

**Sir JOHN THOMPSON.** The agreement with the Government distinctly provides the contrary, as I understand it. The lands are security for the principal first, and then for any arrears of interest.

**Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.)** The lands are security as payment for the interests until the land realises the full amount of the principal.

**Mr. MULOCK.** We are not making a new contract. The contract of 1887 is not being varied and it is not being prejudiced.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

#### DIVORCE—SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 123) for the relief of George McDonald Bagwell.—(Mr. Brown.)

Bill (No. 124) for the relief of Arthur Wand.—(Mr. Small.)

#### DIVORCE—WILLIAM HENRY MIDDLETON.

**Mr. SMALL** moved second reading of Bill (No. 125) for the relief of William Henry Middleton.

**Mr. WILSON (Elgin.)** To my mind the evidence given in this case is not sufficient to warrant this House in passing this Bill. The evidence is incomplete and unsatisfactory, it is not such as would convict any person in a court of law. The only real evidence produced was that of the Pullman car conductor. We find that he states that a lady took passage from Ottawa to Boston. At St. Albans she was joined by some individual. Who that individual was is not stated. He took tickets for Boston and took a sleeper in a Pullman car. It is contended that the two parties occupied one section. The conductor then was asked whether he was sure with respect to the names of these individuals. He stated that he was, and then he was asked how he could be sure as to these persons. He said that on his return to Ottawa some of the officials of the road had asked him whether or not there was a lady and gentleman left St. Albans together for Boston, and it was on that account he remembered it. Further on he was asked whether there were any other parties on the sleeper. He said he did not remember, he thought not. A year and a-half afterwards this Pullman car conductor, who did not know that circumstance, pretended to be able to identify, by photo., the two parties as those who had gone from St. Albans to Boston. If he did not remember whether there were any others on the car or not, he could scarcely be able to swear definitely whether those parties had been the ones who had taken passage from St. Albans and gone to Boston. He was cross examined as to whether he thought they were husband and wife; he said he thought they were. Other questions were asked him and very unsatisfactory replies obtained. I contend that on such evidence, and this is the only evidence upon which even a suspicion can be conveyed, it is not sufficient evidence on which to dissolve the tie of matrimony. It is an unreasonable proposition. If we leave that evidence and go to the evidence of the detective in Detroit, that evidence is not sufficient because the circumstances connected with it are not enough to show there was any guilt whatever as regards the parties.

**Mr. LISTER.** He was coming out of the room, that was all.

**Mr. WILSON (Elgin.)** At ten o'clock in the day a man was seen coming out of the room, and he was going down into the city very likely, and his coming out of the  
**Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.)**

room at that hour is not sufficient to entitle a husband to a divorce from his wife. The detective stated that he went to the door and heard someone talking. He was asked as to whether he heard what they were talking about, and he said he could not hear anything further than the man cough. The man came out of the room. The detective went and rapped at the door, and the lady asked, who was there? The detective said that a person was there desirous of seeing Mrs. Howard, the name under which she was registered at the hotel. In a few minutes she came to the door, and the detective spoke to her. The detective said: "Are you Mrs. Howard?" The reply was: "I am." The detective replied: "Your correct name is not Mrs. Howard, but Mrs. Middleton," and she answered "Yes." If she were desirous of concealing her name, if she were guilty, as it is represented she was guilty, she would not so readily have said that her name was Mrs. Middleton. If you take the evidence of the servant, I say that is not sufficient to prove this case. There is not any of the evidence which will show any guilt on the part of Mrs. Middleton. If you take the subsequent evidence, it is all of a circumstantial character and is not sufficiently strong to justify an Act of divorce. I contend, therefore, that it is unreasonable that this House should be called on to grant a divorce in this case. It might be said that more evidence could have been offered, that a greater amount of evidence could have been presented to the Committee of the Senate. If there could have been more evidence produced it should have been advanced, and we have on right to allow a Bill of this kind to pass, for if there is more evidence it should have been furnished. The Bill should be rejected on this occasion, and it could be reintroduced next year, if there was more evidence that could be produced and laid before the Committee of the Senate. I shall, therefore, take pleasure in voting against granting the relief asked for in this Bill.

**Mr. LISTER.** The simplicity of the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House is astonishing. If there ever was a case in which the applicant is entitled to a divorce it is this case. What does the evidence show? That on the day in question she left her home without the knowledge of her husband, went on the train on which it is said this man joined her; her sister met her there; the Pullman car conductor the day afterwards was asked about the incident, and that brought to his mind the fact that these two people had occupied the same berth on that train on that night. If we follow them to Detroit we find they occupied the same room, that the detective swore that Hamilton came out of the room; that he, the detective, then went into the room and found this woman in her night dress and with a shawl around her shoulders. If that does not convince the hon. gentleman that there is something wrong in the state of Denmark, I do not know what will.

**Mr. WILSON.** I call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that the hour has expired for Private Bills,

**Mr. SPEAKER:** There is one minute more.

Bill read the second time, on a division.

#### MANUFACTURERS' LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

**Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.** Before the Orders of the Day are called I wish to speak on the motion of my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister) respecting the Manufacturers' Insurance Company. It would appear from the hon. gentleman's remarks that an undue return had been made with respect to the formation of this company, and with respect to the deposit of the money. This statement of the hon. gentleman was based on a letter that appeared in one of the Toronto papers, signed by Mr. MacLennan—now Judge MacLennan—as solicitor for Sir Alexander