

"Mr. Clapp"—a bare-faced contradiction. But there is more: that man who pretends to be the paramour of this woman does what not one scoundrel out of a thousand would do—sells the letters that she writes him and makes an admission of the whole affair to her husband for the paltry consideration of \$10. Is there any villain who would do that? This is the man whose evidence is the main support of this case. Would it be to our credit to grant a divorce on such evidence? Then we have the evidence of Mrs. Roehrig. We do not know what sort of a woman she was. She may, however, be a street-walker. We know that she was a spy and an eaves-dropper. And this is the sort of witness who is brought here to swear against the respondent. On the other hand, Dorland comes here voluntarily and swears that he never had any improper intimacy with the respondent. I ask you, can we, on the face of the evidence of Pingle, grant a divorce to this man and stamp with disgrace this woman who comes to vindicate her character and the character of her children? She came before the committee, not because she wished to prevent the separation—she had already left her husband—but to defend her own reputation. How can we grant a divorce when we have all the allegations on one side contradicted by the evidence of more respectable witnesses on the other side? I hope that the report will not be adopted and that this case will not be allowed to go any further. It has gone far enough already.

HON. MR. LOUGHEED—As a member of the Divorce Committee I take the liberty of making a few remarks relative to the points in question. It will be conceded by hon. gentlemen that if the evidence of the petitioner in this case be accepted by the House with the weight that is usually given to evidence, the relief prayed for will be granted, in other words, if adultery were proved this House would at once grant the Bill. To my mind the question to be considered is whether we are to place reliance upon the evidence of the petitioner or upon the evidence of the respondent. It is also a question, of the weight of evidence, as to whether the evidence preponderates on the side of the petitioner or on the side of the respondent, and, it will be manifest to hon. gen-

tlemen who have read the examination, that in this case there are two classes of evidence, direct and circumstantial evidence. I submit to hon. gentlemen that laying aside all the direct evidence that has been imported into this case as distinguished from circumstantial evidence, and accepting the circumstantial evidence before us, having regard to the direct evidence that has been given, we can come to no other conclusion than the petitioner clearly establishes a case for which relief should be granted him. Those of us who have perused the evidence know that there are two or three important witnesses who have given evidence which would clearly establish the case, provided you accept their evidence as true. In the first place, on the question of direct evidence we have the statement of this Detroit lady, Mrs. Roehrig, and we have the evidence of Pingle himself. Assuming the evidence of those two parties to be reliable, then we cannot come to any other conclusion but that relief should be granted. Now, concerning that direct evidence, we have to take into consideration whether there are incidental facts, or whether there is circumstantial evidence surrounding the direct facts which would establish clearly to our minds that the evidence given by those two witnesses is to be relied upon. The first evidence which is brought to our consideration in this case is that of Mrs. Roehrig, she states emphatically that she saw a flagrant act of criminal intercourse taking place between the respondent and the co-respondent Dorland. Now certain reflections have been cast upon the evidence of this witness. It is very well for us to talk away the credibility of a witness by coming to certain conclusions without having any basis therefor. The evidence of this woman has not been impeached in the least. There is a rule of evidence, and the hon. gentleman from Amherst has referred to that—and the rules of criminal evidence are important in the consideration of such a case as this, and these rules being imported into this case, it was for the respondent to impeach the evidence of that woman if her evidence was not reliable; but no attempt has been made to impeach this witnesses evidence. I say that no attempt whatever has been made in that direction, and because this woman comes from Detroit to give evidence here, are we to assume that therefore being