

re-processed, and in each report there will be found that solemn declaration as to non-condonation, and a request from the petitioner that he or she wishes to proceed.

I move the adoption of these 305 reports.

Two columns before he suggested to us that the mass of reports, covering 121 pages, was available for us to read. Then two columns later he said: "I move the adoption of these 305 reports." How could anyone, in five minutes, read all those reports?

I made a computation based on the *Hansard* of the House of Commons of Monday, October 15, 1962. There were 200 questions asked by the members and answered by the Government—200 of them. There were 83 pages covering the sittings that lasted from 2.30 to 6 o'clock in the afternoon, and from 8 until 10 o'clock in the evening. On Tuesday last, for the same hours of sitting, the House of Commons *Hansard* covered 47 pages. In all, that is 130 pages for 11 hours of debate in the House of Commons.

As I have said, in this chamber yesterday the adoption of those reports was moved in the next but one column following the invitation to read them. Physically I am unable to read 121 pages in 10 minutes. I wonder if some others can.

Then yesterday, when His Honour the Speaker asked if the reports should be adopted, bearing in mind the feelings I had on April 17, I said, "Next sitting". Then the honourable senator from Toronto-Trinity said:

Why does the honourable senator say that? Does he wish to look into them?

HON. MR. POULIOT: I do not wish to be unpleasant to my honourable friend, but I missed some parts of his remarks, and I would like to be able to read them before giving my assent.

HON. MR. ROEBUCK: May I repeat them to you now?

HON. MR. POULIOT: No. I missed something, and I want to read the honourable senator's remarks quietly in my office. Next sitting.

THE HON. THE SPEAKER: Next sitting.

We have resumed consideration of the reports this afternoon. This is quite a long story, and I have to check some information. Therefore, honourable senators, I move, seconded by the honourable senator from Queens (Hon. Mr. MacDonald), the adjournment of the debate.

Hon. Arthur W. Roebuck: I suppose that motion is not debatable, but some remarks have been made here that should not go without comment.

Hon. M. Aseltine: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Croll: You can speak to it on a question of privilege.

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: Well, perhaps I have a real question of privilege in connection with some of these remarks.

It has been said that nobody knew what these reports were about. I am responsible, in some measure at least, as Chairman of the Divorce Committee, for the knowledge of the members of the committee and for the combined knowledge of us all. I would like to challenge that remark with all seriousness.

The reports that were on the table at the time in question were the culmination of hearings in which the committee had called witnesses, had heard those witnesses, had considered the evidence and had come to a considered judgment in regard to each and every one. There was not a case there that had not been thoroughly considered and completely understood, and concerning which justice had not been determined in a moderate and judicial manner.

Instead of this body acting capriciously or carelessly in connection with those cases, the house relied on certain senators, such as myself and my colleagues, for the work we had done, the judgments we had rendered and the common sense we had applied. To say that there was anything hurried or careless about the proceedings on that occasion is an injustice to this house and a serious injustice to the members of that committee.

There are only two points I wish to make—and I cannot possibly sit silent while statements of this kind are made. It has been said that the action in the other place was taken as a punishment by Parliament for the celerity with which we had passed these 305 bills. My honourable friend may have information that I have not with regard to the action of the House of Commons, but I would call attention to the fact that Mr. Peters, one of the members of the House of Commons who was blocking the passage of these bills, made the statement that the work of our committee had been well done. I give him credit for that statement.

All my knowledge of what went on is contrary to the statement that there was any revenge or punishment meted out to the Senate because of the celerity with which we had passed bills which, by the way, had taken us almost the whole session of Parliament to consider and pass properly. The ones that are before us today have been before us for nearly a year, and in all that time the information has been available to any honourable senator desiring to make inquiries. The cases now under consideration are those that we deliberated upon last session, and not this