

poor opinion of the woman who would wantonly assail the character of her husband. When Mr. Hunter made propositions to the lady who is now his wife, she and her family well knew what were his circumstances and prospects; and surely when that marriage was consummated they had a right to look forward to many days and nights of nuptial happiness; and when those unhappy differences did arise with his family, the wife surely ought to have exercised a little forbearance and discretion; she ought to have recollected that he was the much loved son and brother as well as husband. When the first little quarrel occurred on the way from Toronto to Montreal, if Hunter did say it was childish for her to wish to see the sparkling of the light on the waters, it was not very harsh, and did not justify her in getting into a pet and telling him that if he treated her unkindly once he would not do so again. Mrs. Hunter was not forced into the match, and I might say, but I don't that this looks very much as if Mrs. Hunter married for an establishment; and, gentlemen, when a wife commences in the "honey moon" thus to differ from her husband, her future actions are well worth watching. This case was opened up at Fredericton on the application for a divorce, a great deal more evidence was elicited than in the present case, and the Master of the Rolls, after deliberating for three months, decided that there were not sufficient grounds for a separation, or for a claim for separate maintenance; and, gentlemen, you should be very careful how you set aside by your verdict such a decision as that. In law, if the husband turns his wife away, she would have the authority to pledge his credit. Did Mr. Hunter turn his wife out of his house? I deny, unhesitatingly, that he did so. On the contrary, after she left, he did all in his power to bring her back—he wrote a letter begging her to come back—took a coach up to her father's house to bring her back, and she was advised by her family not to come. Her father knew that Hunter had used these efforts to get his wife back, and knowing this, expressed the sentiment that he would rather see her in her coffin than go back to live with him. I say that there was no justification for her leaving, and that from the very first she evinced a determination to have a separate establishment, doing all she could to create unhappiness in the family to this end. After Hunter had used unavailing efforts to get her to come back, and after he had been furnished with a bill for her board, he wrote to her father, explicitly stating that he was quite able and willing to support his wife at his own house, and would not be responsible for any bills which she might contract; if, gentlemen, after this you say that she has the right to run about town and contract bills, I consider that you are striking at the very roots of the fabric of society and all domestic happiness. The conduct of the father of the lady in this case is reprehensible in the extreme. He seems to have done all in his power to prevent a reconciliation, forgetting that "what God has joined together" no man should put asunder—and, gentlemen, in this case it was no man who did keep them asunder.

The learned gentleman reviewed the evidence at length, commenting upon it, quoting largely from the judgment of the Master of the Rolls in the divorce case, in support of his statements. We have given but a mere outline of his very able speech. Our space does not permit us to go more largely into it. He spoke for nearly two hours and was listened to with great interest, concluding with an eloquent appeal in favor of the defendant as an affectionate son and brother, stating that it was found invariably to be the case that an affectionate son was sure to be a kind, affectionate husband.

#### MR. GRAY'S SPEECH.

Mr. Gray delivered one of the most eloquent speeches, in closing the case for the plaintiff, that we have ever heard. He was nearly three hours on his feet, and at times was listened to with breathless attention. He took Mrs. Hunter's evidence as published in the TELEGRAPH, and following each successive portion of it dwelt on the causes which Mrs. Hunter put forth for leaving her husband, and the treatment which she alleged she received at his hands. As in the case of Mr. Thomson's speech, we can only give an outline of what Mr. Gray said on the occasion.

In opening he said: If I were to limit my observations to the feelings of the defendant and his mother and sisters, I could say that there are other mothers and other sisters who have feelings in this matter as well as those of the defendant; but I have to go beyond this, and deal with facts as they have been brought out on this trial. My learned friend, Mr. Thomson, has quoted those beautiful words of the marriage service—"What God hath joined together let no man put asunder"—but my learned friend forgot that there was a higher law—forgot to take the Bible and read those words, which are read wherever Christianity has a foothold, and wherever the name of Christ is known: "For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother and cleave unto his wife." A case such as this is not to be governed by mere language, but by arguments and facts. There can be no question about the law which regulates such cases. The Judgment of the Master of the Rolls, from which my learned friend has quoted so largely, has nothing to do with the present case; the application in that case was for a different object, and cannot affect the present, and I ask that your conclusion may be different. The credit that we are endeavoring to establish is that of the husband in a case where the wife, from a fear of personal injury, had left him and had contracted bills for her maintenance after so leaving. The husband in such a case would be responsible for those debts, unless it could be proven that he had made a *bona fide* offer to take her back, and even then if the wife had a reasonable fear that the indignities would be renewed, she would not be compelled to return, and the husband would still be responsible for her maintenance. First, we have to determine if the conduct of the husband was such as to justify the wife in leaving—was it such as to cause her to

have a reason  
she goes  
which the  
bility is  
There are  
the present  
ordering  
his orders  
believe to  
that of the  
The first  
Hunter  
be a very  
which y  
would no  
wife, one  
of the ray  
name of a  
have loo  
poetic te  
she could  
learned f  
Mr. Hun  
and ask  
deliberat  
you belie  
in that w  
perjury?  
timony  
ed to the  
dence of  
weight of  
When I  
could see  
she answ  
love, "C  
I could  
it, and t  
of the s  
ask, was  
fear of d  
home of  
here too  
comment  
evidence  
sitting o  
neck and  
nose ble  
man, and  
of whom  
pretty g  
him! sh  
if his m  
shelld  
ing upon  
united v  
treatme  
her sent  
us a per  
the out  
we shat  
sented t  
case, vi  
same co  
ever wa