

Private Bills—Divorce

Mr. Seguin draws out in evidence. He asked him how long they lived together after they were married and the petitioner said for about two and a half years or some time at the beginning of 1945. Then there is this testimony:

Q. Did you leave her or did she leave you at that time?

A. She would have nothing to do with me. I told her, "The least thing you could do is before going to bed to wash yourself" and she hit me with a bottle. She told me to get out and see—

Here, a word is used that I would not use in this place. It is the shortened form of the word one applies to a woman of the streets, as it were.

That is when I broke up with her.

Mr. Hodgson: Read on.

Mr. Howard: The hon. member is asking me to read on. Undoubtedly he has an intense interest in this sort of thing. There is some phraseology in here, Mr. Chairman, and some words are used—I know they are given in evidence—

Mr. Horner (Acadia): They would not bother you.

Mr. Howard:—which refer to some particular thing, but I would not use them here. They are in the evidence for any hon. member who desires to make reference to them. Then these questions follow:

Q. And you remember the approximate date when you left her?

A. It happened sometime in August or September of 1944 or 1945; I don't remember the exact date.

Q. It was after she beat you with the bottle you left?

A. Yes.

Then farther down there are some questions by Mr. Seguin with reference to condoning this act and there is a reference to a child. You have indicated before, Mr. Chairman, that we have no right to discuss the children, so I think I should not make reference to that. Then these questions follow:

Q. Since you left your wife have you had anything to do with her? Have you cohabited with her as man and wife?

A. No, sir.

Q. Have you been going out with her?

A. No, sir.

Q. Do you know anything personally of the adultery alleged in the petition to the effect that your wife was in a certain place with a man—

He gives here the name of the co-respondent.

A. Yes, sir. I was in the car on the parking lot of the place where the motel is situated.

Q. Did you go in the cabin or the room?

A. No, I was in my car and I saw the detectives going in.

The reference to the detectives, I imagine, is a reference to Mr. Albert Janelle, who appears as a witness and who is listed as an

[Mr. Howard.]

investigator, and Mr. Armand Labonte, who is also a witness and lists his occupation as chief of police. In any event, we will go on with the questions:

Q. That is all you know about it?

A. I saw the detectives going into the motel.

By Senator Bradley:

Q. You don't know who was in the room?

A. I saw my wife and this fellow go in.

Q. And you saw the detectives go in?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you see anybody come out?

A. I saw the detectives come out.

Q. But not your wife or the man?

A. No.

Then there is another question by Senator Bradley on the top of page 11:

Q. Do you know who the man was?

A. I know now who it was.

Q. You did not know at the time?

A. I knew slightly because the man did appear at my dance hall at certain times.

The petitioner lists his occupation, in reply to questions by the clerk, as a dance hall owner. Then there is this question:

Q. What is his name?

He gives the name of the corespondent. Then the next questions relate to the fact of whether or not there is any close relationship between the petitioner and the co-respondent, whether there is any collusion. Mr. Seguin asks these questions:

Q. Had you ever talked to this man before?

A. Maybe "hello" when he would come upstairs.

Q. And that is all?

A. That is all.

Q. Did you ask this man to go out with your wife?

A. No, I did not.

Q. Did you ask your wife to go out with him?

A. No, I did not.

Q. It is also alleged that your wife gave birth to a baby girl. Do you personally know anything about that?

A. I found out about that sometime in December, 1953.

This would undoubtedly be a reference to a child born some years after the parties had separated, although that is not clearly established. Then there is this question:

Q. You were just told; she did not admit it herself?

A. She did admit it.

Then by Senator Bradley, there are these questions:

Q. What did she say?

A. She was very drunk and she told me exactly what happened, that she gave birth to a child sometime in September, 1956, and she gave the child out for adoption.

I think perhaps we may be running afoul of the rules to mention the child, except that this may be permissible here because it would give some corroboration or proof of the adultery. These parties separated in September, 1944 or 1945, according to the evidence given earlier, and the petitioner