

Private Bills—Divorce

insurance commission carried out a survey of the fishing industry in 1951, excluding the fish processing portion of the industry which has always been insurable employment. Consequently we have a good deal of information and I can give my hon. friend a long answer or a short answer. I think I shall give him the short answer, and then if there is any further information the hon. member would like I shall be glad to provide it.

It was found that those engaged in the industry could be classified as follows:

	Number	Percentage
Masters and owners	14,094	16
Wage earners	6,172	7
Sharesmen	49,148	56
Lone workers	18,762	21
Total number	88,176	

The commission further found that the sharesmen, being in effect self-employed, are not suitable for coverage under the Unemployment Insurance Act. To insure the wage earners who are employed under a contract of service would not solve the problem as they number only 7 per cent of the total labour force in this industry. Anomalies would be created because of the great extent to which fishermen pass back and forth between the status of wage earners, workers on shares and lone workers, not to mention woods and farm workers. The nature of the industry, which is highly seasonal, makes it very difficult under present procedures and conditions to apply unemployment insurance even to the wage earners.

As my hon. friend knows, the difficulties which I have outlined apply with special emphasis to the Atlantic coast fishing industry.

PRIVATE BILLS

LILLIAN MAY HOLLOWAY O'BRIEN

Mr. H. W. Winkler (Lisgar) moved the second reading of Bill No. 32, for the relief of Lillian May Holloway O'Brien.

Mr. Speaker: I notice there are a number of divorce bills on the order paper; is it the wish of the house that I call them?

Mr. Coldwell: One at a time.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. M. J. Coldwell (Rosetown-Biggart): Mr. Speaker, I ask that these bills should be considered one at a time. Last Friday evening we did suggest that the group of bills in connection with which the evidence had been placed before hon. members might be taken together. However, that suggestion was not approved by the sponsor, and I have had no

[Mr. Gregg.]

indication today from the sponsor as to his wishes regarding these bills. Consequently I gather that he desires that they should be dealt with as they were on Friday evening, one at a time.

I do not propose going into a prolonged discussion on this bill. In this case I have read the evidence, and I notice that it is quite clear as to the reasons for seeking a dissolution of the marriage. But I cannot refrain from pointing out that once again investigators are involved.

In this particular case the chairman of the Senate committee, Hon. W. M. Aseltine, made the statement that in his opinion the petitioner, in this case a woman, should not have been put to the expense of having an investigator to investigate this case since there was a birth registered by a mother who was not the wife of the person accused of the offence in this particular bill. As the hon. senator said, once again we have an investigator, and unnecessarily so in this case.

One odd thing about this case is that when the investigator who had made the investigation, Abe Golden, was called to give evidence as a witness, the crier reported that he was engaged in the other committee room. In other words, he was engaged in another divorce case in which he had been the investigator. The chairman then asked the solicitor for the plaintiff, Mr. Garber, if it would interfere with the proper presentation of his case to have another witness called in the meantime. Mr. Garber said that it would not, and Harry Maxham was then called. The evidence states:

Harry Maxham appeared as a witness on behalf of the petitioner, and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows . . .

I do not want to put the testimony on the record, but here apparently are two men in partnership as investigators in connection with this type of case. Apparently they are so busy that one was appearing in a case in another committee room, and the result is that the evidence given is not that of the witness who actually swore to the accuracy of the charge, if you care to call it that, but that of the partner who testified on behalf of the other investigator, Mr. Golden.

This is something that indicates once again the position in which the house is put with respect to divorce cases. I am not criticizing the members of the other place, nor am I criticizing the committees of the other place which investigate these cases. A year or two ago, at the invitation of the chairman of one of their divorce committees, I attended one morning and observed the manner in which they dealt with divorce cases, and I must say that I had no quarrel with the manner