

know a man has lived as *he* lived—one caught *flagranti delicto* with a squaw—where you see him going into this House you might infer that he went in for immoral purposes. That was all the Committee did. For myself, I could say—upon my honor upon my oath, I think it is amply sufficient to warrant a jury in finding a verdict to that effect. Every man has to value the testimony according to his own convictions; some under-rate a fact, some persons exaggerate it, but that was the impression left on my mind. I have not charge of the Bill, and I simply move the adoption of the report. If my hon. friend, the member from Alma, wishes to withdraw it, I have not the slightest objection; I am merely contending for this that the Committee were perfectly justified in all their findings, and if my hon. friend opposite has the strong and kindly feeling that he declares he has towards the petitioner I am really sorry that he should impede the action of the House in dealing with the Bill. If there is not proof to satisfy his mind I beg that he will not assume that other minds will not be satisfied with the testimony that is put in. My hon. friend said a good deal on a previous occasion about the importance of having lawyers on a Committee of this kind. Well I sat there, the only lawyer amongst laymen on the Committee, and our relations were exceedingly pleasant indeed. I will quote to my hon. friend if he will accept as authority a sort of rhyming exposition of a perfect procedure, a little altered, and apply to this case:—

“Nine honest men have disposed of the cause, who are judges alike of the fact and the laws.”

HON. MR. POWER—I do not want to have anything to say about this Bill, but at the suggestion of the hon. friend from Lunenburg I have looked through the evidence, looked pretty carefully as to the point which he referred to, but I am obliged to confess the evidence to my mind at any rate does not sustain the allegation as set forth in the preamble of the Bill and I do not think it is proper for this House to pass a Bill which alleges in the preamble something which has not been established to the satisfac-

tion of the House. The leader of the House must feel that, as I presume he must have looked through the evidence himself and for my part I must concur with the hon. gentleman on my left that only one offence is proved. I may say also that the preamble is erroneous in another respect. It alleges that this offence took place during the respondent's residence at Edmonton. The proof is that it took place at Fort Saskatchewan which is some distance from Edmonton.

HON. MR. GOWAN—In a new country like that where boundaries are uncertain, places five, fifteen or twenty miles from a well known point are generally known by the same name.

HON. MR. POWER—There is but one offence proven, and, as the hon. gentleman from Lunenburg has said, that is sufficient to sustain the Bill. I presume this respondent is a worthless man but there is no reason why this House should by solemn statute declare that he has been guilty of more crimes than have been established, particularly as it is unnecessary that the allegation should be made, and I think the Committee might very well amend their report by inserting a few lines to the effect that the preamble should be amended by striking out those words.

HON. MR. OGILVIE—In reply to the remarks of my hon. friend from Halifax, I would state that picking up the evidence in print and reading it, is very different from being seated at the table and listening to the evidence as it is given. I do not for a moment doubt the correctness of what the hon. member from Halifax says, but I feel quite satisfied that had he listened to the witnesses as they spoke there, and to what was said generally, his impressions of the case would have been very different from what they are from merely reading the evidence. The offence is not often proven in such cases, as men who go about that kind of business do not generally take witnesses with them, and sometimes it is difficult to make the proof. The members of the Committee were perfectly unanimous in their opinion that they had not seen or heard any case that was so