

dencies of humanity. Society has much to answer for in this connection, especially when we find, as we do, that apparently a large and influential class, instead of dealing out justice to the sinner, winks at his lapses, and welcomes him as a family guest. The remedy does not lie in preventing divorce. The true remedy consists in an exaltation of life.

For my own part, I am induced for the reasons therein given to follow the report of the majority in its main features, and I cannot see that the enlargement of the causes for divorces along the lines indicated would produce the evils which some people think would result from the changes proposed, if carried into effect. The state of the divorce laws in the United States is not relevant. The conditions are entirely different, and the easy methods of getting a divorce in many of the States are not contemplated here. We look only for sound, conservative and substantial grounds on which a divorce may be granted, and not for the creation of a court too readily available to the man or woman who is tired of married life, or whose respective tempers may not harmonize, nor should we advocate remedies so difficult and costly as to make the court a millionaire's tribunal.

This brings me to the question of the constitution of the court itself. It is manifest that on the trial of issues of pure fact, judges who are experienced in weighing evidence are best qualified to deal with matrimonial causes. Many of the members of the Divorce Committee of the Canadian Senate are laymen. They are engaged in business or callings which are quite foreign to the conception and consideration of the probative force of evidence. A few hours of each session, and an experience only extending over the time they have been members of the Senate, represent the training available to them, and it cannot be expected that they could analyze, weigh and estimate the value of the statements made by witnesses as a judge can do in the light of varied and daily experience, and with that knowledge and penetration, which are the product of half a lifetime at the Bar, and later, on the Bench. It is true there are lawyers on the Committee, but there is not, and cannot be the same searching