

adultery, would have entitled the wife to divorce *a mensa et thoro*—"from table and bed," or, as we say in English, "from bed and board"—and among other things desertion for more than two years without reasonable excuse was, of itself, in such cases, deemed sufficient. In this case, by eliminating the words to which I object from the Bill, the evidence sustains the allegations of the petitioner: although the one act of adultery is not proved as I consider it should have been, I think, coupled with the cruel desertion for 10 years, it is sufficient to entitle the woman to a divorce. I have looked carefully over the report, and I find evidence of only one offense. This man is a doctor, engaged in his practise in the hospital and outside of it, and there is not one title of evidence that he was guilty of general immorality. I therefore ask the House to eliminate these words from the Bill in order to make it right.

HON. MR. MILLER—That can come up at the third reading: we are now considering the report of the committee.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—If the hon. gentlemen who are promoting this Bill say they will look into the matter at the third reading I shall be satisfied to let the report go. I am sure that the petitioner in this case is not desirous of imputing to her husband anything more than is absolutely necessary in order to obtain this Bill. I was very favorably impressed with her, and if an amendment to this Bill would in any way interfere with its passage I should prefer to say nothing on the subject, but record my vote against it in silence. If I have any intimation that my suggestion will be taken into consideration I will not discuss the matter any further, but if not I shall have to deal with the evidence. I should like to know if the hon. member from Barrie will accept my suggestion?

HON. MR. GOWAN—I will answer when the hon. gentleman is done speaking.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Then I shall have to analyze the evidence.

HON. MR. KAULBACH.

HON. MR. OGILVIE—There is not a member of the House who has seen the evidence but is satisfied, except the hon. gentleman.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—That is a very wild assertion to make. Is there any evidence at all, except vague report, that he was a drunkard, and frequented places of ill repute? Only in one case did he visit a place of the kind. He was a doctor who had outside practice, and I am sure doctors would not like, when they have to attend sick and infirm persons in places of the kind, to be charged with immorality. If my objection is not concurred in I shall be obliged, in order to sustain the position I have taken, to go over this evidence in order to show that my contention is right and I shall do it now.

HON. GENTLEMEN—Oh don't!

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I shall have to do it.

HON. MR. GOWAN—If the hon. gentleman noticed, when I was going into particulars I avoided these details. I was prepared to show the very opposite to what he has stated, but I felt a restraint, which perhaps he does not feel, in speaking fully. I was prepared to prove to the satisfaction of the House that every allegation of that Bill is fully sustained by the evidence.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Then I am obliged to go on. My hon. friend says that his taste and ideas differ from mine, and charges me with having a prurient taste. I denounce the hon. gentleman for saying so: it is not worthy of him. Such a statement should not be made on the floor of this House, and I hurl it back with that indignation which such a remark deserves.

HON. MR. OGILVIE—It was correct though.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I am sure the manner in which I stated my objection and my suggestion to make this Bill conform to the evidence deserved a better reception.