



Good luck in baking is usually due to good judgment in using

MAGIC BAKING POWDER



JOHN BULL: "That's a fine horse you're looking after, Mr. Churchill, and he ought to do well this year. But I don't like the look of the fellow on his back."
 TRAINER CHURCHILL: "No, he's far too heavy. I'll do my best to get a bit of weight off him."
 London Opinion.

The Dennistoun Case

The Most Famous Matrimonial Case Since Charles II's Time.

(Continued)

Did it remain so until July 31, 1924?—Yes.

The first allegation of adultery against Mrs. Dennistoun was made on January 7, 1925?—I accept that date.

That is about a year after the action was begun?—Yes.

£10,000 Costs

When did Colonel Dennistoun hand you the £5,000 on account of your costs?—At some date last December. Previously, the witness added, Lady Carnarvon had provided a substantial sum for costs.

How much have you had altogether?—I cannot tell you, but I should say £10,000 or £12,000.

And you are hoping for more?—I have the common expectation of the legal profession. (Laughter.)

How much of the £10,000 has been spent on detection?—The greater part has been disbursed on witnesses and counsel's fees. (Laughter.)

How much has been spent on detection?—I cannot say.

Unless you had put the plea on the record that there was an implied "dum casta" clause in the agreement, if it existed, you would not have been able to bombard Mrs. Dennistoun with these charges of adultery, would you?—I was advised that that plea would make the persons who had given us the statements on which those charges were founded witnesses for the defence.

The witness said that it was an advantage for Mrs. Dennistoun to have particulars of the charges so that she could meet them.

Sir Ellis Hume-Williams.—There are charges against her at about 15 places all over Europe. Do you think that she had the means to investigate such charges?—I think that she had the means.

Didn't it occur to you that, when all these charges were put on the record, including that concerning the man whom she hopes to marry, it might prevent her bringing the action to trial?—Not a little bit.

Why did you have her watched in 1924?—I was advised that the quest on of her present chastity was material.

The witness said that Colonel Dennistoun had never told him about the release of his and Mrs. Dennistoun's interests under their marriage settlement before the interview which he (the witness) had with Sir George Lewis on October 10, 1923.

Sir Ellis Hume-Williams.—Did you know what Sir George Lewis was coming to see you about on October 10?—Yes.

When Sir George Lewis came in do you really mean that the first thing he said was: "When is the marriage?"—Yes.

Rather an odd way to begin the interview?—Very odd. I have never had an interview begin in that way before or since.

Sir George Lewis has not much time to waste on futile interviews?—He knows about that—I do not.

Do you say that you then raised some question about the marriage settlement, and said that it was suggested that the parties could not release their interests? Did not Sir George Lewis say that the release had been effected?—Sir George Lewis said no such thing. I had never heard of the release at that time.

When he tells us definitely that he did tell you of the release that

is an inaccuracy of his recollection?—Yes.

"Appalled at Volubility."

The witness added that Sir George Lewis talked ten times more than he did. He was appalled at his volubility. (Laughter.) He did not suggest that Sir George Lewis had come purely to give more or less of an exhibition in his room; that purpose developed during the interview.

Sir Ellis Hume-Williams.—You were a witness to the marriage between Colonel Dennistoun and Lady Carnarvon?—Yes.

You believed that the French divorce was valid?—Certainly.

Is one of the objects of the defence to prove that the French divorce was a collusive one?—You have the pleadings before you. It is a matter of law.

Do you agree that if it is a collusive divorce the remarriage in England is in peril?—No.

Did not Sir George Lewis tell you over and over again that he had taken Mr. Bayford's opinion, and that was that the divorce was valid?—He did not tell me over and over again.

When Sir George Lewis told you that Colonel Dennistoun had seen Mrs. Dennistoun at Lady Evelyn Beauchamp's wedding and had promised to do something for her, did not you ask what he had promised?

He traversed the whole thing. Mrs. Dennistoun spoke to Colonel Dennistoun outside St. Margaret's Church, Westminster, much to his annoyance, and he at once telephoned to me about it.

Did not Sir George Lewis tell you that Colonel Dennistoun had agreed to make provision for his wife?—No, he is entirely inaccurate about that.

You heard Mr. Birkett say yesterday that you feared that if the case were settled there would never be an end to Mrs. Dennistoun's demands. If it had been settled, would not it have been possible to provide that it was in settlement of all claims past, present, and future?—Of course it would have been, but I never contemplated settling the action. You do not enter into agreements with persons who make such claims. Their assurances are entirely valueless.

No Intimidation

Re-examined by Mr. Birkett, Mr. Fryzer said that there was no intimidation in your version of the interview. Have you departed from the truth?—I have not departed from the truth.

His Lordship interposed to say that the question was whether the memory of Sir George Lewis or that of Mr. Fryzer was the more accurate.

