

and-such. They hire an investigator of minor repute, with good eyesight, who from a distance of several hundred yards can see through the keyhole of a door and tell what is happening inside. Perhaps there is some substance in the evidence that is given, because if we take report after report we find the story is always the same. It reminds me of the story of a general storekeeper who had bought 50 barrels of good black molasses to sell to the lumberjacks of his district.

Hon. Mr. Haig: Honourable senators, I am sorry, but I feel I must interrupt my honourable friend to point out that there is no motion before the house. We will give him every opportunity to speak at the proper time.

Hon. Mr. Farris: What about the story?

Hon. Mr. Haig: I think we should get on with the business.

Hon. Mr. Beaubien: It is a little sticky, but it is all right.

Hon. Mr. Haig: My friend may tell his story if he wishes, but I point out there is no motion before the house. We are anxious to have the motion for the appointment of the committee approved.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald: We have not got to the motion yet. Should we not decide whether we will allow the honourable senator to conclude his remarks? It seems to me that he is about finished. If we shut him off now he can start all over again when the motion is before the house. As I say, I think he is about through.

Hon. Mr. Haig: Will my honourable friend guarantee that?

Hon. Mr. Aseltine: Honourable senators, if I may be allowed to move that the report be taken into consideration now, it will then be in order for my honourable friend to say what he has to say. In my opinion, he is out of order at present.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald: I would agree to that, but I think that what the honourable senator from De la Durantaye (Hon. Mr. Pouliot) has said should be taken as having been said after the motion is put.

Hon. Mr. Aseltine: Honourable senators, with leave I move, seconded by Hon. Mr. Monette, that this report be taken into consideration now.

Hon. M. Pouliot: Honourable senators, I do not want to be accused of obstruction. As a rule, I try to make short speeches, and I thank the house for being so indulgent today.

As I was saying, there was a fellow who bought 50 barrels of molasses to serve to the lumberjacks of his district. His customers

came, and they were served in pints, quarts or gallons. Soon afterward they returned to the store and complained that the molasses, instead of being sweet, turned sour and was very acid. The storekeeper tasted some from the barrel and found that it was not very palatable. So he asked the wholesaler to cancel the deal and take the molasses back, which request was refused. The storekeeper then took action. The court appointed referees, all good men, and each one had to drink a large soup-spoonful of that sour molasses. Imagine anyone drinking 50 large spoonfuls of sour molasses. It must have been very unpleasant. And so it is that when I think of an unpleasant task like sitting on our Divorce Committee I am reminded of the sour molasses case that was decided by the experts. Naturally, all comparisons are odious. I do not want to infringe on the rules, I just want to bring to the attention of my honourable colleagues of the Senate a few facts, which I will summarize.

In the first place, one should have a sense of proportion and agree that the Divorce Committee—and I am not discussing the kind of work that is done by members of that committee at all—is the least important of all the committees set up in the Senate.

In the second place, it will be agreed that a large number of our colleagues spend their valuable time in listening to those sordid stories, wasting their time which they could occupy much more beneficially for the good of the country. That being submitted to the wisdom of all my colleagues, I thank them for the good hearing they have given me.

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: Will the honourable gentleman tell us if he has any suggestions to make?

Hon. Mr. Pouliot: Yes, surely. I make the same suggestion that I made to the house at the time the honourable gentleman was ill last session. I am glad to see that he has completely recuperated.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Pouliot: And this suggestion is now made by special request. I am very thankful to have the opportunity to answer my honourable friend who has spent a lot of time serving on the Divorce Committee.

Going back to what took place at the time of Confederation, we must put ourselves in the minds of the Fathers of Confederation and see the divorce question as they saw it in 1867, when there were none or very few divorces. The suggestion that I made last session, and