

Q. How did the employment terminate, or why?—A. Well, I left; I wanted to be with the children and I left.

Q. Was there any difficulty between you and Marshall Field & Co.?—A. No.

Q. Did you sign any documents before you left Marshall Field & Co.?—A. I do not know that I did.

Q. Oh, but yes, Mrs. Gordon, you would not forget that; did you sign any documents before you left Marshall Field & Co.?—A. Yes, I did.

Q. What was the purport of it?—A. If you have got the document you can look up and see.

Q. Tell me the purport of it.

Mr. Mikel: This is irrelevant.

Mr. Wilkie: It is a matter of credibility of the witness.

By Mr. Wilkie:

Q. Did that document have to do with the matter of your honesty?

Mr. Mikel: Surely we are not trying the witness' honesty.

The Chairman: Mr. Wilkie is dealing with the credibility of the witness. He may ask the question, but if she denies it that ends it.

By Mr. Wilkie:

Q. Then will you tell me, had that statement anything to do with your honesty?—A. Yes, it had.

Q. Had you been accused of stealing?—A. Yes.

Q. And did you, in writing, confess to the fact?—A. Well, of course, I would like to make an explanation in regard to that.

Q. I should like your answer first, and then your explanation may follow.—A. Yes, I will admit that.

Q. Then give me your explanation.—A. I was employed in the millinery department in Marshall Field's, and of course I handled the merchandise, and in handling the merchandise I came across different little articles which were badly damaged, and in fact they were no use at all, as far as selling them in the store was concerned. One of the articles was a flower, and I do not know what else, but at any rate I did, I must admit, I will have to admit that I took them, but the reason I took them was that they were so terribly badly damaged that they never could have been sold. Of course I should not have done that, even at that.

Q. There was a search made for the articles?—A. Yes.

Q. And where were they found?—A. After I told them, I was questioned regarding the matter, and I told the person who made the inquiries that I had—they asked me if I had them, and if I would return them—and I told them that I had them at the house, and they could have them and welcome—and I did return them.

Q. Was a search made of the house?—A. Yes.

Q. Whose house?—A. My brother's house.

Mr. CURRIE: What was the evidence as to the value?

Mr. EDWARDS: The evidence continues:

Q. That brother where your children are now?—A. Yes.

Q. In Chicago?—A. Yes.

Q. Can you give me an idea of the total value of the goods that were found there be-

longing to Marshall Field & Co.?—A. No, I could not.

Q. Am I wrongly instructed when I am told that they would approximate \$1,000?—A. Yes, that is wrong, it would not be that much at all.

Q. Then about how much?—A. I haven't any idea.

If my hon. friend can produce any corroboration for the statement that the respondent was wrongfully accused of stealing, after what I have just read, he is a cleverer lawyer than I think he is.

Mr. STEELE: Is theft a ground for divorce?

Mr. EDWARDS: I am not saying that it is, but I am pointing to the fact that only a small number of the members of the Senate committee gave any attention to this matter, and that only a small number of the Commons committee attended the meetings of that committee. The misstatement of the hon. member for East Simcoe, as shown by the evidence, is, to my mind, strongly in favour of the motion moved by the hon. gentleman from South Perth (Mr. Steele). I do not know anything about it further than what I have read, but it appears to me to be a matter concerning the conduct of a man and a woman, and, inasmuch as these matters come before us for consideration, we should not deal with them lightly. And we should not fritter away time, when only one hour is allowed for consideration. It seems to me impossible to deal with it fairly in a few minutes' time, and, therefore, that this House would be acting properly in adopting the motion that this Bill be referred back to the committee, when we hope that a greater number of the members will attend, and that they will arrive at a proper conclusion.

Mr. GRAHAM: The severance of the marriage tie is a very serious matter. I have almost reached the conclusion that there seldom is a case so clear against one party, with no case against the other, that any divorce should be granted. Here is a case where the committees in both Houses were divided. The committee of the House of Commons certainly was divided, and the remarks we have heard to-night show the reason why. We are asked in this House to pass the third reading of a Bill which legally makes one party lily white, and relegates the other to the lower strata of society for the remainder of her life. Can we do that without having facts to substantiate our position thoroughly? To-