Sir Edward Marshall-Hall said that he had ten witnesses from abroad. To reduce the enormous expense of the case he would call them first.

Arguments covering the admission of certain evidence were heard. At the conclusion M. Gustave Schaubhut, secretary at the Hotel

Beau Sejour, Champelles-Bains, Switzerland, was called. He said that he knew the plaintiff as Mme. Bolin and, secondly, as Mrs. Dennistoun. He identified the portrait produced as that of Mr. Bolin. Asked to refer to the hotel books, the witness said that they showed that on November 25, 1920, Mr. Bolin came alone to the hotel and stayed there until December 19, when the plaintiff arrived. Mr. Bolin had room 117 and when the plaintiff arrived she had No. 118. The two rooms had a communicating door. On the day of the plaintiff's arrival the witness wanted to get her name, so he knocked on her door, but could get no answer. He then knocked on the next door, and Mr. Bolin said, in answer to his question:—"That is my wife. You don't need her name. My name is known." Mr. Bolin and the plaintiff went away on December 20, and the witness next saw him on February 10, 1921, when both he and the plaintiff came to the hotel. On that occasion the plaintiff gave the name of Mrs. Dennistoun. The couple engaged communicating rooms on the third floor. The plaintiff went away again on the 14th, and Mr. Bolin left on the 28th. On February 11, 1921, the witness had arrived, and after staying one night went away with the plaintiff. The witness described other visits of Mr. Bolin and the plaintiff. Mr. Bolin had a photograph of the plaintiff on his dressing-table.

No, I did not. Sir Ellis Hume-Williams, the witness said, she was still at the hotel and had been there for 3 1/2 years. He was there from May, 1920, until October, 1921. Then he went away, but returned in 1923.

Sir Ellis Hume-Williams asked when he was first questioned about his evidence in this case, and the witness said that he was asked by a detective about the matter a year ago.

Sir Ellis Hume-Williams.—Did not it surprise you that, when this lady returned to the hotel in February 10, she gave her name as Mrs. Dennistoun?—I was surprised.

Did you put Mrs. Dennistoun's name down in the book?—No, there was only one account, and she did not give the name of Dennistoun until the day after her arrival.

The witness added that he remembered Mr. Bolin very well because he was always late—late for breakfast and late for luncheon—and when one was a floor-waiter one remembered that. (Laughter.) Josephine Clna, chambermaid at the hotel, said that she recognized the portraits handed to her as those of M. and Mme. Bolin. She knew the plaintiff as Mme. Bolin. M. Bolin asked for a double bed to be put in the plaintiff's room and this was done.

The witness's evidence was translated by a barrister, but she could not understand the question put in cross-examination, as to when she was first asked about the case.

The hearing was adjourned.

The French Code

M. Jacques Quartier, a member of the French Bar, an avocat a la Cour d'Appel de Paris, a member of the English Bar, and a Legal Adviser to the British Embassy in Paris, giving evidence on Friday, said that there was no provision in the French Code which prevented parties to a divorce suit from making a private arrangement with regard to alimony.

The witness added that, if all question of collusive divorce were eliminated, the agreement alleged by Mrs. Dennistoun would be enforceable in the French Courts.

His Lordship.—If the agreement alleged here were closely connected with an agreement for a collusive divorce, I understand you to

McClary's SUNSHINE FURNACE

Installed to meet the exact heating requirements of your home, no matter what the conditions may be.

HEATS NO MATTER HOW THE WIND BLOWS

CURRIE & MURNAGHAN
 Charlottetown
 Agents for McClary's Furnaces.

both agreements would be against public policy?—Yes.

Mr. Birkett.—Have you got any equivalent to a collusive divorce in France?—No.

His Lordship.—In what sense do you use the word "collusive"?—I should call collusive a divorce which has been obtained through an understanding between the parties to deceive the Judge regarding the real grounds.

Sir Ellis Hume-Williams (cross-examining and public policy, an agreement between a husband and a wife that she should have a certain sum by way of alimony is a good agreement?—Yes.

Does collusion in France mean something which affects the evidence that has been given before the Court?—Collusion is anything which amounts to deception of the Judge.

Take this case. A wife who has herself committed adultery brings a suit for divorce against her husband. The husband has committed adultery and evidence of it is given before the Court. The husband has been summoned to appear at the hearing and his representative puts in a statement of defence. The Court gives its judgment after considering the evidence for the defence. At the hearing the wife does not say anything about her adultery, nor does the representative of the husband. The husband's adultery is proved and a divorce is pronounced. Would not that be a good divorce unless the husband brought a cross-petition before the decree was made final.

If the husband had presented a cross-petition at the hearing and the cases of both spouses were proved, the result would be that there would be a decree in favor of each of the parties?—Yes.

The divorce would take place?—Yes.

