

Private Bills—Divorce

Bill SD-347, for the relief of Bernard Lawrence Boire. (Without Amendment).—Mr. McCleave.

Bill SD-348, for the relief of Marie Madeleine Marielle Faust Morin. (Without Amendment).—Mr. McCleave.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. MacEwan): Does the committee agree to consider as a group Bills Nos. SD-19 to SD-291 inclusive, being items Nos. 61 to 73 at page 12 of today's order paper?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Bill SD-19, for the relief of Ruth Georgina Potts Dobie. (Without Amendment).—Mr. McCleave.

Bill SD-20, for the relief of Patricia Burnell Fraser Rosensweig. (Without Amendment).—Mr. McCleave.

Bill SD-98, for the relief of Dawn Jean McKenzie Barr. (Without Amendment).—Mr. McCleave.

Bill SD-99, for the relief of Helen Ann Kovach Ujvary. (Without Amendment).—Mr. McCleave.

Bill SD-100, for the relief of David Scott Brown. (Without Amendment).—Mr. McCleave.

Bill SD-101, for the relief of Doris Margaret Turner Smiley. (Without Amendment).—Mr. McCleave.

Bill SD-104, for the relief of Angelo Ciamarro. (Without Amendment).—Mr. McCleave.

Bill SD-110, for the relief of Gustave Rene Gosselin. (Without Amendment).—Mr. McCleave.

Bill SD-111, for the relief of Marie Berthe Jeannine Quesnel Patenaude. (Without Amendment).—Mr. McCleave.

Bill SD-136, for the relief of Mary Athanas Cosis. (Without Amendment).—Mr. McCleave.

Bill SD-275, for the relief of Greta Libenstein Goldfeder. (Without Amendment).—Mr. McCleave.

Bill SD-276, for the relief of Andre Maurice Petit. (Without Amendment).—Mr. McCleave.

Bill SD-291, for the relief of Jean Huard DeRoberval. (Without Amendment).—Mr. McCleave.

Mr. McCleave: Mr. Chairman, I have a reason for asking that separate consideration be given to this particular group of divorce bills which appears at page 12 of the routine proceedings and orders of the day. Hon. members who read the numbers of the bills will see that they go all the way from No. 19 to No. 291. Some time ago on the debate

on divorce bills I had occasion to mention that a dozen or so bills were being held back by the committee for special consideration. Perhaps the committee may be interested at this time in having a special report as to why this unusual course was adopted.

The other day, I think for the first time in the memory of anyone who is in parliament in the chamber at either this end or the other end of the building, there was a joint meeting of committee members who are charged with the difficult task of looking after the divorce petitions which come before parliament. While this meeting was an informal one in the sense that it was held without the sanction of either chamber it was none the less a highly important one in my opinion and I think perhaps hon. members of this committee will agree with me when I relate to them the kind of discussion we held and the results that were achieved.

So that I may be perfectly in order, Mr. Chairman, I can assure you that what we did discuss was based in each case on points that arose during consideration of the cases that are now being considered by the committee. Unless I am specifically asked to I should not like to single out these special cases by name but I do promise and assure you, sir, that I will not deviate from the practice of dealing strictly with points that arose in the consideration of bills that are on the order paper this afternoon.

It was the purpose of the meeting to have both groups get to know each other better and to assist in appreciating the problems that arise in the first instance at trial, and of course the trials for the most part are conducted by the divorce committee of the other place. A secondary purpose was to give hon. gentlemen of that committee from the other place some appreciation of the problems that we as members of parliament have when we read the record of proceedings over there and have to make our own decision as to whether or not to grant divorce to the petitioners.

In some of these cases the problem that confronts us could be placed under the general category of an incomplete record. That is to say that some of our members felt there were not enough questions and answers on the record of proceedings of the other place to give us a complete story so that we would be justified in recommending that a divorce be granted. For example, in five or six of the cases that are before us this afternoon hon. members felt that the petitioners had not specifically negated the three C's in divorce practice; that is, collusion, condonation and connivance. This particular group of cases was discussed with

[The Acting Chairman (Mr. MacEwan).]