

Private Bills—Divorce

Bill No. 424, for the relief of Ronald Arthur Leslie.—Mr. Hunter.

Bill No. 425, for the relief of Lucienne Saint-Laurent Calve.—Mr. Hunter.

Bill No. 426, for the relief of Roberta Barbara Shvemar Feigelman.—Mr. Hunter.

Bill No. 427, for the relief of Pearl Marie Neil Lane.—Mr. Hunter.

Bill No. 428, for the relief of Marjorie May Price Amory.—Mr. Hunter.

Bill No. 429, for the relief of Marie Jeannette Laure Lafreniere Lucas.—Mr. Hunter.

Bill No. 430, for the relief of Frances Goldberg Glegg.—Mr. Hunter.

Bill No. 431, for the relief of Thelma Nellie McKeage Patrick.—Mr. Hunter.

Bill No. 432, for the relief of Madeleine Roy Julien.—Mr. Hunter.

Bill No. 433, for the relief of Louis Tothe.—Mr. Hunter.

Bill No. 434, for the relief of Joseph Delphis Guillaume Delorme.—Mr. Hunter.

Bill No. 435, for the relief of Nicolas Joseph Ladislav Barath.—Mr. Hunter.

Bill No. 436, for the relief of Ferencz Gyula Babinszki.—Mr. Hunter.

Bill No. 437, for the relief of Beatrice Alexandra Duff Sheppard.—Mr. Hunter.

Bill No. 438, for the relief of Remi Charbonneau.—Mr. Hunter.

Bill No. 439, for the relief of Kathleen Florence Pippy Hayward.—Mr. Hunter.

Bill No. 440, for the relief of Fred Skiffington.—Mr. Hunter.

The Deputy Chairman: We will consider clause 1 of these bills.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to ask you to go through the task of calling all the bills one by one but there are two or three of these cases on which I should like to make a brief comment. I am in your hands as to how you would like to handle them.

The Deputy Chairman: If the committee were in agreement that the bills be committed all at one time, perhaps the remarks the hon. member wishes to make on one or two of them might be made when the appropriate section is called. Is that procedure agreeable to the committee?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[The Acting Speaker.]

On clause 1—*Marriage dissolved.*

Mr. Regier: Mr. Chairman, this divorce case is a case that is based on evidence. I do not choose to oppose the case in any way, shape or form. However, I should like to say something on this matter of evidence. All these cases, as was this one, are based on sworn evidence—evidence taken under oath—by individuals. These people come to the committee of the other house, and if necessary, they come to a committee of this house and take an oath that they will tell the truth and nothing but the truth. Many of us are not trained in legal matters and we have a great deal of difficulty in sorting out the evidence. I feel that our people back home sent me here to legislate. I feel that they sent me here for the purpose of making laws, not to determine between different types of evidence and to decide which evidence is acceptable and which is not. I feel that I am wholly unqualified to perform that function.

The question that enters my mind is this. What happens if in this evidence perjury is apparent or is possibly even admitted? As the committee will recall, I drew the attention of the house to one of these cases on April 2 last. The case was referred back to the committee, presumably for them once again to peruse the evidence and to reconsider their decision. However, when this committee met the counsel for the petitioner appeared and asked permission to withdraw the case. He was asked for a reason and he said that his client had found that those who had given evidence on his behalf were wholly untrustworthy. To me that statement seemed to be an admission of the suspicion to which I gave vent on April 2. There was at least cause to suspect perjury there. In fact, in this particular case the man had given evidence under oath that he was an agent for a certain life insurance company. But we have an affidavit from that life insurance company to say that they had never heard of that man, so he could not possibly have been registered as one of their salesmen. There were other evidences of perjury.

What I should like to know is this. Since these cases are based on sworn evidence, if there is an admission or a suspicion of false evidence having been given, who is responsible for instituting action for perjury? Is it the committee of this house? Is it the committee of the other house? Is it the chairman of our committee or of the other committee or is it our Minister of Justice? Or is it up to the attorney general of the provincial government? If it happens in this house, is