

Hon. Mr. ROBINSON: I would ask what the honourable gentleman is reading?

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: The evidence taken before the Divorce Committee when this petition was heard. I realize several gentlemen here would like to shut this off. They desire to put this divorce through, which I think would be a gross injustice to an innocent woman and to her innocent sixteen-year-old daughter; and I am going to do everything in my power to prevent this injustice. As I said the other day, I believe them to be just as honourable, in respect of what the woman is charged with, as a member of the family of any senator in this Chamber. That is the position I am taking now.

Hon. Mr. ROBINSON: There is a section in the Criminal Code which prohibits the publishing of divorce evidence. Does the honourable gentleman say there is nothing in that section?

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: Surely that must be a piece of nonsense, in view of the fact that we print a copy of the evidence for every member of the Senate and of the House of Commons. I realize that honourable gentlemen who have made up their minds—

Hon. Mr. ROBINSON: Oh, no.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: —do not want to have this record before the people, but I am going to insist that it shall go there.

Hon. Mr. ASELTINE: It is before every senator and every member of Parliament now.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: Then we will add a little to it by putting in some more of the evidence. (Hon. Mr. Murdock continued his reading of the evidence.)

Hon. Mr. ROBINSON: This is the section of the Criminal Code to which I referred:

Nothing in this section shall make it lawful to publish a report of any evidence taken or offered in any proceeding had before the Senate or the House of Commons, or any committee of the Senate or the House of Commons, upon any petition or bill relating to any matter of marriage or divorce,—

I think the honourable gentleman is going pretty far in reading this evidence. The responsibility will be on his own shoulders.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: It will be on my own shoulders. This divorce evidence is printed and distributed to the Senate and the House of Commons. The Criminal Code means it is illegal to distribute such evidence outside. Of course, that is so, it is admitted, but it has nothing to do with this situation.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Is the honourable member from Parkdale (Hon. Mr. Murdock) at liberty to read into the Senate Hansard evidence taken before our Divorce Committee? There is no restriction on the distribution of Senate Hansard, whereas, under the rules, divorce evidence can be distributed only to members of the Senate and of the House of Commons.

Hon. Mr. COPP: And they are not permitted to distribute that evidence.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I do not think it can be done.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: You distribute copies of the minutes of the hearings.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: To members of Parliament and senators.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: Of course.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: By reading this into the record you are distributing it to people all over Canada. You have no right to do that.

Hon. Mr. HARMER: I think the Press is entitled to report everything said in this House in open session.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Certainly.

The Hon. the SPEAKER: I have been called upon to give a ruling on the point of order raised by the honourable member from Winnipeg South-Centre (Hon. Mr. Haig). It seems to me entirely out of order for an honourable senator to read into Senate Hansard evidence taken before the Divorce Committee of the Senate. Consequently I rule that the point of order is well taken, and that such evidence should not appear in the Debates of the Senate.

Hon. Mr. HARMER: All the evidence that has been read should be expunged from the Debates.

Hon. Mr. ROBINSON: I think so too.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: Good-bye, then, to the protection by the Senate of a decent woman and a decent girl. But members are ready to accept, without any discussion, the sworn and, I think, perjured testimony of an ingrate, a rotter, a rat, and of two detectives who had been engaged to do his dirty work and were paid therefor. That is my personal judgment of this particular case. I think it is unfortunate that we cannot get these facts placed on the record here, so that we could read them. I appreciate that all senators can read a copy of the divorce evidence if they want to. I assume they do not want to.