

Private Bills—Divorce

through the evidence it is obvious—or certainly it is obvious to me—that as to the \$700 which she might have collected and might have been able to save, if she were able to save one quarter of her whole income, the total would have amounted to only \$770. As I said, the couple were married in the city of Montreal. The plaintiff was represented by Mr. Blank and he began his questions in relation to the picture as follows:

Q. Is it a good picture of him?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you remember approximately when that was taken?

A. Approximately three years ago. (Photograph filed marked exhibit No. 2).

The questioning continues and we come to the part of the evidence which interests us:

Q. Were there any children born of this marriage?

A. No.

Q. When did you separate from your husband the last time?

A. Last year, February 1959.

Q. Did you ever separate before that?

A. Several times.

Q. What were the reasons for the separation?

A. He used to tell me that he went out with other women and he bragged about it.

Q. You separated three or four times before the final separation last February?

A. Yes.

They have already, in my opinion, built up the fact that the application for a divorce was inevitable and that anything which may have happened was only the conclusion of a decision they had taken on at least two or three separate occasions. The evidence continues:

Q. Do you know anything about the adultery alleged in paragraph 7, other than what I have told you.

A. No.

Q. Did you condone this adultery in any manner?

A. No.

Q. Did you have anything to do with arranging any adultery or any collusion?

A. No.

By Senator Bradley:

Q. Your husband's name is Joseph Cohen, isn't it?

A. Yes.

Q. That is his true name?

A. Yes.

Q. In the marriage certificate there is a reference to one Joe Cohen?

A. Yes.

Q. That is the certificate that you received from the clergyman when you were married to your husband?

A. That is right.

Q. That is one of the names by which he is known?

A. Yes.

By Senator Barbour:

Q. Were you going to school when you were married?

A. No.

Q. How old were you when you got married?

A. Eighteen.

Q. Did you start and keep house by yourselves?

A. Not right away. I lived with his parents at the beginning for about a year.

Q. Have you been working since you were married all the time?

A. Yes.

Q. You continued to work right along?

A. Yes.

By the Chairman (Senator Cameron):

Q. From the very beginning?

A. Yes.

By Senator Bradley:

Q. How long is it since you and your husband separated?

A. The last time was last February, 1959.

Q. Have you had any associations with him since of any kind?

A. No.

Q. None at all?

A. No.

Q. You didn't plan this divorce between you, did you?

A. No.

Q. You will not forgive him for what he has done?

A. No.

Then we get to what I consider to be an important part in a number of these divorces. We have often mentioned the fact that we have been told in the miscellaneous and private bills committee that the average for divorces costs \$2,500 in the manner in which they are handled in the Senate and the House of Commons. This becomes quite important in my opinion, because it would obviously indicate some agreement between the two parties if the money did not come from a wife who was applying for divorce. Therefore we have this type of questioning which tends to establish that the woman paid for the divorce yet there is no opportunity to decide how she could possibly have paid for it with the wages she is reported to be earning. But the question is asked because it is important, and if the answer were in the negative then I am quite sure there would be some difficulty in the Senate committee allowing this divorce to stand.

The question is asked:

Q. Who is paying for the divorce?

A. Well, I am. I want the divorce.

By Mr. Blank:

Q. Are you finished paying for it yet?

A. No.

Mr. Chairman, if we are going to be of the opinion that this woman is paying for the divorce, then I also assume we would have to agree that Mr. Blank is himself financing part of the divorce. I am curious to know what recourse to law Mr. Blank would have if after the divorce is granted he cannot collect his money. I would like to know whether he would have some redress to the court who gave the decree. It also raises the question, I would imagine, how many of these divorces are paid for in this way, and whether there is a payola racket going on where the detective gets some money, the lawyer gets some money, and