

*Private Bills—Divorce*

**An hon. Member:** So as to be bullied by three.

**Mr. Howard:** We are not bullying anyone. We are not bullying a soul. We are indicating that if parliament is to be asked to pass divorce bills it should accept the responsibility of studying them instead of rubber stamping the bills.

**Mr. McCleave:** How do you fellows know, you never show up at the committee?

**Mr. Howard:** I cannot because I am not a member of it. Even though the hon. member extended an invitation to me to attend one day I had to decline because I had made a previous arrangement.

On pages 12 and 13 evidence is given by the detective, Mr. Charron, who appears on behalf of the petitioner and who was questioned by counsel for the petitioner. Although the evidence is not usual it has some bearing on what I intend to say later and therefore I shall read it. Mr. Charles Charron was sworn and gave his occupation as investigator. He was questioned by Mr. Joyal, counsel for the petitioner, as follows:

Q. Here is exhibit 2, a photograph. Who is that?

Mr. Charron replied, giving the name of the respondent. I continue:

Q. Was this photograph given to you by the plaintiff in this case?

A. Yes.

I will delete the names of the central figures in this case and the address as I go along. I continue:

Q. Do you remember seeing this Mrs.—on or about the 14th of March?

A. I saw her quite a few times with the same guy that we caught her with at—a duplex upstairs. On a Saturday morning I went there at nine o'clock and Mrs.—came out about one o'clock in the afternoon and she went out. So I lost her. She took a bus and I lost her. So I came back to the house and waited there and about three o'clock she came back with a man and they went up to the house. I went to the telephone booth on the corner and telephoned for Mr. Morin—

Mr. Morin is another detective who appears in this case. I continue:

—to come and meet me, and he met me at four o'clock and we went upstairs and knocked at the door several times before Mrs.—came and opened the door with a pink dressing gown on and bare legs. I asked if she was Mrs.—and she admitted it and I showed her the picture I had in my possession and she admitted it was one taken of her, and we walked into the bedroom and there was a man in bed. So I asked the man his name and when I asked him his name he sat in the bed and you could see that he was nude. His legs were bare. So he said—So she started to scream so we went away.

Is there anything more foolish than to ask us to accept this evidence? Can you imagine two complete strangers at four o'clock in the afternoon being admitted to a home by a

[Mr. Howard.]

woman in a dressing gown who states her name in response to a question, and identifies a photograph of herself, and does not protest when the two strangers walk into the bedroom and begin questioning the nude man in the bed? The detective testified that the woman then began to scream and they left. This occurred at four o'clock in the afternoon and the people had returned home about an hour previous. This is pretty hard to swallow. If this were the only case in which such events occurred the evidence would not be so difficult to accept but the detective is not a novice at this sort of thing.

According to information given in the Senate in answer to a question asked by Senator Pouliot, this detective appeared in 36 cases before the Senate committee in 1959, 41 cases in 1958 and 19 in 1957. He has served his apprenticeship as an investigator in divorce cases. He knows all the answers and what arrangements to make in order to gain entry into homes.

The same individual is also involved in Bills Nos. SD-34 and SD-35 in which his evidence is almost identical except that in the case of Bill No. SD-34, the respondent is a man and the correspondent a woman. He testified that after the completion of the investigation the man started to get angry and so he and his companion left and in one instance he testified that the man started to get angry and pushed him out. I realize it is not in order to discuss other subjects when a bill is before the committee but the frequent appearance of this man in these cases and his behaviour pattern is a point I wish to draw to the attention of the committee.

One wonders from reading his evidence if his questions and answers are not like a gramophone record and if he mentions hostility on the part of the individuals concerned in order to create the impression that no collusion has taken place. I think the gentleman protests a little too much.

The evidence of this man, Mr. Charron, is corroborated by that of another detective, Mr. Morin, who confirms that the woman answering the door wore a pink dressing gown, that they went to the address at four o'clock in the afternoon, that the woman identified the photograph and gave her name, that the nude man in bed identified himself, and so on. It is therefore not a mistake on the part of the first detective when he stated in the evidence that the woman started to scream and so they left.

I submit Mr. Chairman that if she started to scream and if this scream was an indication of objection to those two strangers being there, then it might be quite natural for