

a stranger she is not to be relied upon? We know that there is a well established and well defined rule by which this evidence could have been impeached if it is susceptible to impeachment; but no attack was made on the veracity of this woman and we have to accept her evidence as being proved; so I say, under these circumstances, that we should accept that evidence in the absence of anything to assail her veracity.

HON. MR. MCKINDSEY—There is the evidence of the respondent herself and the evidence of Dorland against it.

HON. MR. LOUGHEED—That is, with regard to contradiction, but her veracity was not attacked except by the contradictory evidence put in by the respondent herself and Dorland, as to facts alleged by the latter. Then we find Pingle states under oath that he had criminal intercourse with the respondent. From the way in which hon. gentlemen talk, one would expect that there should walk into that committee room a paragon of chastity, a man against whom you could not point the finger of scorn, or whose character could not be attacked in the slightest degree. A man of this character, a debaucher of women, we do not expect to be brought before the committee as a paragon of virtue. We should very naturally expect that this man would be possessed of all the infirmities of human nature; we would anticipate that he would not be clothed with all the virtues which hon. gentlemen seem to think he should possess before we could believe him. We know very well we would have to accept such a witness knowing well that as to his statements we would have to analyze them very carefully, and give due consideration to any evidence he gave, after having proper regard to his character generally. Assuming that we lay aside the evidence advanced by these two witnesses who deal with direct facts, and taking the circumstantial evidence, what do we find to be the result of the investigation? Taking the first incident, which happened at Listowel, it is alleged that this man Pingle had criminal intercourse with the respondent there. She denies absolutely that there was any man in her room upon the night in question. Keeping this in view, and keeping further in view the disinter-

ested evidence which we have of the witnesses Alex. McKenzie and Thos. Watt, let us see what circumstantial evidence there is to shake this allegation of her's that there was no man in that room with her on the night in question. I will refer hon. gentlemen to pages 13, 14 and 15 of the evidence, especially to the latter part of page 15, where the witness says that he distinctly heard the voice of a man in her room. I refer hon. gentlemen also to the evidence of Thomas Watt pages 16, 17 and 18 in which he corroborates the evidence of the preceding witness McKenzie, in which he states also that he heard the voice of a man in the bed-room and that she carefully kept the door closed so that parties could not look in. Now, taking Pingle's evidence, whether you take it with the other or alone, the voice of a man was heard in her bedroom; we further have Pingle's statement of an act of criminal intercourse having taken place on that occasion. If you do not accept the evidence of Pingle, what are you going to do with the evidence of McKenzie and of Watt in this case? They are clearly disinterested parties.

They had no interest in this matter whatever, I say therefore that their evidence should prevail in this case, and that we must give effect thereto. Now, we find these two men directly contradict the respondent; therefore, I say in view of this contradiction, in view of the fact that they were entirely disinterested we cannot place the reliance upon her evidence that we would otherwise do. Now, let us take the evidence of Dorland. She herself states that in 1888 she never met Dorland, but when she was cross-examined she said that she did meet him once on Michigan Avenue. You will find that this statement is corroborated by Dorland himself, and he swears to the fact that after their interview in the office he never met her on the street but on one occasion. The evidence of the detective, Leary, is put in and he says that he saw them from four to six times on the street. Here is a contradiction of their evidence, and when they are cross-examined and re-examined on this point, respondent and Dorland admit that they met on several occasions, and furthermore the respondent admits that she did go up stairs over a saloon on one occasion to see some friends of hers, the very occasion, I submit, that is referred to by this private detective.