bargain that they should live apart. Under these circumstances, it is for the House to decide what course should be taken. This is a majority report, and having acted as chairman of the committee, though unfortunately differing from the majority of the committee in the decision they arrived at, I may say, in justice to myself, that the general rule for condonation, apart from the circumstances themselves, is that there must not only be a condonation, but there must be cohabitation afterwards. That is the general rule. Apart from the special circumstances of this case, that would be the rule that would govern with regard to condonation, and that is the contention of the other side.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—In a matter of this kind, involving the severing of the most sacred of human ties, we should act with great care and deliberation. Our decision must stamp one or the other of the parties with the greatest infamy; and we must exercise all the more caution in this case in view of the fact that the application has not been opposed by the respondent. I shall not go over the grounds which have been stated by my hon. friend from Amherst, but I may say that I have never known a case where the evidence has been placed so imperfectly before the Senate—evidence which would have an important bearing on the case, and which the petitioner could have produced had he chosen to do so. The petitioner himself states that the last child was born some ten or eleven months after his departure from home.

HON. MR. MACDONALD (B.C.)—That was his suspicion.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—He says so positively, and he says that he came to the conclusion from the time he received the last letter from his wife that the child was not his, and upon that he condones or connives at it by sending her a large sum of money—$500. If he wished to produce reliable evidence on that point it was easy for him to have obtained from the register of births and deaths the date of the birth of the child, but he never got any information of that kind at all. He is therefore clearly guilty of neglect, which must enure to his own disadvantage in this case. Not only did he leave his wife in the manner that my hon. friend has described, but we have evidence here which cannot be very readily got over, that he, in 1883, was served with regular papers for a divorce, on the ground that he had been guilty of adultery with a woman whose name was given. That divorce suit was brought in the State of New York, which is the only state in the Union that grants divorces only on the ground that we recognize here. The petitioner in this case admits that he was served with these papers, that he never made any opposition, and in fact took no notice whatever of the proceedings. He said, in giving his evidence, that if she did not wish to live with him she could go. The evidence shows that the respondent in this case obtained a divorce from her husband in the State of New York on the ground alleged, and that she is now living with a man named Simpson as his wife. I ask you if there has not been a laxity, a carelessness and an indifference on his part which would justify us in refusing to grant him a divorce? It is a question in my mind now whether we should, by granting this Bill, declare that the divorce granted in the State of New York was improperly obtained—whether we would not be acting in defiance of a court of competent jurisdiction in a State where the grounds of divorce that are recognized are the same as in this country. If we grant this Bill, we declare that the respondent has been living in adultery since 1883. The petitioner could not have been a poor man, because after he believed that his wife had been unfaithful to him he sent her $500.

HON. MR. READ (Quinté)—The evidence is to the contrary.

HON. MR. KAULBACH.—I will read the evidence. At Page 4 his counsel asked the question: "You sent the $500 before you heard of the birth of this child?" The reply is: "Yes" Then, when he comes to have the evidence read over to him he says as to his answer to the first question on page 11, as to sending the $500, before hearing of the birth of the child, which answer he declares should be "No" instead of "Yes." There he corrects the evidence himself, and says that he sent this $500 to her after he believed she had been untrue to him. Therefore, we are justified in refusing this Bill, because this man has connived at his wife's conduct: he has, by