

Private Bills—Divorce

Mr. Peters: On behalf of the C.C.F., may I say that we will be very pleased to have these bills brought forward. We believe that this is not—

Mr. Speaker: It is obvious there is not unanimous consent. We shall proceed with the order paper.

Mr. Howard: Unadulterated Liberal obstruction.

Mr. Pickersgill: Obstruction?

Mr. McCleave: Talk about obstruction: C.C.F. hypocrites.

PRIVATE BILLS

DONALD SNOWDON

The house in committee on Bill No. SD-31, for the relief of Donald Snowdon—Mr. McCleave—Mr. Rea in the chair.

On clause 1—*Marriage dissolved.*

Mr. Martin (Timmins): With regard to this Bill No. SD-31, may I say that it seems to me there are a great many inconsistencies and contradictions. There are in this bill any number of things which make one wonder how it could have been passed in its present form without at least being tidied up a bit. The first inconsistency we find here may be a minor one but, as I say, in order to tidy the bill up I think something should have been done at some stage. At page 5, which contains the petition, we find that clause 5 thereof states as follows:

5. That after the said marriage your petitioner lived and cohabited with the said...and there is living of the said marriage one child,...age seven years.

Then when we look at page 12 of the evidence given before the committee we find that the petitioner was asked this question by one of the hon. senators:

Q. Have you been looking after your little boy since you separated?

A. Yes.

Q. How old is he now?

A. Eight years old.

This may be a minor mix-up but at the same time it is something which, when taken into consideration with the evidence as a whole, points up one of the many things which I intend to point out, one of the many inconsistencies contained in the evidence presented in connection with this bill.

Mr. McCleave: Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Martin (Timmins): Yes.

Mr. McCleave: Will he not agree that the petition was dated the 16th day of July, 1959 and the boy could have grown a bit since then?

[Mr. Pickersgill.]

Mr. Martin (Timmins): I thank the hon. member for pointing out that fact. Possibly that may be one of the things I overlooked in this bill. That would account for this particular difference. I hope the rest of the inconsistencies I intend to bring out can be explained as easily.

We have, for example, on the night in question, which I believe was June 18, 1959, the date on which the alleged adultery occurred, a description of the apparel worn by the respondent and the correspondent. We find at page 12, when the petitioner was being questioned—I believe this time by the attorney, Mr. Cohen—the following questions:

Q. Could you tell us what happened on the 18th of June, 1959, at 5175 Charles roi in Montreal?

A. I went there myself. I found the address where she was living and I went there about 9 o'clock on the evening of June 18. I rang the doorbell, she answered; she was in her nightgown—

Then again, on page 12, the question was asked by Mr. Cohen:

Q. The madam was in the nightdress and...was in his pajamas?

A. Yes.

Then on page 14, in an answer which the petitioner gave to one of the hon. senators:

When I went there this man was sitting there with her and she was in her nightgown and he in his pajamas.

A. Yes.

Then over on page 15 when the respondent was being questioned she was asked, again by the attorney:

Q. How were you dressed that evening?

A. Baby doll pajamas.

I do not profess to be an expert; I do not know the difference between a nightdress, a nightgown and baby doll pajamas. I do not know whether she was wearing one or all three. But if she was wearing all three, it might lead one to wonder how the alleged offence took place.

An hon. Member: Ways and means.

Mr. Martin (Timmins): Then we have again some inconsistency with regard to the residence of the correspondent. If we look at page 15 of the evidence, when the correspondent was being questioned by the clerk of the committee, he was asked his name and his age and we find the following question:

Q. Where do you live?

A. 7100 Querbes, Montreal, Quebec.

Then again when he is questioned by the attorney, we find the following question:

Q... have you ever had sexual relations with... and if so, more particularly on June 18, 1959 at your residence at 5175 Charles roi?

I do not know whether his residence was at one place and he was living elsewhere or whether his residence was the other place—