

*Private Bills—Divorce*

not have to be named in the petition. It happens that there are a few cases further on in which that practice is adopted.

**Mr. Howard:** However, as I said earlier, I would suggest that the evidence given so far, even though there is no name or address given of the correspondent, there is certainly an indication that there is or was a male correspondent so far as the birth of the child was concerned and it would seem to me that that fact in itself would be sufficient inasmuch as it is not a contested case and that we need go no further.

However, perhaps inasmuch as the evidence is here it might be worth-while determining in a brief way just what evidence is given by the investigator and the chief of the police and what they actually discovered with respect to the actual allegation of adultery having taken place with this particular correspondent because apparently that is what the case is based upon and is what should be considered, although I myself would say without hesitation that the case has been proved already.

Mr. Albert Janelle appeared as a witness and was sworn. He gives his name, address and occupation as an investigator to the clerk of the committee. Then he is asked some questions by Mr. Seguin. He then tells for whom he is working, he identifies a photograph that is exhibit 2 as being that, as he said, of the gentleman's wife or respondent and he gave her name. Then this question is asked:

Q. On what occasion did you see her?

A. I saw her on January 26, 1959. A lawyer, Rene Durenleau, he called me up and asked me if I was free on the 26th, at night about half past six to follow someone who was to pick up a certain lady at—

He gives here the address. It sounds as though this lawyer had an undue amount of information as to what the individual was about to do, whom he was to pick up and when he was supposed to pick her up and at what address. This is what Mr. Janelle tells us. He tells us that he was called up and asked if he was free on the 26th, the specific night and the specific time at night, namely six thirty, to follow someone who is going to pick up a certain lady. As I say, Mr. Durenleau, the lawyer in this case, must have had an undue amount of ability to discover information of that nature if it was not already planned that on the 26th a certain lady would be picked up at a certain address and there would be an investigator there to notice all that sort of thing. In fact, Senator Ger-shaw follows that point up and says this:

A lawyer asked this detective to be ready to go at a certain hour on a certain night. Well, that seems as if the whole thing was planned or arranged that they all be there at that time.

[Mr. McCleave.]

Mr. Janelle spoke through an interpreter, and the interpreter says this:

The witness answers that it was to keep watch.

Even so, if it was to keep watch, it was to keep watch upon a certain thing that he was told beforehand would take place and that he was to follow someone who would pick up a certain lady at a particular address on this particular night. In any event Mr. Seguin follows with the question in this regard:

Q. But did he actually give you a time or anything, or give you an address?

Then there is left out the usual capital "A"—it is not in the evidence—indicating an answer. I suspect that this is merely an omission of this letter and that the answer is as follows:

Oh, yes, he told me about half past six.

Q. To go there around half past six?

A. Yes. He told me that the wife's husband would probably be there, that he had given the lawyer the investigator's licence plate number.

Q. And who was that man, is he here in the room?

A. Yes, but I didn't see him at that particular time. I saw him when I got there, and he followed us, and I had two men with me. My man told me that there was a car following us, but I knew that it was a Rambler station wagon. I stayed in my car with one man, and another man kept watch on the street.

Apparently there are three detectives or three investigators involved in this case and the respondent himself, all of whom knew that at a certain time something was going to take place and they were to be there. Anyway, Senator Bradley follows this question up as follows:

By Senator Bradley:

Q. Who was in this car following you?

A. I don't know. I followed the man to the motel with the wife. He stopped his car in front of 1107, and eleven. One side was a gas station with a restaurant, 1107. The restaurant's name is Laurentides. On the other side of the motel is number 1111.

Q. This thing does not make sense. I mean, you are still on—street, and all of a sudden we find you at a motel, and nothing happened on—. But I have not had an answer to my question yet about the car that was following.

By Mr. Seguin:

Q. Tell us about that?

A. He only found out who the person was in the car at the motel afterwards.

**The Deputy Chairman:** Order; the hon. member's time has expired.

**Mr. Horner (Acadia):** I would like to say a few words on this bill. Here we have a case which is a very good one. There are two gentlemen over there who particularly like defending the rights of individuals. In this case we have a couple who were married some time ago and the question was put, "How long is it since you left her?", and the answer was "Fifteen years". Fifteen years,