

● (1530)

To conclude, I say that Bill C-10, is grossly deficient. It must go back to the drawing board. I do not accept the Minister's excuse that we cannot do more in the present context. The Minister himself is an expert in omnibus Bills. We had a 306 page Bill on criminal law legislation. Surely this is an area on which there should be an omnibus Bill. It should be omnibus on divorce, to deal with all the related issues such as the enforcement of maintenance payments, the establishment of unified family courts, credit splitting of pensions by judges, and income tax access and statistical record access for the location of defaulters. These are all federal statutes which need quite modest amendments. However, the principle is important. When this does not take place people really do suffer.

If the Department cannot draft suitable legislation, it ought to hire someone who can. I suggest that the Minister withdraw the Bill and bring it back with suitable amendments. We do not need more study because we know what needs to be done. I can assure the Minister of my Party's support for speedy passage when he brings back a Bill that really deals with the issues of maintenance, a Bill which is fair and deals with the issue adequately and concretely.

**Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West):** Mr. Speaker, I know the Hon. Member is seeking to ask questions but questions are not permitted with the first three speakers. Questions may be permitted with the round I am starting. We will welcome the intervention of the Hon. Member from Hamilton at that time.

When I look at this Bill, I call it swinging door legislation. Marriage in Canada is destined to become a swinging door affair. It is extraordinarily easy to get married, notwithstanding the rather strict requirements of many established churches for people to attend marriage preparation courses. While many people take those courses, and I am pleased that they do, they in themselves are no guarantee that a marriage may not break down. A mere trip to a justice of the peace, the deputy registrar of vital statistics in any city or some "marrying Sam" is evidence enough that if certain people perhaps have an amorous or physical desire for one another they can satisfy themselves under the cover of legality. But surely a marriage based upon that alone will not last.

What I and, I am sure, many Hon. Members and hundreds of thousands of Canadians are concerned about is that this Bill is frankly an attack on the family and its continued existence. Marriage should not be buried as a traditional way of life that has gone out of style. That is not the purpose of marriage.

The purpose of marriage is essentially the procreation and raising of children by a man and a woman. Through the years it is married people who have produced and raised children. Are we now to make a sort of rabbit colony relationship in which man meets woman, man likes woman, woman likes man, bingo, they live together and produce children? Is that going to be our concept of life?

### *Divorce Act*

I suggest to the House that this Bill is in many ways part of this, shall we say "easy does it" mentality of the 1960s and 1970s that has permeated through to certain academic levels, certain levels among social workers, among the so-called intelligentsia and sophisticates. The mentality is that if a couple of people get tired of one another or if a particular way of life is not satisfactory, the man need only go out and shuck his wife as he would discard his suit or the wife may discard her husband as she would her year-old dress. This Bill merely reflects that attitude. I do not know that Canadian society will improve as a result thereof.

This Bill has encountered a good deal of opposition. One might expect the Conference of Catholic Bishops to have their say, and to their credit they have done so. It is an area in which they have a right and obligation to speak. There are other church groups and organizations which must look after the children of many of this mismatings and casual matings that we have in modern day society. They also have to look after wives who are discarded.

Incidentally, this divorce law is in many ways no different from some of our veterans affairs legislation. That legislation allows a veteran, under the insurance plan, merely to put aside his wife and live notoriously in the open with another woman. After a year, if he is not in a position to get remarried, he can merely designate his female companion as a beneficiary under the policy. There are other similar features about common law living with regard to veterans' pensions. It is "easy does it."

We must reflect upon whether Canadian society has become a rabbit hutch society. Many of my colleagues have criticized the philosophy behind this legislation. May I say that I have before me a Department of Justice hand-out of information which is printed in the *National Review* that is published by the Canadian Bar Association. The only thing I can say about the Department of Justice publicist who wrote this is that I wish he had learned his English. We are at repeated points. Just to take one, the word "alternatives" is used to describe numerous options. Let that individual go back and find out what the word "alternative" means. It means one of two, not one of many. There is a column replete with the misuse of that word. That is not good enough for the Department of Justice. We are faced here according to this learned person, with a span of 15 years from the last divorce amendments and consequently there must now be a change in the Divorce Act to comply with social developments. What utter piffle!

● (1540)

We remember before when the Divorce Act was changed when cruelty, desertion for three years, adultery, and several other sex-related crimes were the sole grounds of divorce. Of course, that really did set up, at times, an adversarial form of dealing with divorce, an accusation of adultery perhaps when quite often there was not that situation. There was the business of spurious grounds for divorce in manufactured cases, the old motel room routine; what we used to see so often before the Private Members' Committee of the Senate on Divorce. There was a whole industry in the Province of Quebec, which did not