

Courts of the United States, the marriage which took place in Upper Canada in December, 1851, was dissolved by the sentence of divorce pronounced in July, 1870, and the subsequent marriage of Dr. Sangster in the State of Michigan, was therefore a valid marriage, and undoubtedly recognizable in the United States. And the decree of divorce of July, 1870, being regular according to the law of Illinois, and the second marriage being valid in the United States, it is also valid in Canada.

"(Signed),

"J. HILLYARD CAMERON.

"Romain Buildings,  
15th June, 1874."

"I can readily understand how a man . . . . . might be willing to save them (his children) from her (his wife's) polluting presence by a separation, obtained on grounds even less strong than adultery."—p. 14.

"We have seen that she (Mrs. Sangster) has been divorced, *a vinculo matrimonii*,"—p. 15.

"Circumstances, into which I do not wish to enter, unless forced to do so, came to my knowledge, which led me to see that the existing state of things *could not be permitted* to continue, and we were, in pursuance of steps then taken, divorced by legal process in the State of Illinois,"—p. 19.

"That I did subsequently marry on my divorce, &c."—p. 21.

"I some days ago sent my divorce to the United States, in order to obtain a certificate from the Secretary of State as to its genuineness and validity, and also opinions from the most eminent legal men of the country, of the perfect legality of both my divorce and marriage."—p. 32 note.

The whole tenor of these extracts gives the indubitable impression that Dr. Sangster obtained the divorce, and we have not yet met a person who would put any other construction upon them.

Now mark what follows. In consequence of discussions in the public press, Mr. Hillyard Cameron wrote the following letter to the *Globe*:—

(To the Editor of the *Globe*.)

"SIR,—On my return to Toronto to-day, my attention has been called to an article in the *Globe* of the 5th inst. on Dr. Sangster, and to an opinion set out therein, and alleged to be mine, on the validity of a divorce from his first wife, obtained by him in the State of Illinois.

"My opinion was never either asked or given on such a case, but it was asked for and given on a decree of divorce obtained on the petition of his first wife, against Dr. Sangster, on a statement of facts submitted therewith, and as only part of it is set out in the *Globe's* article, it does not show my views on the case really sent to me, and bears no application whatever, as stated, to a divorce obtained by Dr. Sangster.

"J. HILLYARD CAMERON.

"Romain Buildings, 10th July, 1874."

It will be observed that, Mr. Cameron denies ever having been asked to give an opinion on a divorce obtained by Dr. Sangster. What then becomes of Dr. Sangster's own statements, and those of his friend "Hastings," incorporated in his pamphlet? Is the equivocation they display a mere coincidence, or does it imply collusion on their part to deceive teachers and the public? Dr. Sangster, in a very lame letter, addressed to the *Mail* of July 14th, says: "I have no where in my pamphlet, either said or implied that the divorce of July, 1870, was sought for by me, or that I ever sought for a divorce in the State of Illinois at all." We shall not insult the intelligence of our fellow-teachers by discussing this assertion, we feel quite safe in leaving the question of its veracity to all who have read the above extracts, or have read his pamphlet.

It will be further observed, that Mr. Cameron says his opinion was asked for and given on a decree of divorce obtained on the PETITION OF HIS FIRST WIFE AGAINST DR. SANGSTER, on a statement of facts submitted therewith. Now, throughout the pamphlet Dr. Sangster represents himself as a grievously wronged husband, as one who was altogether the innocent victim of the gross wickedness of an abandoned wife. Not one word does he use to imply that he committed any indiscretion, much less any fault. Yet now we find that his wife petitioned against him for a divorce, got it, and it is upon that divorce that she married again, and that he subsequently acted. The question that now arises is, upon what ground did she obtain a divorce? On page 20 of his pamphlet, he says: "In England, with twenty millions of people, some three hundred (divorces) are granted every year, yet only on the ground of adultery, upon which ground alone I think divorces ought to issue." Was it, then, in accordance with this opinion, on the ground of his adultery she obtained her divorce? Not so, for in his letter to the *Mail* of the 14th inst., he avers that the charge of adultery was never referred against him by any one but the editor of the *Globe*. We conclude, therefore, that despite his opinion, he acted upon a divorce granted for some other cause than adultery. What was that other cause? It cannot have been cruelty, for he represents himself as a most forbearing and exemplary husband. It cannot have been desertion, for if we accept his statement, the desertion was on his wife's part, (see pp. 15 and