

Divorce Bills

against half of them, that we give relief to half of them because otherwise all of them are going to suffer disappointment.

I understand that the hon. members who have been speaking have given considerable study to this subject. It may be that there are certain cases about which they have graver doubts than they do about others. Possibly they might be willing to let every second bill go through or the first half of the list or the last half of the list. I am merely suggesting that the hon. members can achieve the same objective even if we give relief to half of these people, and I would ask them to consider that suggestion.

Mr. Howard: If I may answer the hon. member, Mr. Chairman, it would appear to me that he was not asking a question but rather making a suggestion as to how we might approach this matter, but either way I will deal with it. Unfortunately, I think we would be picking and choosing among the various cases that appear on the order paper and if we did that we would in fact be saying that simply because the bills involving certain people are in a particular position on the order paper we would grant their petitions but would not deal with those bills that happen to be in another position on the order paper.

I do not think parliament should be put in the position of attempting to pick and choose on the basis of drawing a line halfway down the list or a quarter of the way down or picking out certain ones and not picking others because we have doubts about them. If we accepted this suggestion I think it would cause a great deal more consternation than is being caused at the moment and we would be laying ourselves open to charges against which we could not defend ourselves.

Parliament drew a distinction last year between the types of bills before the house. I have been told by someone who has kept track of the matter in the other place that perhaps two of these bills—I do not know their numbers—involve annulment rather than dissolution of marriage. In other words, a marriage did not exist in the first place because of some peculiarities with regard to the marital relationships of the couples involved. Last session we treated annulments in an entirely different way because a marriage did not exist in the first place. If the sponsor or anybody else wants to pick out the bills of that type on the order paper we can proceed with them and pass them as was done last session. That would be quite agreeable but in our view that is the only distinction we can draw with regard to the bills now before us. We do not think it should be done on the basis of tossing a coin or saying that

the first 50 bills will pass but the next 50 will not, or by drawing numbers out of a hat. I do not think we can engage in a lottery in this regard. I would prefer to have some announcement made by the government of an approach that would meet the situation. I do not think there would be any hesitation then in letting them all pass. Failing that, I am afraid we would be inviting trouble if we followed the suggestion of the hon. member.

Prior to the question being asked I was dealing with what had been ascertained by Mr. Foucher, the investigator, in the course of following the respondent. I do not know where I was when the hon. member asked his question but I will read again the words of the investigator near the top of page 13.

A. On returning close to her residence on Selby street, which is just around the corner from St. Antoine street. I followed the car after that. I returned to the Mount Royal hotel and from there I was able to establish that he had gone up to the sixth floor and I had the name given to me before through the hotel registry—

He gives the name of the person who is recited in the petition as being the correspondent.

He had room—

He gives the room number.

Throughout that night I failed to notice anything happening. Mr. Dewing was not in his room, I lost him, and it was not until the following day, Saturday the 16th, that I was able to take up again after—

He gives the name of the respondent.

—at approximately 7.30 p.m. left in her car and drove and parked it on the northwest side of Atwater avenue near St. Catherine street, and a few minutes later was picked up by the same car and the same man and they went across to the Clover cafe where they remained inside for approximately an hour. They came out again and drove directly to the Mount Royal hotel. I noted that the woman was carrying besides her purse something that looked like a paper bag. The car was left at the hotel, the attendant looked after it, and they went into the Picadilly lounge on the ground floor of the hotel where they remained until approximately 9.15 p.m. Then they both made their way to the elevator, went to the sixth floor. In the meantime I called Mr. Vinet to join me at the hotel. He did so about 9.30 p.m. and from there on I made periodical checks on the room, I heard voices inside until about 11.10 p.m. when Jean Vinet and myself went up to the room and I knocked on the door. It was opened by Mr.—

He gives the name of the correspondent.

I addressed him by his name and asked him to go in and as he was standing inside the door we entered and I asked to speak to—

He gives the name of the respondent.

—who at that time was just on the edge of the bed partly sitting up and wearing a light blue nightgown.

The Chairman: I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.