

Q. Did he make any promises to you?—A. Yes.

Q. What were they?—A. That he should marry me.

Q. And under cover of that promise did anything take place?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you have any relationship with him?—A. Yes.

Q. To what extent did that go?—A. I had a child by him.

Q. And is that child still living?—A. Yes.

Q. When was that child born?—A. June 30, 1906.

There is no proof whatever that Geo. Allison Spratte was at St. Albans within the nine months whereby it could be claimed that he was the father of the child. She swears it was in August that he met her. She swears the child was born on the 30th June, and it is strange that a woman of this kind, when she was put in the box, once her character is admitted to be bad that her evidence was not corroborated. She was never asked by the committee if Mr. Spratte was the only man with whom she was acquainted. There is no proof that Spratte was the man. It was for the committee to find out. The examination continues:

Q. Who was the father of that child?—A. George Allison Spratte.

Q. The respondent in this matter?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you know where this George Allison Spratte came from?—A. He came from Canada, Parry Sound.

By the Hon. Mr. Lougheed:

Q. He told you so?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Haight, of counsel for petitioner:

Q. Did you see this lady, the petitioner, there with him?—A. No, I did not.

Mrs. Spratte has sworn that she was six weeks in St. Albans, and if this woman's evidence is correct, would she not naturally be anxious to see who he was living with in St. Albans. She spent six weeks in St. Albans, and this cook says she never saw her. This woman's oath is taken as gospel truth. No attempt was made to identify this George Allison Spratte, and I venture to say that this witness was either mistaken or was swearing to what was false, because she swore that the man who called himself George Allison Spratte was a short thick-set man with red hair. Now, Spratte had not red hair. The evidence proceeds:

Q. What sort of looking man was he?—A. He was short, thick set, and had red hair.

Q. What were his habits?—A. Drinking mostly, and smoking cigarettes.

These were the only two bad habits sworn to by the oath of this woman, whose

character was never looked into, but whose evidence was accepted. The evidence proceeds:

Q. And how long was he at St. Albans?—A. He left St. Albans shortly after he found I was to have a child.

If he left in September or August, she did not have much of a child because the child was born on 30th June. The evidence proceeds:

Q. And did you do anything?—A. I did. I had him arrested.

Q. And what did he do?—A. He ran away.

Q. Is that your signature?—A. Yes, it is.

Q. Did you write that letter?—A. Yes, I did.

(Letter filed and marked as Exhibit No. 2.)

Q. Is that your handwriting also on the envelope?—A. Yes.

Q. And that letter was posted by you at Fairfax post office, in Vermont?—A. Yes.

Q. And addressed by you to Depot Harbour? That was the terminus of the Canada Atlantic Railway at that date?—A. Yes.

Q. It is addressed to George Spratte, Depot Harbour?—A. Yes.

Q. You are spoken of in the petition as Jenny Barchow. What was your maiden name?—A. Jenny Bouchard.

By the Hon. Mr. Bostock:

Q. When were you married?—A. I was married seven months ago, October 25.

Now there is the entire evidence, and it is not even evidence, because it is contradicted by the oath of the father of the petitioner. The question was put to him several times: 'Now describe your son-in-law,' and he describes him as a small man, and he was asked if he had not red hair, and he said no he had not red hair, and he was asked: 'Are you sure he had not red hair?' and he said: 'Yes,' he was. We have his evidence contradicting the woman's, who is supposed to have had a child by Spratte, and there was no attempt made to have this Spratte identified by her in any shape or form. Petitioner's father simply says, when he was asked the question as to what sort of a man he was, that he was a small man with light hair. He was asked was it not red, and he says: 'Well, it was light in colour.' They tried to make him say on his oath that it was red. But he could not say it. Now, what proof have we that George Allison Spratte was the respondent in this case? Why was not the woman's evidence tested and her character investigated? Then you will remember this famous letter written on June 23, 1907, about a year and a half ago, Mrs. Spratte was asked in regard to his letter as follows:—