

Such evidence would be all right in a civil action against the man for non-support. Then the father is further examined as follows:—

Q. During the whole course of their married life that you observed, what if anything did Spratte contribute to his wife's and daughter's maintenance and support?—A. Well, very little, I think. I had to keep them practically all the time. Even when they were living in the house they got the most of the supplies and living from the hotel.

Q. What sort of person was Spratte? What sort of a looking man was he? You have not any picture of him?—A. No.

Q. What sort of a looking man was he?—A. I do not know that I can describe him very well.

Q. Small or tall?—A. A small man.

Q. What was the colour of his hair?—A. Light.

Q. White or red?—A. Well, it was a kind of a light colour.

Q. Was it inclined to white or sandy?—A. No, it was not red. It was more a lighter colour. It was not sandy. It was a kind of lighter colour.

Q. Was it a sort of reddish? Have you got a good perception of colour?—A. I should not describe that very well.

By the Hon. Mr. Wilson:

Q. Was it brown or red?—A. It was a kind of reddish; it was not brown.

Q. Did he have any marked habits?—A. Drinking was the most marked.

Q. Was there anything else that he did that marked him at all in any other way, any other habit that you know of? Did he smoke?—A. Yes, he smoked; a very heavy cigarette smoker.

Q. Do you know why he went to St. Albans? Do you know why your daughter went there?—A. Yes.

Q. And so far as you know she went there to meet him and live with him at St. Albans?—A. Yes.

Q. Did he not tell you so at any time thereafter?—A. I do not know that he did.

By the Hon. Mr. McMullen:

Q. What was his condition before he got married to your daughter?—A. As far as I ever saw him, it was all right.

Q. When did you notice he began to drink?—A. Shortly after he got married. He was clerking for me some time before, but I never noticed him drinking very much until after he was married.

Now, there is the entire evidence in this case, and I ask this honourable House, and the gentlemen of the committee not to grant this Bill. I have made no argument; I have simply put the evidence as fairly as possible before the House, and I ask in the name of our fathers and mothers and our families, if we cannot abolish divorce altogether to have it restricted as far as possible. I, on behalf of the clergy of this country of all creeds and denominations, from bishops down, appeal

to the legislators and the courts to help us to restrict the evils of divorce. We have had here recently an eminent prelate of the Catholic Church from Ireland, Cardinal Logue, and he is marching hand and hand with all the ministers and bishops of all denominations throughout the civilized world in seeking a remedy for this evil. Here is what he says:

I have watched and studied the divorce problem here with a good deal of interest, and the time has come for all religious bodies to unite upon this subject. It has been a great pleasure to me to note that the ministers of all the sects are united in preaching against it. It is not entirely a matter of religion. The welfare of the state demands that something should be done in this country to check this evil.

A continuation of the divorce evil means the degradation of the race. The reason for this is very evident—the welfare of the family being the foundation of the race.

The only object that eminent prelate can have is to secure the welfare of mankind, and as much stability to society as can be secured, and that stability rests largely on the sanctity of the marriage tie. When I introduced a Bill in regard to this matter a couple of months ago, I did so spontaneously, and without consulting a soul. I did so after reading several critical divorce cases, and when I felt it my duty to ask the Senate to take part in this fight for decent manhood and womanhood, I felt that this House should not permit any ruffian whom we declare by our votes to be a ruffian, to bring ruin upon innocent parties by allowing him to marry again. It is not within my jurisdiction or duty to interpose any obstacle in the way of the rights or wishes of parties seeking divorce; but we have the power and authority, under the Criminal Code, to check the evil course of any man whom we declare to be unworthy the title of husband. I took that step on my own responsibility and without consulting any one. It has been said that I acted on behalf of the clergy. I doubt if the clergy would approve of my action, because some consider it more or less a toleration of the evil; but I never had an opportunity of consulting them. In all my political experience, the clergy were, as far as I am concerned, my most powerful opponents. I have had the most active opposition of the clergy from the highest