

have no testimony, except his own, to support this theory, and even that testimony is limited to a very few instances. He mentions one occasion on which she had expressed a desire to separate, and wished that her children were dead, or, if they were dead, (his recollection was not good as to the precise words.) she would be glad to separate from him. She denies this story *in toto*. We have no evidence to corroborate a statement made, I will not say for the first time, but certainly elaborated and extended before this committee, as if greater importance would be given to it here than elsewhere. Then, as to her conduct towards her husband, we have only two instances, and one of these is brought out by her own evidence. The petitioner's counsel did not venture in his cross-examination to question her as to her frivolity on the trip to the Old Country. What did it all amount to, taking the evidence on both sides? Simply to this:—On their return across the Atlantic she walked with a gentleman on the deck of the steamer, and played and sang for him in the cabin. No complaint, not even a remark was made about it at the time. It would appear the husband was inattentive to his young wife, whom he had taken abroad for her own pleasure as well as his own—at least a good husband would put it that way—and she accepted civilities from those she met on equal terms and whose acquaintance she made on the voyage. Every gentleman who has crossed the Atlantic will testify that some of the most agreeable and desirable acquaintances of life have been formed in that way. On this occasion, it seems Mrs. Campbell, according to her own statement, was escorted up and down the deck by a gentleman coming to this country, and a bowing, walking and talking acquaintance sprang up between them. The husband, observing all this said nothing, but seemed rather glad that somebody should take charge of his wife while he was amusing himself with his own reflections. But after their return to Whitby, in a chaffing way, as he admits, he made allusion to this gentleman as a person she admired more than himself. And this insignificant circumstance is gravely imported into this case as proving, or tending to prove, or in some way bearing on the crime of adultery with

Gordon! The Vice-Chancellor quotes this story as told by the petitioner, and, sagely, and I suppose we must admit, learnedly concludes, that as she did not deny the walking, or the subsequent "chaffing", or the other insignificant incidents that had occurred months, and some of them years, before the alleged seduction by Gordon, they help to establish that fact. I submit, with all due deference, to the Committee, some of whose members are learned in the law, that there is no relevancy in such evidence, and that it ought not to be considered. The only instance of alleged improper conduct proved by the petitioner and admitted by the respondent is the visit of Gordon one evening while he (Campbell) was in the house, and at the time taking his tea. Gordon was shewn by the servant into the parlor; Mrs. Campbell went in to meet him and the husband was invited by her to see him. He went in, apologized for not being able to stay, went out leaving Gordon with Mrs. Campbell, and returned a couple of hours afterwards finding his visitor still there, and again entered into conversation with him. The petitioner says he "chaffed" her about it, but did not at first pretend that he spoke seriously, or charged her with any impropriety. But when examined upon the point at such length as to suggest the importance of giving some color to the case, he says she *burst into tears*! I think we all felt that this incident, heard for the first time, suggested innocence rather than guilt. But Mrs. Campbell spoils the poetic features of the case, for she denies the "tears," denies the chidings, and only admits the "chaff"! It was mere banter—was thought nothing of at the moment,—and soon passed away. This insignificant fact is also brought into court, is the subject of serious comment by the Vice-Chancellor, and is one of his reasons for reversing his first opinion, and finally refusing Mrs. Campbell's application for alimony. These are the two instances or proofs of waning affection, and which you are asked to accept by way of preparation for the infidelity, which is alleged to have taken place on the 26th of August. I must say I have never heard, or read of a case, standing upon such a flimsy foundation as regards