Is it the practice in the French Courts not to give the name of a person with whom adultery has been committed?—We avoid all sorts of publicity.

(To Be Continued)

FOR HOT SAUCEPANS

Keep on hand in your kitchen several enough hardware boxes on which to place hot saucepans. It will save your sink and your kitchen table immeasurably.

Easy Place

"I'd like to live in a town like that where they don't have any laws to cut," said a weary-looking little man when scenes of Yankee Money often wins the first battle, were shown at a movie theatre.

An ALEMITE Announcement



to the Automotive Trade:

Here is something to make your customers glad—a transmission lubricant that is 100% efficient. Longer life for gears—less friction—more power. Shows highest heat and lowest cold tests. Order your season's supply now and be prepared for a big demand.

Good Openings in the Lubricating Business

Now is the time to start, if you are going into the lubricating business. How to qualify as an official Alcmite Service Station is told in our booklet on the lubricating business—send for it today.

BROWN-PUTNAM, LIMITED.
 Union and Peel Streets St. John, N. B.
 Maritime Distributors for
ALEMITE PRODUCTS CO., OF CANADA, LTD.
 Belleville, Ontario

CONSTIPATION

A cause of many ills. Harmful to elderly people.

Always relief in taking

CHAMBERLAIN'S TABLETS

easy—pleasant—effective—only 21c.

Waiting for "Something to Turn Up"

Industrial Eastern Canada is languishing for lack of Canadian population.

President Beatty of the C. P. R., declares that only more people on the soil can bring Canadian prosperity.

Sir Henry Thornton announces that until immigration is stimulated, Canada must languish.

Premier Mackenzie King and his advisors, day in and day out, preach immigration.

Population, they all say, is the one remedy; in fact the urgent need for immigration has become an axiom in Canadian life.

... But how, when and by whom is immigration to be promoted?

Have any of these gentlemen made any real, definite, concrete move to bring the required thousands to Canada?

The truth is that like the genteel Mr. Micawber, our railroads, industrial Canada and official Ottawa are simply "waiting for something to turn up." Meanwhile, the industries and people of Canada, like the children of Mr. Micawber, are getting shiny in the elbows, ragged at the cuffs and hollow at the stomachs.

Promotion of California as a national playground, during the past 10 years, has raised the population of Los Angeles from 319,198 to a round million people. Lying in Los Angeles banks today are \$780,000,000 of free capital.

Vigorous promotion of Florida's charms, during the past two years, has raised the population of Miami from 29,571 to 111,000, and other cities and towns of the State are on the move. Florida has just commenced. Her cycle of boom will last another ten years.

Both Florida and California have been transformed from desert wastes into rich populous countries bursting with wealth.

And that transformation has been accomplished by the energy and initiative of California and Florida people who have gone out and circussed the attractions of their States to the whole North American continent.

These millions of people and these hundreds of millions of wealth that have been drawn in, may have been creatures of a boom. But even though a certain percentage of California's expansion has been of the mushroom variety, the great balance has been good, solid, permanent growth.

By whatever means and by whatever devices, California and Florida have been tremendously successful in attracting wealth and population. California's population is half that of the whole Dominion of Canada. Her annual production is actually greater than that of the Dominion of Canada.

And what has Canada been doing while California and Florida have been turning themselves from desolate camps into rich teeming cities, by their own promotion and salesmanship?

Nothing.

While California and Florida have been creating their own fortunes, official Canada has been sitting, vacuously, Micawberlike, "waiting for something to turn up."

And yet Canada has the most wonderful latent field for promotion that the world has ever seen, not for retired plutes, but for young virile soil-workers who are the backbone of any nation.

Beside the legitimate advertising promotion potentialities of the Maritimes, all the blistering sunshine and orange groves of California and Florida look sick.

What California and Florida have done for themselves by attracting tourists and wealth, Ottawa can do for the Maritimes by using Prince Edward Island as a super-attraction to draw farmers and settlers into the Maritimes.

California and Florida may be creaming North America of its wealthy class. Canada, with the colorful, irresistible Maritime magnet, can cream the world for the short-legged, broad-backed fellow who digs into the soil with his horny hands and creates the only real, permanent kind of prosperity for any country.

But that influx will never occur so long as official Ottawa sits back on its calloused haunches waiting for something to turn up.

Promotion of the Maritimes is Canada's one big hope for renewed life. Such legitimate advertising promotion would inject the same new vigor into this Dominion as was injected when Sir Clifford Sifton threw open and boomed the prairie provinces.

And what Sifton did for Canada with the prairie provinces can be repeated today, not by lolling back in an easy chair and waiting for a compassionate God to send down population, but by actually turning loose one or two real live colonizers who, with Prince Edward Island as their drawing card, will sell Maritimes to the farmers of the world.

The way to bring those people in is written in the recent history of California and Florida. It is a simple recipe—

GO AND GET THEM !!!