

Hon. Mr. ROBINSON: It is a little difficult for His Honour the Speaker to make a ruling on this; but if the honourable gentleman would agree not to inflict upon us all the evidence, we might be very glad to have him go on. I think, however, it is hardly fair to the members of the Senate to ask them to listen to page after page of evidence which they have had before them. I think it is not very courteous.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: The honourable gentleman apparently has to get the consent of the House to read the evidence. One honourable gentleman has objected to giving that consent. I am another who does so. If the honourable gentleman will get up and say that he is not trying to carry on a blockade until eleven o'clock, when the House will adjourn, I shall be perfectly content to let him read whatever he likes. But this is purely a blockade, and the honourable gentleman knows it as well as I do. The evidence has been printed and distributed to all honourable members.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: I fully expected to be finished before eleven o'clock.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: You did not look like it.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: I should have been through if I had been left alone.

The Hon. the SPEAKER: Honourable senators, because of the position which I occupy in this House I am not at liberty to enter into any controversy whatever. It is my understanding, after a long experience of parliamentary affairs, that the evidence taken before the Standing Committee on Divorce is of a private nature; and a well-known practice prevents such evidence being distributed to the public. It is distributed only to members of Parliament.

What cannot be done directly should not be done indirectly. To read the evidence of what happened in the present instance does not appear to me to be according to the practice, and I do not think it would be in the public interest to permit this evidence to be read in this Chamber, thereby making it public. Consequently, my ruling is that the point of order is well taken, and that no evidence read should appear in the Senate Debates.

The remarks made a moment ago by the honourable senator would indicate that this House is a kind of appeal tribunal. There is another tribunal to which appeals can go—the Private Bills Committee of the House of Commons.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: Will not the honourable senator from Parkdale be satisfied to make his main objections and omit the

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK.

reading of the evidence? I think that every honourable senator here, after hearing the honourable senator from Parkdale at a previous session of this House, has read the evidence, and it seems to me that the honourable gentleman would be doing justice to his own conviction and to the House if he were just to speak on the principal objections he has and omit the reading of the evidence.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: I could, of course, do that; but in doing it I might not be altogether accurate. I should like honourable senators to exercise their own judgment, so far as they can, after listening to the questions and the answers. They cannot see, as I did during the whole course of the trial, the woman and her daughter.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am not a lawyer, but common sense tells me that as this case has been heard by the committee, which, after all is a judicial body, or a court, that should put an end to the hearing of evidence so far as this House is concerned. The committee has given its decision, and for the honourable senator from Parkdale to object is, to my mind, an extraordinary proceeding, and altogether out of order. What right have we in this House to hear the evidence? The evidence was given before the Divorce Committee.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: But we are passing on the second reading of this Bill, and we have been educated to believe that we have a right on second reading to discuss the facts concerned and the questions involved in a particular bill. That is all I have been trying to do. I am willing to bow to the will of the Senate. If you do not want to hear any more about this, it is all right so far as I am concerned. I will refrain from reading the evidence. I had intended to read a little more of this man Taffert's evidence; then I intended to read the evidence of the woman and her sixteen-year-old daughter, both of whom I regard as being crucified by a couple of perjured detectives. No, I do not believe they knew they were telling a lie. I believe the petitioner "framed up" the woman. He hired the detectives; the lawyer did not.

Now, can this petitioner do that kind of thing? Down in New York his wife had to get \$1,000 to keep him out of jail for embezzling money, and later she had to put up another \$500 because he said he needed it to join an organization and protect his job. Both of these claims were "phony"; both of them were grafting. That is the kind of man he was. I say that he is exactly the type of man who would arrange to do just what was done in this case.