

Private Bills—Divorce

Mr. Lennard: In each case?

Mr. Knight: Yes, in each case. In cases where it is shown to the satisfaction of the committee on divorce that an applicant is unable to bear this expense, the fees are usually reduced to \$125. That is the sum I mentioned earlier. This decrease is made because, in round figures, it covers the out-of-pocket expenses. In a few special cases the fee has been reduced to as low as \$75.

It might interest the hon. member to know that, of 280 petitions heard to date in the present session, in seventeen cases the fees were reduced to \$125, in eight cases to \$100 and in four to \$75.

Mr. Higgins: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Knight: I love questions, if I can answer them.

Mr. Higgins: What is the average all-in cost of divorces?

Mr. Low: All-in?

Mr. Hatfield: That is the sixty-four dollar question.

Mr. Speaker: May I remind hon. members that the debate is assuming a general tone. The discussion would appear to be on divorce generally and does not relate directly to the bill before us. I have not stopped the hon. member, nor do I propose to do so. However, I trust the discussion will not go too far afield.

Mr. Knight: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thought that perhaps in the debate on second reading one might have a little leeway in the matter of general discussion, provided it had reference to the bill. As I said earlier, I have read the bill thoroughly and could discuss it for an hour if necessary. I thought the facts I was placing on record were of more interest to the house and country. However, in view of your admonition perhaps I should say no more about it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knight: What I have said is on the record.

Mr. Speaker: As I pointed out, I had no desire to stop the hon. member, but I would remind the house that the discussion should be pertinent to the bill. However, now that the hon. member has begun his speech, I feel he should be allowed to conclude it.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. member for Saskatoon completed his remarks?

Mr. Knight: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, I could talk for a long time about this case, but I do not think I have anything further to say for the record.

Hon. members may be interested to know that \$10 is paid by the applicants in these divorce cases for the translating and printing of the bills. I take it from this return however that that does not cover the evidence. Six hundred copies in English and two hundred in French are printed, and I cannot see the necessity for that number. They are in stereotyped form, and perfectly uniform. In view of our advocacy of another type of court, I suggest that this procedure of having a court of 102 judges in the other place and 262 here who have to be supplied with all this evidence might well be replaced, and certainly more cheaply, by a court in which there would be less judges.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

GEORGE KEITH HENDERSON

Mr. H. W. Winkler (Lisgar) moved the second reading of Bill No. 343, for the relief of George Keith Henderson.

Mr. E. D. Fulton (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, I shall not detain the house for more than a moment, but I should like to ask a question of the sponsor. I know we are not in committee, but before going into committee I would ask him to answer a simple question. Can the hon. member tell me from what city the petitioner George Keith Henderson comes?

Mr. Winkler: I cannot tell the hon. gentleman that.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended speaking on this bill but since a question has been asked and apparently no answer can be given I feel obliged to say that it should be given. The domicile of the petitioner in this case is Montreal while the respondent is living in the United States. The printed evidence here runs to 57 pages. I have read it, and I know one or two other hon. members have read it, and it appears to be most confused. The case was contested before the Senate committee and I hope our committee on miscellaneous private bills will go into it very carefully.

One reason for the confusion that exists is the fact that one wonders why it was contested. When a case is contested there is usually a motive, and that motive is generally quite clear. Many times the question of money seems to be involved, but in this case both parties appear to have plenty of money. They