

Private Bills—Divorce

from the evidence, nothing but harm would accrue if the divorce were not granted and the people who would suffer the most are the children. They are ten and eight years old. They will have a much better opportunity to grow up in a less strained and more decent environment than they would have if the divorce were not granted.

Mr. Peters: I am quite concerned with this case, too, because this appears to me to be what I would call a run of the divorce mill that is being operated in the Senate. As the hon. member for Skeena has pointed out, we have in this case the ingredients that make for the effective functioning of this divorce mill. We notice another aspect of this case, Mr. Chairman, that indicates—and it has been indicated in the detective's evidence—that this is an operation which is carried out in a cold and calculated manner by the legal authorities also. Hon. members will notice that in this particular case the lawyer was Mr. Joyal, a barrister-at-law, Ottawa, Ontario. From his questioning it is evident that he is a very competent lawyer and a very capable one. In his questions he leaves no alternative but to get the answer he wishes. He asks the question in such a manner that he cannot help but get the answer he wants. He asks questions like this:

Q. You have no intention at the moment of adopting a new domicile?

A. No.

I suggest that this is a planned question. He did not ask: Do you intend to live in the province of Quebec? Are you giving up your home? Have you any intention of moving out of the province of Quebec? No. He asks this question:

You have no intention at the moment of adopting a new domicile?

Putting in the words "at the moment" would indicate that there was some question of the domicile. Mr. Joyal, being very scrupulous and honest as a member of his profession, asks the question in such a way that he gets the answer he wants. Even if the fellow intended to move in four or five hours, at the moment he has no intention of adopting a new domicile. As was indicated to the committee a few days ago, "domicile" does not necessarily mean where your house is but where you decide to set up your domicile, and it does not necessarily change because you move from place to place.

Mr. Joyal goes on to ask the questions in a very precise manner. I think it would be advantageous for the committee to examine the number of cases that Mr. Joyal handles in this divorce mill because I made inquiries and I found that the lawyers have raised their price within recent times. Their fee

[Mr. Howard.]

to handle a case before the Senate committee used to be \$1,000 but now they have raised it. The best information I can get is that they have raised it to \$1,500.

Mr. McCleave: Will my hon. friend permit a question?

Mr. Peters: Certainly.

Mr. McCleave: Does the \$1,500 include disbursements to detectives? Will he break down that amount to give us the lawyers' fee and can it be related to this case?

Mr. Peters: I do not know if that amount includes the detective fees. We will come to the detective fees in a moment and probably now is a good time to do it. The investigator in this case, Mr. Charron, has handled 36 cases this year. It is true that he is not the senior man. Mr. Etheridge has handled 67 cases this year so Mr. Charron is not by any means the senior man. However, he is not the junior in this field because he handled 36 cases.

These investigators operate with the legal profession and if you check the evidence you will find that it takes a few days for them to complete their work on a case. Sometimes, as in the previous case, they are occupied for several months. I am not too sure how much money they are paid but I have been told that it is at least \$25 a day plus expenses and other costs. If Mr. Charron had 36 cases and takes an average of 10 days per case he works for 360 days in a year. As a member of a union I object to him working for that number of days. I think he should at least be able to leave this dirty business alone on Sundays. I presume he has not a union contract and therefore can work overtime if he wishes. He probably calls himself an entrepreneur who runs his own business.

Mr. McCleave: Will my hon. friend permit a question? Will he try to unionize these detectives and have them join the labour party that the C.C.F. is forming?

Mr. Peters: I certainly would like to organize them because if they were organized I think we could demand that they meet certain conditions. If they were organized they would not be able to break down people's doors or steal nameplates off doors. I think we would limit them to certain hours. They would have to work shifts.

Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert): How about moonlighting?

Mr. Peters: I think I agree with the sponsor of the bill that this would be a very good thing and we would like to do it. It appears to me that Mr. Charron only has five days