

Very likely both contributed to this.

On one or two occasions the defendant left home, and, according to the plaintiff's evidence, did not, before leaving, or during his absence, provide for his wife and children as well as he should have done.

The house occupied by the parties had been sold, and possession was to be given to the purchaser some time in the autumn of 1909.

The defendant alleges that the plaintiff was of a peculiar disposition, and given to ungovernable fits of temper; that at times she was kind, and at other times abusive, to the children.

The plaintiff admitted striking the defendant, at least on one occasion, but said that she was provoked to do so, by the defendant.

There was a great deal of quarrelling between the two, and not wholly the fault of either one.

While the parties were living together, in the way described, without anything of an exceptionally unpleasant character occurring—so far as appears—a separation was brought about in this way.

On the 10th August, 1909, the defendant was due to return home from his work between five and six o'clock in the afternoon.

Just before that time, the plaintiff, having given the children their supper, prepared to leave the house.

According to her own story, she left the children in a back room, she going to a front room; and when her husband entered by the back door, she went out of the house by the front door.

The plaintiff told a neighbour that she intended to leave her husband.

She went to a friend's house, and remained away all night.

The defendant, not finding the plaintiff, enquired of the neighbour, and got the information that plaintiff had gone. He did not appear to be at all agitated or concerned, but, simply remained all night with his children, and the next morning, went with them to his father's home—both father and mother living not far away.

About 9 o'clock, or a little later the following morning, the plaintiff returned to the house, saw neither husband, nor