

livery van, and the people are in the habit of carrying with them the material that is to be made up. The allegation is made that this was a house of ill-fame. That is an inference, and an inference only. The Toronto police had watched this place, but had never come forward to say that it was such. But whether it was so or not, I contend that before this woman should suffer for going to a dressmaking establishment, which, perhaps, possessed a name other than a good one, it is incumbent upon Mr. Gordon to show that his wife knew it. She swears that she knew nothing of the kind. There is not a tittle of evidence to show that his wife knew it was a house of ill-fame, even if it actually was such, and I submit that the evidence is to the effect that it was not a house of that kind. Mrs. Gordon denies absolutely that she knew anything against the house. There was no impropriety or even noise observed around the place by the police when Mrs. Gordon was there. It was not a disorderly house. Gordon asks the committee and this House to infer knowledge upon the part of Mrs. Gordon. I submit that it would be ridiculous to ask us to draw such an inference.

The other occasion was one evening when Mrs. Gordon and this gentleman entered the building on Adelaide street, near Yonge, where his office was, in order to get an umbrella. The petitioner asks the committee to infer that Mrs. Gordon went up three flights of stairs to this man's office, and there committed the act complained of. But there is not a tittle of evidence furnished even by the private detectives to show that she went up three flights of stairs. She swears she never left the vestibule, but stood there while he got his umbrella, and then they both left together. These are the two chief acts relied upon by the petitioner to show, purely by inference, that he deserves the relief for which he is praying.

Mr. NORTHROP: How long does she swear she was there?

Mr. MORPHY: I do not care how long. My hon. friend can fix it for himself any way he likes. The evidence is entirely unsupported; there is no corroborative evidence of any kind; there is simply the fact that the woman entered the vestibule.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: I understand that she was in the vestibule for only a very short time, about six or seven minutes.

Mr. MORPHY: There is a conflict in the evidence between Mrs. Gordon and this gentleman on the one hand, and the detectives on the other. But I would have regard to the dictum of Lord Halsbury, who states that the evidence of paid detectives must be taken with a great deal of suspicion, as they are paid to get a conviction. Their work is to earn their money, and as was pointed out the other night, a private detective in Toronto who went in search of liquor, as he passed through one establishment took three five dollar bills and put them in his pocket. He was sent to jail for it.

Mr. THOBURN: It was \$20 on the last occasion.

Mr. MORPHY: My hon. friend seeks to make a point of that. It just shows what slender reeds some gentlemen will lean upon. Is it worth while for a public man to allow his mind to get warped and have a fixed view of a certain set of circumstances, which may have one meaning or another? Is it wise for him to leave room for doubt? Under circumstances where there is room for doubt, I say it is unsafe to grant a divorce. There should be some clear evidence before a deliberative assembly should take away the character of a woman who is now supporting her own children. It is a serious proposition to my mind, and one fraught with grave consequences to the rights of the people of this country. If this woman did go up three flights of stairs to this gentleman's office, which she denies, and did sit at a table in his office, there was absolutely no harm in it, if she was not guilty of an act of impropriety. I cannot conceive why some hon. gentlemen are taking such an interest in the defamation of this woman. I do not find any basis for it in the evidence.

Have hon. gentlemen such high morals that they will not grant other people the right to say that there is another kind of morals which will protect a woman against an injustice? If so let them be as free and frank as possible in this case. Let them view the matter free from all narrow bias and let them approach it with a sense of fair play and justice with regard to what the evidence proves and not overstate what is inferred or inferrable from the evidence itself. One of the strongest points in favour of this woman is that during two years of watching by detectives paid by Gordon two acts alone are found which offer any suggestion of guilt. If the woman is as bad as the man's ruffianly conduct shows him to have been, there would have been plenty of evidence brought forward, but in the

[Mr. Morphy.]