

favour of the House, perhaps no more effective way can be taken of killing this bill, because then it will have to be put down again for third reading, and I cannot ask the government—for they are under no obligation in the matter—to fix another day for the third reading; with the result that the bill will be in exactly the same position as it was at the end of last session.

Mr. A. M. CARMICHAEL (Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, I am not of the same religious persuasion as the mover of the amendment (Mr. Vien), so that possibly I cannot be charged with having my views influenced in the same way as his may be; nevertheless I find that I do hold views similar to his. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that divorce is wrong in principle and in practice. I cannot find anything in my nature that is favourable towards divorce and remarriage. I can go so far as to favour divorce if remarriage is prohibited. A number of quotations have been made this afternoon from the Great Book and the words of the Great Teacher. It caused me to let my mind run away back prior to the writing of this Great Book and the teachings of the Great Teacher. I am led to the conclusion that the original divine intention was for one man and one woman to continue as one flesh so long as either one should live. If it had been otherwise, I am quite convinced that, instead of one woman being created in the Garden of Eden, there would have been an alternative woman created so that if Adam were not satisfied with Mother Eve, he would have somebody else that he could take as his companion. That kind of condition existed on down until the time of Moses, which was, I believe, some twenty-five hundred years later in the world's history. We could mention a number of cases that are exceptions to the rule, but exceptions always prove the general rule. When the Great Teacher was here upon earth, he was asked as regards the law instituted by Moses some twenty-five hundred years after creation, whether he would sanction divorce or not, and he said:

Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives; but from the beginning it was not so.

I prefer to take the original intention of the Creator that from the beginning it was not intended that man should put away his wife. Feeling as I do, I propose to support the amendment. In supporting the amendment, I feel it will not do away with the principle as embodied in the bill. The principle of the bill is to bring into effect equality as between man and woman in western Canada, and I am heartily in accord with that principle.

The amendment does not affect that principle. The same equality stands. If the amendment is voted down and another amendment is proposed, as has been intimated by the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), it is next best to this amendment, and I shall certainly support the proposed second amendment.

Mr. J. L. BROWN (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, this is not the first occasion on which issues have been confused by the bringing in of an amendment, and before we vote upon the amendment in its particular form or consider any subsequent amendment, it is necessary that we should clearly and definitely understand what we are voting on and what effect our votes will have. It is not my purpose to enter at any length into the theological discussion that has taken place. I am not prepared to admit that any of the statements that have been made by brethren surrounding me would altogether meet with my approval, and I would not like to say that their statement of New Testament teaching absolutely agrees with mine.

I should like to pay tribute to the spirit of the mover of the amendment (Mr. Vien) and the emphasis which he has laid upon the teaching of Jesus Christ. It might be well for us to remember that Christ was speaking to those who accepted him as Lord and Master. He was undertaking to lay down for those who accepted his teaching, what should be the law, and it will always be a difficult proposition for those placed in a position such as we are in as legislators to decide just how far we should impose upon others those laws which we accept for our personal guidance. The question of divorce is not the only question which we have to consider when we come to determine how far we can make the teachings of Jesus Christ applicable to the people of our land. So, for my part, I propose to put that question aside and to say that the teachings of Jesus Christ, so far as I am concerned, are for my personal guidance and not for me to seek to impose them upon others.

Let us consider what will be the effect of this amendment. I know the mover of the amendment has repudiated the idea that he wishes to defeat the bill. He says that this bill has already passed its second reading by a majority of the House and that his amendment will simply add a clause to the bill. That will not be the effect. The effect of the amendment, taking it in the words in which it is given is that this bill be discharged from the order paper and that it