

any Senator in this room ask himself what feelings would actuate him against such a man, even if she were a relative and not his wife, that he had led astray as alleged in this case? I do not know what my feelings would be if I were placed in that position, but they certainly would not have been feelings of kindness towards the destroyer of my wife's honor. The letter that this woman writes to her children, is brought up as evidence against her; but nobody can say that it is couched in the language of a bad woman: still is used here against her, though her advice to her children is to obey their father, because they were under his control. Is that such language as should warrant a divorce of this kind? It is not sufficient for me, I want something more substantial than that. I am not going to grant a divorce merely on suspicion. I must have proof, for it is a serious matter that we should prove this woman a harlot and a perjured woman. If she is as bad as she is represented to be would she come here at all to defend her honor? Certainly not; she would say to her husband, "you go your way and I will go mine." She tries to explain her letters—that she wanted to get a divorce from her husband and that she wrote to Pingle and asked him to come to Detroit to assist her in doing so. For my part I shall give her the benefit of the doubt every time. ▲

HON. MR. MCINNES (B.C.)—As a vote is likely to be taken on this report, I desire to place my views on record for opposing the granting of the divorce, but before doing so I must say that I heartily endorse every word that has fallen from the hon. gentleman from Amherst, on the urgent necessity that exists for establishing a court, where cases of this kind can be properly dealt with; and I trust that the hon. gentlemen, old parliamentarian that he is, and a legal luminary, if the Government fails to bring in a bill for that purpose next Session, will introduce a measure himself to carry out the suggestion that he has so ably presented to the House in this debate. I was very much pleased, as we all were, at the eloquent address of our hon. colleague from Calgary. He always puts music into everything that he speaks about in this House. He dealt very largely with the letters of the petitioner, but something has come to my notice

within the last couple of hours about those letters that is not referred to in the report, and that I have not heard mentioned in this debate—namely, that there were important erasures made in those letters submitted to the Divorce Committee. The question is, what were these erasures? What were the words? What meaning did they convey? By whom were they made? Were they made by the respondent? Bear in mind that it was not merely the crossing of a pen through the words, but the erasures, I am given to understand by a member of the committee, were made with a knife, completely obliterating the words. Is it reasonable to suppose that the respondent would take such pains to erase these words with a knife? The only inference to be drawn is that these erasures were made by the petitioner, and I am very much surprised indeed that the shrewd lawyers who were on the committee did not sift that matter to the very bottom.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—The hon. gentleman has gone beyond the evidence. There is no evidence of that kind before the House.

HON. MR. MCINNESS (B.C.)—I think I am perfectly within the rules of the House; I am quoting the words made use of by an hon. gentleman from N.B., the hon. Mr. McClellan, and I do not think there is any gentleman in this House who will for a moment doubt his veracity in that or any other statement he makes. That is the most important feature in this report, and I am surprised at hon. gentlemen, members of that committee, reporting to this House, and taking extreme views—being almost the advocates of petitioner without mentioning such a fact. I cannot understand it. It is contrary to a true judicial spirit, and I hope in future if we are to have such cases before us they will be dealt with in a more judicial spirit than they have been in the past. I must confess that the only doubt that I had in my mind at all about Mrs. Clapp's fidelity rested in these letters, but since I heard of these erasures I am bound to say that I have been relieved to a great extent on that point. The hon. gentleman from Monck has just referred to the witness Pingle. I do not think, on careful investigation of the evidence before us, that any unbiassed mind