

**Mr. Speaker:** I declare the motion lost.

Therefore, the next question before the House is on Motion No. 9 standing in the name of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Crosbie). Mr. Crosbie, seconded by Mr. Hnatyshyn moved:

Motion No. 9

That Bill C-47, be amended in Clause 11 by striking out lines 18 to 24 at page 8 and substituting the following therefor:

“arrangements have been made for the support of any children of the marriage and, if such arrangements have not been made, to stay the granting of the divorce until such arrangements are made; and”

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion No. 9 (Mr. Crosbie) agreed to.

**Mr. Speaker:** The next motion before the House is Motion No. 13. I take it that it is the pleasure of the House to adopt the same recorded vote on that motion as was adopted on Motion No. 3A and the amendment to Motion No. 9?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** Mr. Robinson, seconded by Ms. McDonald, moved:

Motion No. 13

That Bill C-47, be amended in Clause 15 by striking out lines 31 to 46 at page 11 and substituting the following therefor:

(7) an order made under this Section that provides for the support of a spouse shall be directed to one or more of the following objectives:

(a) subject to paragraphs (b), (c), and (d) to promote the economic self-sufficiency of each spouse within a reasonable period of time;

(b) to recognize any economic advantages or disadvantages to the spouses arising from the marriage or its breakdown and to relieve any economic hardship of the spouses arising from the marriage or its breakdown;

(c) where the marriage is of long duration and where one spouse worked full-time in the home and was financially dependent on the other spouse during the marriage, to provide support for the dependent spouse throughout his or her lifetime and to equalize the standards of living of the spouse awarded support and the supporting spouse;

(d) where there is a child of the marriage and the spouses had agreed before divorce proceedings were commenced, that one spouse should stay at home full-time to care for the child, to fulfil the terms of that agreement insofar as it is economically practicable.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Robinson) which was negated on the following division:

*(Division No. 184)*

YEAS

Members

Allmand  
Althouse  
Angus  
Axworthy  
Berger  
Blackburn  
(Brant)  
Blaikie  
Boudria  
Caccia  
Coppes  
Deans  
de Corneille  
Finestone  
Foster  
Gagliano

Gauthier  
Gray  
(Windsor West)  
Guilbault  
(Saint-Jacques)  
Heap  
Hopkins  
Hovdebo  
Jewett  
Kaplan  
Marchi  
McCurdy  
McDonald  
(Broadview-Greenwood)  
Mitchell

Murphy  
Nicholson  
(Trinity)  
Nunziata  
Nystrom  
Orlikow  
Parry  
Pépin  
Prud'homme  
Riis  
Robichaud  
Robinson  
Rodriguez  
Rompkey  
Skelly  
Waddell—42.

*Divorce Act*

NAYS

Members

Andre  
Attewell  
Beatty  
Bertrand  
Blenkarn  
Boyer  
Brightwell  
Brisco  
Browes  
Cadieux  
Caldwell  
Cardiff  
Champagne  
(Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot)  
Clark  
(Yellowhead)  
Clark  
(Brandon-Souris)  
Collins  
Comeau  
Cooper  
Corbett  
Crosbie  
(St. John's West)  
Crosby  
(Halifax West)  
Crouse  
Darling  
Daubney  
Della Noce  
Desjardins  
Dick  
Dorin  
Edwards  
Epp  
(Provencher)  
Fennell  
Ferland  
Fontaine  
Forrestall  
Fraleigh  
Fretz  
Friesen  
Gagnon  
Gass  
Gervais  
Gormley

Graham  
Greenaway  
Grisé  
Gurbin  
Hamelin  
Hamilton  
Hardey  
Hawkes  
Hees  
Hicks  
Hnatyshyn  
Holtmann  
Hudon  
James  
Jelinek  
Johnson  
(Bonavista-Trinity-  
Conception)  
Kempling  
Kilgour  
Landry  
La Salle  
Lawrence  
Layton  
Leblanc  
Lesick  
Lewis  
MacDonald  
(Kingston and  
the Islands)  
MacDougall  
(Timiskaming)  
MacKay  
Mailly  
Martin  
Masse  
Mayer  
Mazankowski  
McDermid  
McGrath  
McInnes  
McKinnon  
McKnight  
McLean  
Minaker  
Moore  
Murta

Nicholson  
(Niagara Falls)  
Nickerson  
Nielsen  
Nowlan  
Oberle  
O'Neil  
Paproski  
Peterson  
Pietz  
Plamondon  
Porter  
Price  
Ravis  
Redway  
Reid  
Ricard  
St. Germain  
St-Julien  
Schellenberg  
(Nanaimo-Alberni)  
Scowen  
Siddon  
Sparrow  
Speyer  
Stackhouse  
Stevens  
Stewart  
Tardif  
(Charlesbourg)  
Taylor  
Thacker  
Towers  
Tremblay  
(Québec-Est)  
Tremblay  
(Lotbinière)  
Tupper  
Turner  
(Ottawa-Carleton)  
Vankoughnet  
Weiner  
Wilson  
(Swift Current-  
Maple Creek)  
Witer—121.

**Mr. Speaker:** I declare the motion lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 30 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson). I take it the same recorded vote would be applied as was applied earlier?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** Mr. Robinson, seconded by Ms. McDonald, moved:

Motion No. 30

That Bill C-47, be amended in Clause 17 by striking out lines 17 to 28 at page 14 and substituting the following therefor:

“(4) Before the court makes a variation order in respect of a support order the court shall satisfy itself

(a) that there has been a change in the condition, means, needs or other circumstances of either former spouse or of any child of the marriage for whom support is or was sought occurring since the making of the support