and Steamboat Company, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company Agreement."

He said: The object of this Bill is to confirm an agreement entered into between the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskat-chewan Railroad and Steamboat Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Com-There has been an agreement for the running of the road after it is built by the former company, and while there is no doubt about that company having the power to make the agreement, there is some doubt about the Canadian Pacific Railway Company having the power, and this Bill is to confirm the agreement.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

The Senate adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Monday, March 10th, 1890.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

KEEFER DIVORCE BILL. SECOND READING.

Hon, Mr. DICKEY moved the adoption of the report of the Select Committee on Divorce on Bill (G) "An Act for the relief of Hugh Forbes Keefer." He said: It may be convenient to the House that I should, as chairman of the committee, tell exactly what the situation of this matter is, and what are the points that will arise for the consideration of the House. These parties married in the year 1871 and lived peacefully together until the year 1880. In the spring of that year the petitionerthe husband—removed, in the course of his business, to a portion of the United States, in order to get employment, and remained there five months, returning in the autumn of the same year. He remained until April of the following year, 1881, and then went off seeking employment, ultimately reaching British Columbia on the 1st January, 1882. While there he received information of the birth of a child, which he says, in the course of the evidence, he was quite satisfied he was not the father of, and I assume that this action was pre-

by the Bill that the complainant says: "In or about the year 1883 the said Rebecca Ann Keefer deserted her said husband, and has not since resided with the said Hugh Forbes Keefer; that after she deserted her said husband as aforesaid he discovered, as the fact was, that the said Rebecca Ann Keefer had been leading an irregular life, and had committed adultery in or about the year 1883, and on divers occasions subsequently to the said last men-

tioned year.

Acting upon that supposition the petitioner sent a sum of money to his wife to pay off debts, with the intimation that that was the last she was to see of him. Things went on in that way until ultimately, in the year 1883, there being no correspondence between the parties whatever-I may say there was no cohabitation between them—when the applicant learned that & divorce had been applied for by his wife, in the State of New York, from himself, on the ground of adultery committed by him-Papers were served on him, but he paid no attention to them, and took no action whatever, although he denies the fact that he was guilty of adultery. No proceed. ings on that application for divorce were brought before the committee, for the res. son, as he says, that the papers he received were burnt in the great fire in Vancouver, and that is a satisfactory reason, perhaps, why he could not produce the papers. will be seen, by referring to the report, that subsequently to his having ascertained in 1883 to his own satisfaction that his wife was living an irregular life, and particularly with a person whose name is mentioned in these proceedings—the man Simp son-he took no steps whatever until proceedings were taken in this case, and she appears on the scene afterwards as the wife, of this person, how or under what circum stances there is no evidence before the committee; but all this is brought out in examination on the part of the promoter of the Bill. There was no opposition to the Bill. The consideration of this matter involves a series of complications, I am sorry to say, and as this is a majority report it is but right I should explain what these complications are. The position of the promoter is this: that she, having lived with another man, in the year 1883 and subsequently, there can be no question about the subsequent acts of adultery, what dicated on that supposition; because I find ever may be the impression as to the birth