

He brings a Mrs. Roehrig, who says that on two consecutive days she saw something take place that it would be very hard to make me believe did take place. She is asked:—"If they had legal business with them, you would not be surprised at that would you?" A.—No; there were lots of ladies coming and going all the time."

Now, the first day that this impropriety was alleged to have taken place, was Decoration day. This lady had gone into the office at 11 o'clock when Mr. Dorland and his partner were there. At about 2 o'clock this witness says she saw something improper taking place in the room. She saw it by looking through the slit in the door through which letters are dropped. Does anyone believe that such a thing would happen on the floor of the office at an hour of the day when people might be calling at any time on business? I could not conceive it possible that the most abandoned prostitute, and the most degraded man could be guilty of such conduct. It is so improbable that I must either believe that the witness did not see what she describes, or that she was mistaken as to the identity of the woman. Dorland says nothing of the kind ever took place, and that the only occasions on which the respondent had called to consult him were in the previous year, when she asked him for advice about getting a divorce from her husband. But Mrs. Roehrig swears that the next day, the one following Decoration day, she saw Dorland and the respondent repeating the impropriety. I think she said the occurrence took place about 2 o'clock in the afternoon in business hours. Soon afterwards Mr. Powell, Dorland's partner, entered his office and she went and told him what she had seen. I cannot believe a word of that evidence. I know that animal passions are strong, but if those people were inclined to do evil, they had other and better opportunities to meet. Mr. Dorland, who appears to be a respectable man, is a Canadian by birth. He comes from Prince Edward County, where Mrs. Clapp and her husband resided at the time of their marriage. Dorland was a lawyer for five years in Detroit, but was obliged by ill health to change his occupation. He lives in Chicago when he is not travelling, and he came all the way to Ottawa to give evidence. We could not have compelled him to come; he came

voluntarily to deny on oath the statements made by Mrs. Roehrig. Both the respondent and Dorland flatly contradict the evidence of Mrs. Roehrig and the detective, and, therefore, so far as the Detroit witnesses are concerned, nothing has been shown to justify this House in granting Mrs. Clapp the relief she seeks. We now come to the evidence of Pingle, a drunken character, who by his own admission, was an impecunious, worthless fellow. Mr. Clapp seems to have purchased his evidence, because he admits that when he told Mr. Clapp that he had debauched his wife, he slipped \$10 into his hand. But that was not sufficient; he wanted money after that and once or twice afterwards received further sums. He was not sober when he was giving his evidence here, and though he was sharp and smart in answering questions, he was not a man that one would readily believe. He does swear that he had criminal intimacy with the respondent at Palmerston and at Detroit also. If you believe him, of course the petitioner is entitled to relief; but I for one do not believe him. There are some letters written by the respondent which have a suspicious aspect, but it must be borne in mind that she was a musical crank and that Pingle and Miss McKenzie were also musical cranks. It is shown that when the respondent was earning a small pittance in Detroit, she was trying to save enough money to get a piano, for which she was to pay \$3 a week. She was willing to deny herself food and clothing in order to have music. Pingle, so far as I can see, is a man who would do anything for a glass of whiskey; it appears to be his failing. Two weeks before he was examined here, his medical adviser said he could not leave his room for seven weeks, yet he could come here and give evidence. One would think that a man who was not utterly degraded, would at least have kept out of the way, if he had been guilty of improper conduct with this woman, and would not have been so anxious to come here and give evidence against his partner in guilt.

HON. MR. DEVER—For \$10.

HON. MR. READ—He got more than that. He got money from time to time, according to his evidence. These, among other things, have led me to decide that I shall give my vote against this Bill.