

in regard to a Bill fraught with such tremendous consequences to both parties to this issue. When there is such a cleavage in two bodies, showing a division of opinion and that men who have heard and read the evidence have great doubt, would it be safe to grant a divorce? If this Bill be carried, it may be carried by the vote of an hon. member who has never read the evidence, who has seen none of the witnesses and who knows nothing whatever about the matter. I cannot conceive it possible that, in the Parliament of Canada, any such haphazard, reckless method, as is asked for here of deciding a question, should become effective. It is only apropos to discuss a little of the evidence at this stage to bear out the opinion I hold. Gordon the husband admits that he has no personal knowledge of his wife's adultery. He says that this evidence is derived only from paid private detectives employed by him to follow his wife. After having entered into an agreement with her that she should not be put under espionage, that she should live as a feme sole, free from any of his espionage, he immediately put private detectives on her track and kept them there for two years. Lord Halsbury, in speaking of the evidence of private detectives, says that the court looks with strong suspicion upon such evidence. That is the only evidence presented, as I see it, in this case.

Mr. NORTHROP: Not at all.

Mr. MORPHY: That class of evidence covers the only main points relied upon in this case. What are the main points? In the first place, these people were married and lived together for about ten years, and had two children, the boy about fourteen years old and the girl about twelve years old now. During the whole of that period there is no contention of any immorality on the part of the wife, but there were temperamental disagreements. During these disagreements, this man, who is said to come before Parliament with clean hands has been proved, on the evidence itself, pages 93 and 94, to have behaved brutally towards his wife. I ask the hon. gentlemen supporting this Bill to point out where there is any denial in toto of this brutality. This is a man who, it is claimed, with clean hands, is asking this, the highest court in the Dominion, to grant him a decree. In equity and good conscience, that cannot be done if the things given in evidence are true. This high court of Parliament is not going to extend its beneficence and judgment in favour of one

guilty of such brutality. Surely we have come to a pretty pass when men of that kind have the temerity to ask Parliament for relief, if those actions of his are true, as the evidence shows they are.

The couple finally separated under a written agreement which the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has referred to. By that agreement Mrs. Gordon was to obtain \$1,200 per year. He was to keep the children, and she to see them daily, Sundays and holidays excepted. On one occasion he refused to give her this money, and she was compelled to bring action against him in court; and to get her rights under that agreement she had to pay \$100 in costs to a Toronto lawyer. After the separation under that agreement he assaulted her twice, and she had him summoned to the Toronto Police Court (the evidence will be found on page 100). She was fighting all the time for protection against this man, who sought to drive her from home by assaults and brutalities. Would it be surprising if a woman did not keep virtuous under such circumstances as those? But the evidence apparently shows that she did keep virtuous. With all due deference to those who take a different view, I can discover no direct evidence that this woman was guilty of any impropriety warranting the petitioner in suing for divorce.

The detectives that Mr. Gordon put upon his wife's trail for a period of over two years—he paid them, instead of paying his wife the alimony she was entitled to—found that there were two occasions upon which the petitioner relied to prove adultery. The first occasion was on a visit she paid to a dressmaking establishment in Toronto, in the company of a respectable gentleman, an acquaintance of hers for many years, whose name I will not mention, but a man of good standing and of respectable family. The other occasion was when she went into the vestibule of this same gentleman's office. No charge had ever been made by the husband against this gentleman. He stood in the light of day absolutely as a friend and nothing else. In the whole two years, the detectives who had been on Mrs. Gordon's trail day and night could discover only two occasions on which she was seen in company with this gentleman. The evidence disclosed that on the first occasion they went to this dressmaking establishment at a reasonable hour in the evening, Mrs. Gordon carrying a parcel, and it is pointed out that in Toronto the ordinary dressmaking establishment, not the higher class ones, has no de-