater reduction in the number of divorces than we are ever likely to do by obliterating our divorce laws from the statute books. I say again that I would like those members who wish to see divorce abolished to believe that we are just as sincere, just as honest in our idea of what is right and just and true as they are, but we do not believe the cause of humanity will be served by wiping the divorce laws off the statute books of this country.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice): I feel it my duty to say why I am going to vote for the amendment of the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton). I do so not because I think divorce and remarriage can be accepted or recognized under any circumstances, but because I believe the amendment tends to a decrease of the present evil. In the first place, it will prevent collusion as it exists to-day in so many instances, and on the other hand it makes sure that at least one of the parties will never remarry while the other party to the original marriage contract is still living. I will vote for the amendment merely because it will, I hope, decrease the evil of divorce, and in order to alleviate the misgivings of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) as to my conscientious feeling in the matter, I assure him I will vote against the third reading of the bill even with the amendment attached to it, because I am opposed to the whole institution of divorce.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Marquette): Mr. Speaker, while I did not hear the discussion this afternoon, I shall not detain the House more than a moment. I intend to vote against the amendment, and I shall briefly state my reasons for so doing. In the first place I think the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) has followed a very unusual course in introducing this amendment on the third reading of the bill. The purpose of the bill was very clearly stated in the measure itself and I do suggest to the hon. member for West York and to all others in this House who may be inclined to support his amendment that the proper time to have introduced this amendment was on the second reading, at any rate in the committee of the whole House, when there could have been a fuller and freer and more intelligent discussion than is possible

[Mr. Forke.]

at this stage. If my hon. friend wishes to see his suggestion enacted into legislation—and I am free to confess, Sir, that there is some merit in it; I am inclined somewhat to agree with the sentiments uttered by the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) in that respect—it will be quite within his right to introduce such legislation at another session of parliament. I agree entirely with the hon. member for St. John and Albert (Mr. MacLaren) that this amendment as introduced at this stage of the bill cannot receive the earnest and serious consideration that it should receive.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. member not understand that if the amendment carries the House must again go into committee and all the consideration that ever could have been given can then be given?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. CRERAR: I do not so understand it.

Mr. VIEN: Yes, that is it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It has to be re-committed.

Mr. McMASTER: I thought we had unanimous consent.

Mr. CRERAR: I have endeavoured very briefly to state the reasons why I shall vote against the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON: May I ask the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) if the amendment as presented will prevent a person securing a divorce in Canada from remarrying in the United States?

Hon. JAMES MURDOCK (Minister of Labour): My understanding is that this amendment deals with a question broader than the original question dealt with in the bill proposed by the hon. member for West Calgary (Mr. Shaw), which bill was intended to remove from western women the disabilities under which they are now suffering and to place them on the same plane in the matter of securing divorce as their eastern sisters. The amendment of the hon. member for West York ignores entirely the question whether this inconsistency as between conditions respecting divorce in the west and in the east should any longer prevail, and proposes that the guilty one in case of divorce in any part of Canada shall not be permitted to remarry in Canada. It seems to me that if the amendment carries it would simply be conniving at illegitimacy or sending to the United States the guilty ones in divorce cases. It was stated to-day that some 1,300 Canadian mar-