

I think that this case comes within the particular illustration I have cited; and again:

"A desire to avoid public exposure of the scandal at a mother's wish, and a forbearance of twenty years, though an unreasonable delay, have not been considered sufficient grounds for barring a decree.

"An impression that by the elopement of his wife to America and residence there a divorce would be unnecessary, and mental prostration due to his wife's misconduct, has been held a sufficient explanation of the petitioner's delay. Hence the explanation of the delay may be various, and it is manifest that their force or weakness depends entirely upon the facts of the case."

I assert that there could not be a condonation in this particular case on the point of delay, for the simple reason that the wife had married another man, and there could have been no hope in the petitioner's mind that by condonation he could have effected a reconciliation with his wife, because she was married to another, and living with him as her husband. The hon. gentleman from Lunenburg has referred in the most pathetic terms to the dissolution of the marriage tie, and to its sacred character. From the evidence here it is quite apparent that the sympathy should be with the petitioner in this case, for the wife entirely ignores the marriage tie, and violates the solemn contract of matrimony, and marries another, and lives with him as her husband. Therefore, I think it would not be justifiable in this case to refuse the extension of sympathy to this petitioner, if such is proper in the consideration of such a case. He ought to have sympathy, so far as sentiment can be introduced into a case of this kind, and on these grounds I am of opinion that we are perfectly justified in supporting this Bill.

HON. MR. READ (Quinté)—It seems that the only objections to this Bill are that in one instance there has been a condonation of the wife's offence and that there has been delay in making this application. The hon. gentlemen who oppose this Bill do not altogether agree on these points. So far as condonation is concerned, I cannot see how this petitioner has condoned his wife's guilt, and I fail to see how he can be condemned for having delayed his application. He is a poor man, who failed in business and went quarrying stone for the Welland Canal. He afterwards went away for two years, and finally went to work on the Canadian Pacific Railway. During all this time, it is shown

by the evidence, he repeatedly sent home money to his wife for her support and for the support of the family. After getting a letter from a friend stating that she was not behaving herself properly in her relations with Simpson, he immediately telegraphed \$500 to bring her and the children to him. Connivance would be a bar to divorce, but it is quite evident that this man did not connive at his wife's offence. If she was in the way of temptation he did all in his power to remove her from the temptation. Consequently, there is nothing to be said on the subject of condonation. Then, as to the delay, we have this very Session granted a divorce for an offence committed sixteen years ago, and there was not a word said about the delay of the petitioner in making application to this House for relief—the same committee, the same chairman—and sixteen years after the event the action was carried through. This man, in the year 1883, heard that his wife was applying for a divorce. That was late in the fall of that year. Six years have elapsed since. He was 3,000 miles away, and had to earn the money to enter this suit, and certainly he should not be barred from getting a divorce when he made enough money to apply to this court, which is no trifling matter. He prosecuted his claim, to my mind, at as early a date as it was possible to do, and it should be no bar to him that there was delay. I am quite prepared to support the report of the committee, and I hope the House will do the same.

HON. MR. CLEMON—I think the principal cause of the difficulty in this matter is the charge of condonation. As I understood the evidence, when he remitted the money to his wife he had no knowledge that she was acting improperly. It was long subsequent to this that he received a letter from some of his friends in this country that his wife was unfaithful, and it was then he opened his eyes to the fact that she was not a suitable companion for him, and he telegraphed her that from that time out he would have nothing more to do with her. At the time he sent the \$500 to his wife he had no knowledge that she was acting improperly, and to my mind it would not amount to condonation in this case. He has been employed in different parts of the country, had been