

I do want to say that in this particular case I think a divorce is justified. There is one thing I want to add. Of these five cases, there were four in which the investigator who investigated the case—I mean the professional investigator—found it necessary to lie in order to obtain the evidence.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Knight: I think that is something that should be brought to the attention of the house as showing the manner in which the evidence in these cases is procured. In this particular case you will find that at page 10 of the book of evidence the investigator said that he went to a certain room to see this man, to accost him with his crime. He said: "I told him I was the watchman and there was smoke coming out of the room."

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Knight: There is a proverb which says that there can be no smoke without fire. I think this is the exception which proves the rule. Of the other cases, the evidence of which I have read or waded through, I found that according to the evidence of four out of five cases the investigator has lied in order to prove his case. These are the same people upon whose evidence under oath these marriages are broken up. I want to say right here that if a man does not tell the truth when he is not under oath I do not believe him whether he takes an oath or whether he does not. I think the manner of doing this sort of thing is shameful. However, sir, I do not want to talk the bill out. I have already said this is a case in which I think there is a reasonable claim for divorce. I am not opposing it.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion.

Mr. Fournier (Hull): On division.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

HILDA RICHARDSON TAIT

Mr. H. W. Winkler (Lisgar) moved the second reading of Bill No. 15, for the relief of Hilda Richardson Tait.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 15, unlike the last two that we have had before us, is another one in connection with which we have not yet received the evidence. Therefore I feel, as I did with respect to the first two that we had tonight, and as I felt with respect to the one we had the other night, namely, that we should not proceed with it on this occasion. I would not think of moving the adjournment of the debate at two

Supply—Finance

minutes to nine o'clock, because if there were objection to such a motion it would mean the necessity of taking a vote, which would take ten or fifteen minutes off the consideration of the supplementary estimates. If, however, the house is willing to accept such a motion and let it be carried then of course I would be prepared to make it.

Some hon. Members: Nothing doing.

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Some hon. Members: Nine o'clock.

Mr. Knowles: I hear voices say "nothing doing" and others say "nine o'clock". May I point out that all we know about this case is that it is the wife who is seeking the divorce. Her initials are H. R. T. She lives in the city of Montreal, and it is one D. C. T., the husband, from whom she is seeking the divorce.

Mr. Speaker: Nine o'clock.

Mr. Knowles: I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Speaker: It being nine o'clock, the house will resume the business which was interrupted at six o'clock.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Beaudoin in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

General items of payroll costs including superannuation payments—

584. To provide for a government contribution to the superannuation fund in an amount equal to the estimated current and arrears payments of individual contributors in the previous fiscal year—further amount required, \$4,943,977.

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Chairman, before six o'clock we had an interesting statement from the Minister of Finance as to the nature and purpose of this vote. The fact had emerged that the intention of the government is to place the civil service superannuation fund on an up-to-date actuarial basis. But there was one thing which I do not think had been established clearly, and therefore I should like to ask the minister whether I am correct in my understanding that although this is, in the sense in which he explained it, a book-keeping transaction, the effect nevertheless will be that when he gives us his completed statement of revenues and expenditures at the time he presents his budget the net surplus will have been reduced by the total of \$102,943,977, as a result of votes 584, 585 and 586; so that that reduction will be reflected when he presents his official report on the surplus.