

*Divorce Bills*

**Mr. Howard:** Was account taken of the time for the question and answer?

**Mr. Peters:** Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that the hon. member for Skeena was interrupted because of the rule of the committee. He was raising a very important point and I only want to refer to one part of the evidence. There are a couple of amusing passages I might mention. I am always interested when these questions are asked about how so and so was dressed. We find the answer here is that he was wearing cream coloured, solid coloured pajamas.

**An hon. Member:** What colour do you wear?

**Mr. Peters:** Here, we have a budding investigator in our midst, and we did not know it. After the events of the next few months, perhaps he will be appearing before us regularly as one who has entered this very lucrative field.

**Mr. Churchill:** I rise on a point of order, which is not really a point of order. On other occasions when evidence such as this was being read into the record, contrary to what was the practice in this chamber in days gone by, may the page boys be relieved of their duties in the chamber.

**Mr. Peters:** We certainly support that.

**The Chairman:** The committee is in agreement with the suggestion made by the minister, and the page boys are therefore relieved from further attendance at this time.

**Mr. Peters:** We are not going to embark on that type of discussion, anyway. I only wanted to point out one thing that was said. There was a question asked by Mr. Gomery, who was the lawyer for the plaintiff, I am told. The question was asked, I presume, of the first detective, Mr. Foucher, and I quote from his answer:

I explained the purpose of our presence in the room and I would say they took it philosophically, there were no acrimonious comments made when we left. We retired downstairs and stayed there for about half an hour and then left.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this would not be surprising if it were not for the fact that this couple were seeking a divorce. This is one of the problems with which we are always faced in connection with these matters, connivance and arrangements that are quite often made. We should refer again to the questioning by the lawyer for the plaintiff, and I quote:

Q. What prompted you to leave? Start from the beginning.

A. Well, things had not been going too well within the family for several years. My wife, for the last two years insisted on taking her holidays on her own, without me, and she came home late one night last summer, very early in the

[The Chairman.]

morning and I gave her a severe reprimand and this time she said she wanted a divorce. I thought this over a couple of weeks.

It would be very interesting to know what a severe reprimand is from a husband to his wife.

Q. Why did she say she wanted a divorce? A. She told me she was in love with another man and wanted to marry him.

Q. Did she say who he was? A. No, but the following day she told me.

Q. Who was he? A. Mr. Arthur Dewing of Stamford Connecticut, United States of America.

Q. Do you know Mr. Dewing? A. Both my wife and I knew Mr. Dewing in England.

Q. He is an Englishman? A. Yes.

Q. What is he doing in Stamford, Connecticut? A. He emigrated to Canada first then he went to join his sister in the States.

Q. What did you do as a result of this conversation with your wife? A. I thought a couple of weeks about it and finally I decided to secure legal advice.

Q. What did you instruct your attorney to do? A. I thought they should start a divorce investigation at least.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is the point of the remark that was made at the scene of the alleged offence when the investigator said they took it philosophically and there were no recriminations, as there sometimes are in these cases. The reason for this treatment was that they had decided to get a divorce. She wanted a divorce and he wanted a divorce. He went to a lawyer and asked how to get it. Obviously, this is one of those cases where the corespondent may or may not be guilty of the offence. There is reason to believe that this divorce was obtained by what I would consider to be other than the regular legal procedures.

I return to the evidence, and I find that this question was asked.

Q. As a result of this consultation with your attorneys, did you learn anything which made you think you should move out? A. Yes.

Q. What did the attorneys report to you?

I am surprised this testimony was allowed to continue this far, but the chairman finally intervened and said:

We cannot allow that.

I would think that not only could the chairman not allow it but I would be very surprised if the lawyer could follow this type of question because it would be inevitable that he would become implicated if this line of questioning were continued. The lawyer then said:

Mr. Chairman, I merely want to establish the reasons for his moving out.

By The Chairman:

Q. As a result of the investigation which your attorneys made you moved out?

A. Yes.

It is surprising that in this evidence the chairman did not ask about the date he