

HON. MR. OGILVIE—I do not require any lessons on what is becoming from you.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I would be sorry if I did not set a better example in this House and out of it than the hon. gentleman, and when he has had as long parliamentary experience in this House as I have had, he will know how to conduct himself and make proper remarks—remarks such as one gentleman makes across the floor of the House to another. It is evident that the hon. member has only been a short time with gentlemen of the character of members of this House, otherwise he would have refrained from the remarks he has made on this occasion. I ask the leader of the House to look at the Bill and examine the testimony, and say whether there is a tittle of evidence to justify the finding of the Committee except the evidence as to one offence. As I said before, there is sufficient evidence to pass this Bill, and if there is anything that would prevent its passage, it is the discourteous manner in which I have been treated by hon. gentlemen on the other side of this House.

HON. MR. GOWAN—I trust that the House will bear with me, after the long speech we have had from the hon. member from Lunenburg, if I endeavor in a few words to point out wherein I think the Committee were fully justified in assuming, as a jury might assume, that a second act of adultery was committed by this man. First I would say that it is impossible to exaggerate the calm and excellent manner in which this case was presented to us. The counsel for the petitioner had evidently taken extraordinary care to frame his Bill in a correct manner. The evidence was fairly brought out, the case conducted with great propriety, and I do not think I exaggerate in saying that every member of the Committee believed that no similar bill this session had been conducted with more propriety or in a more becoming manner. It is always an advantage to any Committee—to any tribunal—to have a case well presented by the counsel conducting it. My hon. friend says there was no evidence to go to the Committee of the

second act of adultery and he says a good deal of the man who gave his evidence before the Committee on this point and I must say without any exhibition of feeling. He left the matter in his mind, he kept it to himself, for several years, and it was only last year he communicated the facts to a brother of the petitioner. He did not himself recollect the time when he communicated it and was uncertain about it, but the brother recollected the time distinctly, and that he did not communicate to his sister for some time afterwards. With regard to the point which my hon. friend endeavors to make, that the evidence does not show the act of adultery sworn to by the witness Elliott. My hon. friend must be of a very unsuspecting nature if he supposes that the respondent—who was known to be a dissolute character—took a squaw into his bedroom for any good purpose; but the evidence is more explicit. Elliott swears that the respondent, when he took this woman to his room, asked him to leave it for a while, and when the door was opened he was caught in the very act of adultery charged against him in the Bill. It is also proved that he visited a shanty occupied by a half-breed woman and her daughters, who were known to be common prostitutes, and whose place was resorted to by men for the purpose of prostitution. The witness was asked the question, I think very properly, which brought out the facts—“Was it a tent or a wigwam?”—to which he replied it was a regular log-built hut occupied by a family of half-breeds; “and,” he adds, “this woman, when her husband was away on the plains, the men were in the habit of going there to have connection with her and her daughters.” Now, he was seen going there.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Once only.

HON. MR. GOWAN—It was open to the Committee to infer what his motives were. If you saw a man who was living a creditable life, a man who was not indulging in drunkenness and debauchery, going into a place like that, you might attribute nothing to it, but where you