

might happen to disagree with their husbands. He censured the parents of Mrs. Ham for interfering in the controversy between their daughter and the Defendant; and in exemplification of what the conduct of a parent should be in such a case, he facetiously related an anecdote, which he thought was applicable to the present case. A man, who had some dispute with his wife, gave her a moderate chastisement; upon which she ran home, and complained to her father. The father, affecting to resent the husband's behaviour, said, what! has the fellow had the impudence to beat my daughter? Then I will be revenged on him, and will beat his wife; which he did, and sent her back to her husband, and was no more troubled with their quarrels. Mr. Hawley should have done the same.

*The Solicitor General addressed the Court and Jury in the Defence.*

*Mr Lord;*

*And Gentlemen of the Jury;*

This case is of much less importance than you were probably led to anticipate, from the public expectation attending it, and the solemn and impressive manner in which it was opened. The learned Counsel, in his address to you, exerted a degree of ingenuity and eloquence, which I have seldom heard equalled, and never exceeded. The only fault attending it is that it was not founded in fact, and is not supported by the evidence. I am sure he did not wish to deceive you; but he was himself deceived by the instructions in his brief.

If the case had been proved, as it was stated; if the serious charges opened against my client had been substantiated; if he had been shewn to be such a beast, such an absolute brute, as he was represented, I would not stand up here to defend him. The reverse, however, I am happy to find, is the truth; and I now have the satisfaction to tell you, Gentlemen, that Mr. Ham is a respectable man, who from a poor shoe maker and labourer, as he was when he married the Plaintiff's daughter, has, by his own merit and good conduct, raised himself to wealth and respectability. Were he such a monster, as they would make him to be; if he had illegitimate children scattered about the country; if he kept mistresses in Bath

and Montreal; if he really had a seraglio, like the Grand Turk; how is it that he is now associated with and respected by his neighbours? I aver that, for any thing that appears to the contrary, he is a moral, exemplary man, quite as respectable as Mr. Hawley or any of his connexions: If he were such a sordid wretch, as they would make you believe, why has he been so long on the list of magistrates? Have any of his brother magistrates remonstrated against his remaining in the commission, or objected against sitting with him? No, Gentlemen, they appear to be satisfied that he has conducted with decency and propriety. And how, Gentlemen, I would ask again, if these facts really exist, how has it happened, that in the face of such objections, and against the influence of the Plaintiff and his friends, this very Mr. Ham was, on one occasion, elected by his neighbours to represent them in Parliament?

Let his character be compared with that of the Plaintiff, whose conduct has already appeared in part, and will be further proved to have been most improper. I am not retained to asperse him; but I am instructed that we shall prove, that when he went for his daughter, he said to the Defendant, "You damned rascal, you have ill used my daughter, and she shall not live with you. I was able to support her before you married her, and I am so yet: and you will be glad to come after her in three months." That is a sample of the language of this moral man, this regular attendant upon public worship, this immaculate Clerk of the Church. I state it according to my client's instructions. There he stands. If he has instructed me wrong, the greater fool he; for you will be governed by the evidence, and not by the statement I make from my brief.

The Plaintiff had no right to interfere at all with the Defendant's family government. When a woman marries, she ceases to be under the protection of her father. Parental authority is at an end. The wife is bound to forsake father and mother and cleave to her husband. It is his right to command, and her duty to obey. This is a matter of necessity; otherwise there could be no government of the family. For both cannot be supreme. There cannot be two Kings in Brentford. One of them must have the power of governing the other. By the marriage, he