

Am I justified in that belief? Well, on the 30th of April he went to the landlord of the house where his wife was staying and served notice on him that he would no longer pay the rent. On that date he engaged the two detectives. Then within a very few days what occurred? He proceeded to get what he asserts is evidence. It is my personal judgment that he just hired a "stoogie" woman whose night's work was to keep them around the corner of St. Antoine and Windsor streets in Montreal; a woman who lived at the Hutchison street address where he had planted or put his wife. All he had on this woman to distinguish her from anybody else was a red hat. He was sitting in the back of the car, crouched down, and he says that he was pointing out this woman to the detectives, and that they watched the woman with the red hat. I do not believe for a moment, and never did, that the woman with the red hat was Mrs. Taffert. I believe the whole thing was purely and simply a frame-up made by Taffert because he had secured from her \$1,000 on one occasion and \$500 on another, and did not want to pay those sums back. He did not want to pay her family, but he wanted to unload the woman and her sixteen-year-old daughter.

I should have liked to place on the record the evidence of Mrs. Taffert, because to me it was convincing. Maybe I am wrong in my judgment. If so, the judgment of honourable gentlemen would be just as good as mine. But I sat in on this case, and I think the detectives were just made use of. Imagine if you will, honourable senators, a petitioner and two detectives being on duty for ten hours and thirty minutes, from before eight o'clock at night till six o'clock in the morning, and for seven hours and thirty minutes or eight hours of that time being around the corner of St. Antoine and Windsor streets. Then they went up to Sherbrooke street, where they were on duty a while longer, until the petitioner Taffert and the other detectives were tired out and Mr. Green, one of the detectives, kindly took them home so that they could go to bed. One would have thought that after that length of time on duty Green would need sleep and rest too. But no. He went back to this place where he had this "stoogie" woman, and stayed around, and at about six o'clock in the morning he was just in time to see the woman getting into the man's car and starting for the Hutchison street address. Green followed along carefully behind the "stoogie's" car until they all came to the Hutchison street address, where the woman got out of the car and shook her fist at him.

Does anybody believe that a combination of circumstances like that would develop or that it could occur? I do not believe it. But I am not permitted to handle this matter as I thought necessary in order to make my argument reasonably convincing. The petitioner has proved himself to be a rotter and a rat. I thought the evidence of the woman and of the 15½-year-old girl would have been of some benefit in protecting the honour and the rights of a person whom I regard as a normal, honest married woman, and of her daughter. But I will say no more.

Hon. C. W. ROBINSON: Honourable senators, I was present at the trial of this case, but not the other day when the matter was decided by the committee. I sympathize with the honourable senator from Parkdale, who has just spoken (Hon. Mr. Murdock). I am not quite sure what attitude I should have taken had I been present when the matter was decided. I do not like to impugn the evidence of any witness, but in this committee we hear a good deal of evidence by people whom we do not entirely believe and who sometimes actually contradict themselves. In this case there is some ground for the argument of my honourable friend from Parkdale. I suppose I should support the finding of the majority, who did their best to arrive at the correct conclusion. They did not believe the evidence given by the respondent. As a matter of fact, I did not believe it myself. On one side we had evidence given by the husband and two detectives, which was contradicted on the other side by the respondent and her daughter. There is some question in my mind as to whether we should give the woman the benefit of the doubt. I do not know whether I should say that, especially as I did not believe her evidence.

As far as I personally am concerned, I suppose I shall have to vote in support of the committee's recommendation.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: May I ask the honourable gentleman a question?

Hon. Mr. ROBINSON: Yes.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: Would you place any credence at all in the evidence of the petitioner, considering what he himself said he was?

Hon. Mr. ROBINSON: I do not think the petitioner gave any evidence that was not more or less corroborated.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: Oh, yes, he did.

Hon. Mr. ROBINSON: As far as I personally am concerned, I shall have to leave the matter for the Senate to decide what they think is best to do.