5. That if the respondent desires to oppose the granting of the divorce and to be heard by the Senate Committee on Divorce the respondent must send a notice to that effect to the Clerk of the Senate at the Parliament Buildings at Ottawa within—

That is all, —notice of contestation and no indication of the various grounds upon which the party proposes to defend. And worse than that: if you will look at page 23 of our present Rules you will see that the form of petition is the cause of a great deal of our trouble. The fifth item states:

5. That on or about the day of , A.D. 19 , at the in the , the said C.D. committed adultery with one G.H. of and since then on divers occasions has committed adultery with said G.H.

That is where our own form has led petitioners astray. By this form we allow them to plead "on divers occasions" the commission of serious offences. That phrase will, of course, disappear from this form with the passing of new rules. They will not hereafter follow the old form and we cannot criticize them too much for having done so in the past—and plead "on divers occasions" and "at divers places" and "with divers persons".

I turn now to new Rule 140:

No petition for a bill of divorce shall be considered by the Committee unless the applicant has paid into the hands of the Clerk of the Senate the sum of two hundred and ten dollars towards expenses which may be incurred during the proceedings upon the petition and the bill, and the disposition of this sum shall be as ordered by the Senate.

There is no substantial change proposed here, but I think honourable senators are entitled to some information which we have recently obtained. Last year the Committee passed a resolution as follows:

Resolved, that Mr. H. D. Gilman, Chief Treasury Officer, Senate, be requested to prepare a report to be presented to the Senate Committee on Divorce at the next session of Parliament, showing the total cost to the Senate of processing an average divorce petition, i.e., all costs, including printing, stationery, staff, etc.

In reply, Mr. Gilman presented us with this statement:

Honourable Senators:

In compliance with the instructions of the Standing Committee on Divorce, the printing charges and other relevant items of expense to the Senate incurred in processing an average divorce petition, were, for the purpose of obtaining the nearest figure to current costs, applied to the petitions for divorce considered by the Committee during the 3rd session of the 22nd Parliament, 1956. The costs thus produced, together with their components, are as follows:

Printing	
Staff	61.90
Stationery (including equipment de-	
preciation)	1.70

Total cost to the Senate of processing an average divorce petition \$235.00

I do not know how Mr. Gilman made it up. I have not gone into the details myself, even with him; I took his word for it. I was told that the Chief Clerk of Committees was asked how many of his staff he would dispense with if there were no divorce petitions to be processed, and that on the basis of this information Mr. Gilman made up his costs that respect. The information about in printing came, no doubt, from the Printing Whether it is accurate I do not Bureau. know, but I have no doubt it is the best estimate that could be made under the circumstances. The fact which stares us in the face is that the processing of a petition for divorce before the Senate of Canada costs \$235, which is higher than we previously estimated, and which does not take into account, though something might very well be allowed in that connection, the services of the honourable senators who hear the petition.

Hon. Mr. Reid: The only change in the Rule relates to cost?

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: No, there is no change in that respect. It has been \$210 for many years.

Hon. Mr. Reid: Then why is it suggested that the present Rule be deleted? The report states: "Delete Rule 140 and substitute therefor the following:"

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: There is some small change in detail. The clause relating to translation is left out. But there is no change in the amount. The phraseology has been improved; that is about all.

Hon. Mr. Farris: How large was the deficit?

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: We charge \$210 in each case. Mr. Gilman says that the cost to us is \$235; and that is without taking into consideration the valuable services of honourable senators who are members of the Committee.

Hon. Mr. Gershaw: And sometimes a reduction of fees is granted.

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: My honourable friend from Medicine Hat (Hon. Mr. Gershaw) calls attention to the fact that rather frequently, when poor people come before us and show us that they are in financial straits and the cost is hard for them to bear, we reduce the fees if requested. These people are usually women earning small salaries and perhaps having children to support.

Hon. Mr. Farris: Why not increase the charge to others in order to cover the cost?

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: I do not think we want to raise the amount from \$210 to \$235.