

Mrs. Hunt was able to prove that she was *virgo intacta*, and therefore not guilty of the offence which the verdict against Portman, seemed to establish. But that may not happen again in a thousand years. Now, in my case it is argued that because a jury of 12 men, in an action against Gordon, found *him* guilty, we must assume that Mrs. Campbell is also guilty,—that we are concluded by that verdict. But it must be remembered, that verdict was based on the evidence of two witnesses, who swore that Gordon admitted his guilt.—a statement we have disproved, but which, even if true, would not be conclusive against her according to English law, and English experience.

Hon. Mr. Dickey—You over-rate the effect of this verdict upon the Committee.

Hon. Mr. Macdougall.—It is a fact in the case which has been referred to by members of the Committee, and is stated prominently in the preamble of the Bill, while the other verdict in Mrs. Campbell's favor is carefully excluded. It is necessary for me to point out the little weight that should be given to a verdict obtained in such a manner. On the question of time, I must ask your attention. Evidence in rebuttal—at least it was so called—has been produced, to strengthen the case on that point. A tavern-keeper is called, who says James Campbell was seen on the night of the 26th of August, coming home at 3.30 a.m. Now, is it credible that they could have walked down the street; waited there until after the discussion with Gordon, proceeded to their shop which, it appears, they twice entered, remaining there taking their whiskey, and discussing this matter together; then proceeded to the house to put up a ladder to the window for the purpose of doing, God knows what; then stood grumbling there because they could not get up a discussion with Mrs. Campbell, and only have occupied half-an-hour in all their movements? The Committee will judge for themselves what bearing that evidence can have on the case, and on the credibility of the petitioner's chief witnesses. Instead of rebutting my evidence, I submit they have rebutted their own. The case of the petitioner rests upon the evidence of Campbell and Anderson, and if they are found to have made wilful misstate-

ments upon three important, material points, such as singing or no singing, in the house; the admission or denial of Gordon when accused of the crime; and the hour of the morning when he left the house, then I ask you, what reliance can you place upon their recollection or report of the conversation that took place within the house? Are they witnesses who can be believed when they tell you that they heard the mother of three children,—then large with the fourth—ask a young man in her own parlor, in a loud voice, to “come half way” for a criminal purpose, and the “crazy” libertine reply—“No, you proposed it, you come”! I will not elaborate the point. It is only necessary that I should refresh your recollection as to the absurdities, improbabilities, and contradictions in the evidence, to discharge my whole duty in this part of the case. I, perhaps, will be justified in calling your attention to the manner in which the chief witness, James Campbell, gave his evidence. You heard him examined and cross-examined. You observed his hesitation to answer, his refusal to answer sometimes, and the way he fenced throughout the enquiry, endeavouring to evade every question which he fancied would tend to vindicate my client. All the witnesses produced by the respondent, I submit, gave their testimony in a straightforward, candid manner. There was no attempt to evade, or conceal the truth, or to make up a story. She, herself, as I heard a spectator remark, seemed willing to tell the *whole* truth, without reserve. On the other side, the witnesses could not hide their bias; they hesitated, backed, fenced, explained, and strayed from the question, as if they had come to corroborate a case previously agreed upon, and not to state to you all the facts within their knowledge. One word as to the extraordinary conduct of the principal witnesses, the extraordinary service they enlisted in, and the still more extraordinary manner in which they executed their commission. They went there to watch. When I asked for what purpose, I could not get an answer. There was no particular object in view. They repudiated the suggestion that they went there to watch for Gordon. They said they went to the house to watch for something!