

some trifling article from a bargain counter is penalized by perhaps a month in a cell. But the gravest of crimes against Divine laws, and a vicious defiance of the well-recognized principles of morality, are allowed to go unpunished and treated as a matter only of scandal and idle gossip. There should be some deterrent, some dread of the future consequences ever present to the mind of a man who has taken a young girl from her home under a promise to protect and provide for her as a wife, and who, in violation of this, has used her as an unresisting object on which he could vent his anger and exercise his cruelty. If proved, why should not the tribunal have the right to punish? A witness who clearly commits perjury in the box is dealt with at once, and a judge orders that he be forthwith arrested and prosecuted for the crime. Half a dozen serious crimes may be proved on divorce proceedings, but the man goes free, and a judgment is given, a Committees' report is made, or a private Act passed, granting him that result which, but for his own misconduct, he would perhaps have cheerfully applied for on his own account.

I do not think there is anything more I could say to advantage. I believe as much as any one does in the sanctity which ought to exist in connection with the marriage relation, and the care we ought to exercise in dealing with the question I have discussed, but in a matter of this kind, if that sanctity has been desecrated by either husband or wife, or by both, it no longer exists, and the marriage relationship is a hollow mockery and a thing defiled. And when it is found by proper judicial enquiry that one of two lives is blasted and that death itself would be a relief, it surely cannot be argued that a tribunal which pronounces bare justice, is acting contrary to the laws of God or the higher principles of modern civilization.