

this woman, and who gave testimony as to her living with Simpson. The question put by the hon. gentleman from Victoria was: "Did your sister give you any reason for getting a divorce?" The answer was: "I had no communication with her at all."

"Q. She never told you why she got a divorce?"

"A. No; she gave me the divorce papers. I had no communication with her.

"Q. She gave you no ground for seeking a divorce?"

"A. I never spoke to her on the subject at all. We were living some distance from each other."

That would indicate that if there had been any serious matter for divorce proven against her husband it would have been, under the circumstances of the case, communicated to her brother. But it was not so communicated, and therefore I say we have not only the direct statement made by him that the charge was false, but we have also the conclusion which we can inferentially draw from the testimony given by the brother of this woman, that the charge was unfounded, that adultery was not the reason why she got what she called a divorce in the State of New York. So, looking at all the points developed in this case, I may say that, so far as my humble judgment goes, it is as clear a case as any that has ever come before us in which relief should be granted.

HON. MR. DICKEY—I do not propose to argue the matter in any way, but I think it would be well for the House to look at the evidence, rather than to the arguments which are advanced, and which I deem to be rather contradictory. In answer to the question as to the birth of this child, a question put by the petitioner's own counsel, as follows: "Since you left your wife the last time (that was in the spring of 1881) had you any intimation of other children being born?" He says:

"A. Yes; there was another child born after I left her.

"Q. How long after you left?"

"A. Ten or eleven months after my leaving home.

"Q. Have you ever disclaimed the paternity of that child?"

"A. Yes.

"Q. For what reason?"

"A. Well, on account of the child being born the time it was. I knew that unless it was something out of the ordinary, that I was not the father of the child."

Then one of the members of the committee seems not to have been satisfied with the answer to that question, and the question is put by Mr. Ogilvie:

"Q. You cannot fix the month. How can you tell that the child was born ten months after you left?"

"A. Because when I got news of the birth of the child I knew the dates then. You see my letters that I had were all burned at the fire in Vancouver, and I was away, too, at the time."

That is his answer. Now, as to the other point, the evidence has not been adverted to. It is an answer to a question put by myself, and will be found on page 2 of the evidence. After he had stated that he had sent \$250 to pay outstanding accounts, he was asked:

"Q. That was in the summer of 1882, was it?"

"A. 1883, I think. Then a little while afterwards I got an intimation from a friend at Thorold that my wife was not behaving herself in a very proper manner with a Mr. Simpson there, and I telegraphed her \$500 through the bank, and told her to take the children and come out at once, and if she did not, that that was the last she would see of me."

That is the evidence, and it will be for the House to decide upon the evidence.

HON. MR. OGILVIE—I think that the last remark from the hon. gentleman from Amherst is the best proof that we could have that the petitioner did not condone any offence, but was trying to save his wife if he could do so. It was not only his wife that was being supported by this money that he sent: the children had to be supported as well, and that was one of the reasons. Then the hon. gentleman from Lunenburg seems to have directed the principal part of his remarks to that divorce from New York, and he gave great weight to that incident. Hon. gentlemen who were sitting in this House three or four years ago would have thought the hon. gentleman from Lunenburg had got enough of New York divorce at that time, when we had a week's fight over it, and it was then the opinion of this House and the vote of this House that we should pay no attention to foreign divorce at all.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—No.

HON. MR. OGILVIE—I beg the hon. gentlemen's pardon; I say, yes, it was. When the different States of the Union will not recognize divorce among themselves, I should like to know why we should recognize their divorces in this country? That was the understanding come to then, and hon. gentlemen should remember that divorce in the State of New York has no recognition here; and as truly remarked by my hon. friend opposite, we pay no attention to it. The gentlemen who did sign this report were unanimous, and some of them spoke out very clearly, and