

from De la Durantaye (Hon. Mr. Pouliot). My friend, I think, is misinformed or not sufficiently informed with regard to the character of the cases we try. It is true that a certain number of them are of the "hotel room" kind, but not all are, by any means. I have given instructions quite recently to ascertain just how many cases there are of that type, and I believe my colleagues will be surprised at the percentage of cases that do not arise from that type of evidence. I have sat now as chairman of this committee for the last five years and I have come to have a greater confidence rather than a lesser one in the professional evidence that comes before us. We have found the men who testify for wages, who come back over and over again, to be fairly responsible witnesses and I resent any charge against them of perjury or fixing up of cases, and so on, for after considerable experience I do not feel that these are frequent occurrences. They occur very seldom and I would not charge any of the professional witnesses who come before us with being guilty of an offence in this class. Any such charge should be thoroughly backed up with real knowledge and not based on general statements alone. The taking of notes by members of the committee would be quite unsatisfactory. The report of the committee's proceedings in each case goes to the other chamber and the evidence must be thoroughly reported.

Let me say a word of commendation of our reporting staff. I have occasion to be very familiar with their work in reporting these cases, and I am sure all my colleagues on the committee will agree with me when I say that the reporting is of the very highest class.

Hon. Mr. Aseltine: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: They do their work in a capable and faithful manner.

I am grateful to my honourable friend from De la Durantaye for his kind attitude toward the members of this committee. I thank him for thinking hard, as he says, to find some solution of the difficulties that face us in doing this work. I hope he will go on thinking hard.

Hon. Gunnar S. Thorvaldson: Honourable senators, it has been a great pleasure to listen to a discussion such as this, and I just want to contribute a very few words to it. The reason I do so is that I was particularly impressed by the fact that the debate was commenced by the honourable senator from De la Durantaye (Hon. Mr. Pouliot), although I think it has probably gone off on a tangent not intended by him. I may have misunderstood the honourable gentleman and if I did

so I hope he will correct me, but I gather from his remarks that he does not believe divorces should be heard by the Senate. Well, I just want to say that I agree with him most heartily. A discussion such as this at least gave the honourable senator from Waterloo (Hon. Mr. Euler) an opportunity to make the suggestion he did, and it gives me the opportunity to agree with him most heartily. Perhaps if we had a debate like this each session for a few years there might be hope that in due course the honourable senator from De la Durantaye and those associated with him in his views, which of course we respect, would support us in organizing proper courts for the two provinces from which petitions for divorce now come to Parliament. Then we could be rid of what I deem to be a great nuisance to the Parliament of this country, namely, that senators are compelled to listen day by day to divorce cases.

While I have said these things I do want to pay my respects to the honourable senator from Toronto-Trinity (Hon. Mr. Roebuck) and commend him for the most efficient and capable manner in which he continues the work of chairman of this committee. Nothing I have said is intended to detract from the very faithful work that he does. However, I am happy to have this opportunity of adding my support to the few remarks that were made by the honourable senator from Waterloo (Hon. Mr. Euler).

Hon. Mr. Pouliot: When may we expect the resolution, sooner or later?

Hon. Gustave Monette: Honourable senators, I excuse myself for rising to speak tonight, because I have not had time to look a little more deeply into the question under discussion. I say, first, that all of us, on both sides, are not very far apart on this question. There may be a few topics on which we in Quebec cannot agree with honourable senators from the other provinces, although we realize they are very sincere in their suggestions. This question is very serious, and I do not think that even the senator from De la Durantaye (Hon. Mr. Pouliot) has in mind any criticism of the work of honourable senators who sit on the Divorce Committee.

Hon. Mr. Pouliot: No. I said that last week.

Hon. Mr. Monette: On the contrary, he has complimented those who sit on the Divorce Committee. Speaking from what I have observed in this Chamber—I have not been here long and I have not had the experience that others have had in this field—I can say that I am very gratified and enlightened by the attention, sincerity and indefatigable