

had often to reprove her for staying out late and to use force to keep her from going out. We also have evidence to show that she came home frequently late at night accompanied by Pingle. Finally, she left his house and went to Detroit. All that is corroborated by the respondent—that she went out frequently to concerts returning late at night accompanied by Pingle. After a quarrel with her husband, she decided to leave him and in doing so she carried away a quantity of silver and other articles from the house and went to Detroit where she earned her living. After this she invited this man Pingle to meet her at Palmerston, as she says, to consult him about obtaining a divorce from her husband. She gets a young man named MacKenzie to drive her to Palmerston, where she meets Pingle in a hotel, at nine o'clock at night. She states that her intention was to go back to Listowel that night, but that she changed her mind and stopped all night at the hotel. Young MacKenzie went up to the room she occupied to ascertain what she intended to do about going back, and he states that he heard voices in the room. The respondent came out of the room holding the door knob in her hand and talked to him. Having received his orders he went down stairs. The son of the proprietor of the hotel corroborated this evidence. Next morning, about half-past seven, they saw this man Pingle coming down stairs; they had not seen him in the house before that—and did not know that he was there.

HON. MR. ROBITAILLE.—Pingle swears that he slept in the third story of the house.

HON. MR. MACDONALD.—Then the respondent returns to Detroit accompanied by a young woman named Mackenzie, and by Pingle. She admits that she took two rooms in Detroit and that she and Bella Mackenzie and Pingle lived there three weeks together. Besides the evidence, we have the letters which she wrote to this man, in which she addresses him as "dear Fred," and in one of which she invites him to come back to Detroit, that there is room for another man if that man be Pingle. Then we have the evidence of Mrs Roehrig who witnessed the offence which took place in Dorland's office on two occasions. That woman's integrity was not called in question in any way except by the

accused, Dorland, himself, who said that the offence never took place. Then we have Pingle's evidence of criminal acts taking place at the hotel in Palmerston and afterwards at Detroit. Then the question is asked the respondent "do you believe this man to be a creditable man and worthy of credence," to which she replies I do. This she says even after he had testified against her. She says she did not see this man in Detroit during 1888: we have the evidence of Mrs. Roehrig and the detective that she was frequently seen with Dorland in 1888, so on that point her evidence fails again. Taking all these things together, her own letters of endearment, this appointment with Pingle at the hotel in Palmerston, the circumstances attending her life in Detroit—taking all the circumstances of the case into consideration, what conclusion can you arrive at?

HON. MR. POIRIER—I am not in the habit of taking part in these discussions. In the first place, I am obliged by my religious convictions to always vote against such bills, but in this case, were I a citizen of Chicago and a Protestant, I would take the same view of the case that I take now. I believe that this divorce should not be granted, for many reasons. In the first place there is nothing against this woman except the letters that she wrote. I admit that the letters may be a little spooney, but there is nothing beyond that, and I do not believe in granting a divorce because this woman wrote to the music teacher of her daughters letters which may have been a little soft but in which there is nothing improper. That is, in fact, the only serious evidence, in my opinion, against the respondent. As to the other evidence, I will take the strongest, that of the man Pingle, and I say it is a disgrace to have such evidence printed or to attach any importance to it. In any ordinary court of justice I believe Pingle would have been committed for contempt. Not two hours after he gave his evidence he was seen dead drunk in the city, and I believe while he was giving his evidence he was not conscious of what he was saying. Low as he was, he would not have contradicted himself in the way he did if he had been quite sober. He is asked at one part of his examination if he got any money for coming here and he says "No." Then at page 68 he is asked "Who paid your fare?" He answers