

burnt out and lost all his papers, and had a great many difficulties to contend with. I do not think it should be a bar to getting relief in this action that there was delay. He seemed to have a great desire to support his wife, until he heard from his sister that she was acting in an improper manner. It was brought out in evidence that he had only heard incidentally that she had applied for a divorce.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Not incidentally. There was a legal process served upon him, charging him with adultery.

HON. MR. CLEWOW—He admits that. But about that time the great fire in Vancouver took place, and all his papers were burned, and I do not know that he was aware of the contents of those papers.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—He swears that he did know—that he had read them.

HON. MR. CLEWOW—Possibly he had, but paid very little attention to them, as he had found out at that time that she had acted improperly.

HON. MR. McMILLAN—He admitted the charge.

HON. MR. MACDONALD (B. C.)—No; he denied the charge against himself.

HON. MR. CLEWOW—I do not think he admitted any specific knowledge of the contents of those papers, and as far as I understand from what he said upon that occasion, he simply admitted there were papers served on him.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—He admitted that the papers were served upon him, and that a divorce suit was to be prosecuted in New York. He also admitted that the papers served upon him charged him with adultery with a certain woman, and that he knew she had got a divorce; but he denied before us in committee that he was guilty himself of adultery.

HON. MR. CLEWOW—That denial ought to go as far in his favor as the knowledge of the service of those papers should go against him. We know, from the evidence, that the woman committed adultery, and the petitioner should get relief.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—As a member of the committee to whom this matter was referred, I endeavored to give close

attention to the case, and I was unable to come to any other conclusion than that to which the majority of the committee came—that the Bill should be granted. Although there was some little objection taken to some points, it did not occur to me that it was sufficiently strong to justify the committee in refusing to grant the Bill. As to the charge of condonation, it appeared to me that the husband, situated as he was, so many thousand miles away, and hearing rumors of scandal from something that was written to him, it was eminently proper for the husband to do under the circumstances what he did do, with a view to rescuing his wife from the dangers which appeared to beset her, and if possible put her in a position where she would be beyond suspicion; and I do not think the steps he took on that occasion would amount to condonation of her offence. It was not that he was cognizant of certain facts, but that his suspicions merely were aroused, and although he had his suspicions he was quite willing to supply all the spare money he had in order that his wife might be removed to where he was, and they might live happily together. Subsequently, as he told us, his means became more limited, and he was not able to defend the case brought against him in New York, but he was afterwards enabled to spare means to prosecute the divorce, which subsequent events proved to him was necessary. Consequently, this should not be brought against him as any objection against the passing of this Bill. It has been stated by the hon. gentleman from Lunenburg that the divorce obtained by the wife in the United States was not recognized by the committee in any way, because it has become pretty well established, in this Chamber at any rate, that divorces obtained in the different states of the Union are not such divorces as can be recognized as legal and proper here, so that the evidence of that proceeding was not developed before the committee to any extent. The mere fact was brought out, and nothing more. Not only did we fail to secure any evidence to support the view that the husband had committed adultery, as was alleged, but we had his own evidence completely contradicting the charge, and we have other evidence inferentially to the same effect. I call the attention of hon. members to the evidence given by J. P. Tisdale, who is a brother of