

By the Hon. Mr. Wilson:

Q. You left on account of information you received in a letter—is that it?—A. No, I did not get the letter until after I had left him.

By the Chairman:

Q. Has there been between yourself and your husband any connivance with regard to a petition for this divorce whatever?—A. I do not know what you mean.

Q. Any arrangement between you and him of any kind whereby the application should be made for this divorce?—A. No.

Q. Or that he should not defend it?—A. No.

Q. Has there been any collusion between you and him at all in reference to this matter?—A. No, not at all. Of course, he had this letter, some lawyer in Winnipeg had written to Ottawa, but I have not had anything to say to Mr. Spratte or any writings or understanding at all.

Q. No connivance of any kind with him?—A. No.

Q. Has there been any condonation of the offence since it came to your knowledge? Have you since then cohabited with him or forgiven him?—A. No, I have not seen him since the letter came. The letter came last May.

Q. Did he at any time make overtures to you to come back to him and ask to be forgiven?—A. No, not since I received that letter. The only time he asked me to live with him was when I went to St. Albans.

The letter came last May. Here is a letter written on January 23, 1907, and this woman swears she only got it in May. Why was that fact not probed into? Why was not this contradiction brought before the attention of the committee? The whole thing seems to me to be a clumsy fabrication of evidence, by getting this girl to take the responsibility of having signed the letter J. M. B. I am rather astonished that the highest court of the Dominion is to be called upon to render a verdict on evidence of this kind. I have spoken to members in reference to the case, and they say that if they were on a jury they would no more think of condemning a man on that kind of evidence than they would of hanging themselves. I have no brief for Mr. Spratte; but take the evidence of the father of the petitioner who was more or less interested in him, and see what he says. His evidence reads as follows:—

Charles Alonzo Phillips, of the town of Parry Sound, railroad contractor, father of the petitioner, was duly sworn and testified as follows:

Q. What is your occupation?—A. I have been railroad contracting for some time.

Q. You are the father of the petitioner?—A. Yes.

Q. Your age?—A. Fifty-three.

Q. Occupation at the time of your daughter's marriage?—A. Hotel-keeper.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN.

Q. You were the proprietor of the Canada Atlantic, now called the Kipling Hotel?—A. Yes.

Q. You remember the circumstance of your daughter's marriage?—A. Yes.

Q. After your daughter's marriage to George Allison Spratte, can you tell me, shortly, what Spratte did, what employment he was in?—A. He was employed by me for a time, I think, during the winter, until spring, and then I think he went to Depot Harbour, and worked in the office of the Canada Atlantic Railway there during that summer, I think. Then I think he came back, and I am not sure where he went. I think he went about that time to Oakville, and he worked for me and lived in a house for two or three months next to Judge McCurry's house, near the hotel, and worked for me I think until the following spring or summer.

Q. Doing what?—A. Clerking in the office.

Q. In the hotel?—A. Yes.

Q. During that time was he contributing to your daughter's support?—(No answer.)

By the Hon. Mr. McMullen:

Q. Was he married then?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Haight, of counsel for the petitioner:

Q. Where was your daughter living?—A. Well, during that summer, or at least I do not know whether it was that summer, that winter I think it was—well, I do not know. However, I know they lived there a little while anyway, and then they came back and lived at the hotel.

Q. Speaking now of the time they occupied the house next to Judge McCurry's house, did Spratte pay the rent of the property, do you know, or do you know anything about it? If you do not, say so?—A. I do not remember whether he did or not.

Q. After quitting that house, you say he was still clerking around your hotel?—A. Well, while he was living there, he was clerking in the hotel too, and then I could not get along with him.

Q. You could not get along with him, why?—A. Well, he was drinking too heavily, and I had to let him go, and he went to Toronto, and was in Toronto for I do not know how long, some little time, and he finally came back to Parry Sound again, and came back to the house, and was there I think nearly all winter, until I got a position for him with Johnston & Beveridge. I was interested in a lumber contract up at Pomogasing. He went clerking up in the camp there.

Q. That is up in Algoma?—A. Yes. Then he came back and was round there a short time.

Q. Was he devoting himself to his work in any sort of proper fashion during this time? When he was up at Johnston & Beveridge's were you satisfied with his services there, and why did he leave?—A. Well, they were through with him there. They got through with the contract and quit.

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.