

He said: Honourable senators, this bill is similar to one which was presented last year, and its purpose is to amalgamate certain wholly-owned subsidiaries of Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The company owns all the issued capital stock and bonds of these subsidiaries, and all the companies are operated by Canadian Pacific under long term leases as part of its system. A similar bill introduced last year amalgamated 13 companies; the bill now under consideration is intended to amalgamate 12 companies. The object is to simplify the corporate organization of Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and to get away from considerable legal complications and expenses. For example, several meetings of directors and shareholders would no longer be necessary, and the keeping of several sets of books would be avoided.

A bill will be introduced at the next session to amalgamate 12 other companies, and that will complete the reorganization. Canadian Pacific Railway Company is assuming all the obligations as well as the rights of all of these companies which are to be amalgamated or dissolved, so that no one will lose anything through the reorganization.

All these companies are under the jurisdiction of the Board of Transport Commissioners.

Honourable senators, if the bill is given second reading I shall move that it be referred to the Committee on Transport and Communications. There is no objection at all to the bill by the Department of Transport, or any other department. Representatives of the Department of Transport will be present at the committee to answer questions, but if any honourable member wishes further information now I shall be glad to furnish it, for I have all the details here.

The motion was agreed to, and the bill was read the second time.

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bouffard, the bill was referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

DIVORCE BILLS

SECOND READINGS

Hon. Arthur W. Roebuck, Chairman of the Standing Committee on Divorce, moved the second reading of the following bills:

Bill K, an Act for the relief of Dorothy Amelia Ashmore MacDonald.

Bill L, an Act for the relief of Dorothy Frances Auger DeJacobis.

Bill M, an Act for the relief of Patricia Jean Jones Robinson.

Bill N, an Act for the relief of Gwendoline Stedman Adrain.

Bill O, an Act for the relief of Joyce Bernice Good Taylor.

Bill P, an Act for the relief of Jessie Pearce Meti.

Bill Q, an Act for the relief of Maud Lenore Wheeler Lanctot.

Bill R, an Act for the relief of Patricia Anne Wylie Houstoun Patience.

The motion was agreed to and the bills were read the second time, on division.

The Hon. the Acting Speaker: Honourable senators, when shall these bills be read the third time?

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: Next sitting.

DIVORCE RULES

AMENDMENTS RECOMMENDED BY COMMITTEE—DEBATE ADJOURNED

The Senate proceeded to consideration of the thirteenth report of the Standing Committee on Divorce.

Hon. Arthur W. Roebuck moved that the report be adopted.

He said: Honourable senators, this is the committee's report which, as I stated when tabling it a week ago, recommends amendment of the Senate Rules on divorce. The text of the report appears in the Senate *Hansard* and *Minutes of the Proceedings* of January 17, and possibly some honourable senators have studied it in detail. May I assure all honourable members that the proposed amendments were drawn with a very great deal of care by three outstanding officials of this house, namely, Mr. J. F. MacNeill, the Clerk, who has had long experience in these matters; Mr. E. R. Hopkins, our capable Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel; and Mr. Harvey Armstrong, Chief Clerk of Committees. The amendments have been approved unanimously by the Senate Divorce Committee, the members of whom, of course, are very familiar with the working of the Rules, and the amendments are now before the Senate for its consideration. From what I have learned, and from the comment I have heard, the amendments have met with the approval of those best qualified to pass on them, that is, lawyers and others familiar with the situation. It seems to me, therefore, that I can pass over the mere details rather rapidly.

As I said on January 17, we are proposing only two major changes in the Rules. One is that the respondent who replies to a petition and seeks to oppose it shall give a short and concise statement of the facts upon which he or she relies. That requirement is so