Senate would not hear the evidence but would only verify the Quebec judgment based on proof of adultery and would automatically pronounce favourably on the petition for divorces. Is that the view the honourable senator holds?

Hon. Mr. Bouffard: It is exactly that.

Hon. Mr. Monette: I agree with you.

Hon. R. B. Horner: Honourable senators, as a member of the Divorce Committee I have listened to a good many cases over the years. I think it is misleading to suggest that in many cases the petitioner has been living with his or her spouse as man and wife almost up to the time of application to the Senate for divorce. In some cases the husband and wife have been separated for as long as 20 years. It has been suggested that divorce petitioners should move out of the province of Quebec and take up domicile elsewhere, perhaps in the province of Saskatchewan. I have no authority to invite those people to my province, but it might be of some benefit if they went there. However, it could result in a great depletion of the population of Quebec if we turned Saskatchewan into a place for evasion of the present law. We have had some cases of prominent people going there and taking up residence.

Hon. Mr. Euler: It would make a little Reno of the province of Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Horner: Yes. However, what I rose to say was this. If, as the honourable senator argues, a spouse living in Quebec were granted separation as to bed and board, and the evidence in proof of adultery was taken in that province, there would be nothing for the Senate to do but grant the petitioner a divorce. For the life of me, I fail to see any difference between that procedure and the granting of divorce by the Quebec courts. People would say, "Well, the plaintiffs are attempting to prove adultery for purposes of divorce petitions." The courts would be reluctant to grant such a decree because in effect they would be granting divorces. If evidence submitted to the Senate was accepted as proof of adultery without any further inquiry, you would to all intents and purposes have your divorce court in the province of Quebec.

Hon. G. Percival Burchill: Honourable senators, I just want to say that I sit as a member of the Divorce Committee out of a sheer sense of duty and nothing else, and I am quite sure that there are other members of the committee who share my views. Honourable senators from the province of Quebec who decline to sit on the committee do so because the church to which they belong is opposed to divorce. That is their privilege, and it is their duty to do as they see fit. I too belong to a church that is opposed to divorce.

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: So do I.

Hon. Mr. Burchill: But I also belong to a body in the Parliament of Canada, one of whose duties it is to pass on petitions for divorce. I consider it my duty to do the things for which I took an oath when I became a member of this body, and that is what I am trying to do.

If there is any thought at all of appointing a committee to discuss ways and means by which the situation may be improved, I would suggest to the honourable senators from the province of Quebec that if they do not become members of the committee they should select one from among their number to act as an observer during a session, to note what takes place in the committee. I feel quite sure that they would benefit as I have benefited, and they would then have a totally different idea of the whole proceedings. I do not think that anybody should discuss this matter without a knowledge of what takes place during the weeks and months when the committee is listening to what have been properly described as domestic tragedies and trying to come to a proper decision about them. If at least one or two honourable senators from Quebec would sit in as observers and see what is taking place, I am quite sure that when a committee met later to consider the problem they would have a greater appreciation of just what it is, and that would help greatly in reaching a solution.

Hon. Mr. Monette: May I put a question to the honourable senator? I hope he will take my word for it that in all our discussion, none of us in Quebec—Catholics—mean to reproach the honourable members of the Divorce Committee. It is simply that we feel we cannot agree to sit on that committee. Our refusal is in keeping with our religion and does not imply that we have no confidence in the honourable senators who do the job. Please believe that we are fully satisfied in that respect. If I were entitled to be a member of that committee I would like my work on it to be as highly regarded as that of the present members is regarded by me.

Hon. John J. Kinley: Honourable senators, this discussion was started by the senator from De la Durantaye (Hon. Mr. Pouliot) on the question of the cost of printing divorce cases. I agree the cost seems high but, as was suggested by the honourable senator from Medicine Hat (Hon. Mr. Gershaw), it is largely paid by the petitioners