

Hon. Mr. Pouliot: I thank you.

PRIVATE BILL

STANMOUNT PIPE LINE COMPANY— THIRD READING

Hon. Gunnar S. Thorvaldson moved the third reading of Bill S-14, respecting Stanmount Pipe Line Company.

Motion agreed to and bill read third time and passed.

DIVORCE

BILLS—SECOND READINGS

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

Bill SD-250, for the relief of Dorothy Mary Shrimpton Legault.

Bill SD-251, for the relief of Maria Giuseppa Di Nunno.

Bill SD-252, for the relief of Marie Jacqueline Fernande Belisle Wechselberger.

Bill SD-253, for the relief of Simonne Fournier Bergeron.

Bill SD-254, for the relief of Cecily Anne Maud Carter Bernard.

Bill SD-255, for the relief of Marie Henriette Andree Massue Prevost.

Bill SD-256, for the relief of Lovell Orville Woodard.

Bill SD-257, for the relief of Joseph Wing.

Bill SD-258, for the relief of Adrienne Menard Huot.

Bill SD-259, for the relief of Hilda Jamesie Hatfield Carter.

Bill SD-260, for the relief of Evelyn Mae Wood Snell.

Bill SD-261, for the relief of Robert Smith.

Bill SD-262, for the relief of Ethel Fisk Gwynne-Davies.

Bill SD-263, for the relief of Marie Reine Drouin Milliard.

Bill SD-264, for the relief of Joseph Leonidas Albert Paradis.

Bill SD-265, for the relief of Hyman Wexler.

Bill SD-266, for the relief of Natasha Harp Crayter.

Bill SD-267, for the relief of Martha Ratelle Holtken.

Bill SD-268, for the relief of Shirley Bertha Marietta Birrell Wilson.

Bill SD-269, for the relief of Norma Elizabeth Gammie Costigan.

Bill SD-270, for the relief of Merita Helen Gertrude Alarie Russell.

Bill SD-271, for the relief of Sydney Clarence Walker.

Bill SD-272, for the relief of Barbara Anne Young McFadden Pallett.

Hon. Jean-François Pouliot: Honourable senators, before this motion is put I would like to draw attention to a matter of considerable importance. All of you must have realized that the evidence in the various cases before the Divorce Committee piles up much higher than our sessional papers, than the *Hansard* of the Senate, and the Minutes of the Senate, and the reports of the other committees of the Senate. It would be interesting to know how much time our *Hansard* staff spends in taking the evidence in shorthand and transcribing it. They must spend five times as much time in doing that work as in reporting debates and other committees. The conclusion is obvious: it is that at times when very important committees are sitting we cannot have a stenographic report made because the reporters are held at the Divorce Committee taking notes in the various cases. It is unfortunate that the work of the Senate suffers owing to the number of divorce cases that are brought before the Senate committee.

We have an experienced *Hansard* staff; they work nearly day and night to do the work of the Divorce Committee. We have their services here in the chamber for our debates, but we cannot have them in our other committees. This is something everybody knows. I wonder if it would not be easier if the members of the Divorce Committee took a few notes of the evidence given before them. For instance, if the evidence was that the sheets were up to the neck or shoulders, the note need only show "ditto"; if the clothes are on the chair, another "ditto". In this way a lot of time would be saved, we would have the valuable assistance of the Senate reporters at our other committees, and as a result the country would benefit.

Some days ago I said that I would think hard to offer a suggestion on this subject. Honourable senators, this is one suggestion. Nobody would suffer if the honourable gentlemen who sit on the Divorce Committee would make a note that they are satisfied with the evidence; they could say "ditto" for their decisions too. It does not take long to write "ditto". It would be a time- and money-saving experiment, and I submit it in all good faith, with the hope that it will be taken into consideration if another more constructive way cannot be found.

Hon. W. M. Aseltine: Honourable senators, may I say that the honourable senator from De la Durantaye (Hon. Mr. Pouliot) is absolutely incorrect in what he has said. If