

Mme. Lefavre and Mr. Baxter were passengers, and he saw them together on board, but nothing more. It is a fact that in London and Paris, Baxter and Mme. Lefavre went to the theatre and places of amusement together, and were at the same hotel in Paris. They also returned to this country together. During the next ten months, from the end of 1879 to August, 1880, Mme. Lefavre was a boarder with Mrs. Heavysedge. Baxter visited her there at any rate once a week, and if he called in the evening he was shown to her bedroom, because the drawing-room was occupied by the family. Mme. Lefavre was next a boarder at Mrs. Rickens', in St. Alexander street, for several weeks. James Baxter had a bedroom there at the same time, and his room was on the same flat as hers, and no other bedroom was on the same flat.

We have next Mme. Lefavre living through the winter of 1880-1 at No. 52 St. Urbain street, as the housekeeper or guest of James Baxter, the occupant. They went out driving together and went to the theatre together. He was a married man, but separated from his wife. His two minor children, aged respectively seven and eleven years, were with him. They played about the rooms in which were Mr. Baxter and Mme. Lefavre, and retired about 8 or 9, after which Baxter and Mme. Lefavre were alone. His bedroom was the common sitting room. Servants have given their testimony who were in the house at this time. They were François Charette, Mme. Charette, Sophie Charette, and Emilie Moore. Their testimony is to the same effect, that they did not like the appearance of things as regarded the relations of Mr. Baxter and Mme. Lefavre, though no testimony has been given showing acts of familiarity between them. Sophie Charette left at the end of a month because she did not wish to serve in a house in which there was no mistress, and in which the lady was separated from her husband. Mme. Lefavre had an auction sale of her own furniture; Baxter was present, and certain portraits were moved up to his house to hang on his walls. During this winter she was absent for some weeks at Detroit, wrote him letters of which several are produced by him, signed "Mina" or "H.L." meaning the defendant. One of them is signed "Your friend

Mina;" another, "Your absent friend, Mina;" a third, "Affectionate friend, Mina." It is also in evidence that Baxter has lent her money from time to time, and two notes in his favor are shown for over \$100 each. It is right here to note that on the return of Lefavre from Barbadoes, he received through the post office two anonymous letters charging adultery against his wife. This may explain why the husband and wife did not meet at that time. A prominent witness in the case is George W. Parent. He speaks of having seen a letter from Mme. Lefavre to Baxter about the date of her husband's return, expressing contrition and penitence, and a desire to retire to a convent. He says more than this. He had seen divers letters from her to Baxter, and they were of a decidedly amorous character. Parent in answer to a question put by the Court said that Mme. Lefavre was Baxter's mistress. He says also that he had himself received from her letters of a similar tone, and he would not have his own wife associate with her. Mme. C. E. Belle, the stepmother of Mme. Lefavre, mentions that she went on one occasion to the bedroom of Mme. Lefavre at the St. Lawrence Hall, and found there a gentleman whom Mme. Lefavre introduced to her as Mr. James. She does not know who he was, but thought at the time that it was a curious circumstance to find a gentleman in Mme. Lefavre's bedroom.

Looking at the entirety of the above evidence, the only evidence very plainly establishing adultery on the part of the defendant, is that of the steward and stewardess of the Sardinian. Is it to be believed? The character of the witness is not attacked, and if there was any possibility of his being mistaken as to Mme. Lefavre being the same person who was in stateroom Nos. 23, 24, the plaintiff has asked that Peter Roberts, the witness, be brought up again and confronted with Mme. Lefavre. Why was it resisted by the counsel for the defence? The only rational conclusion is that they had nothing to gain by the confronting of the witness with the defendant—that it would only make matters worse. Again, the evidence here pointing to a criminal relation between Baxter and Mme. Lefavre, if the evidence of Peter Roberts be untrue, why has it not been contradicted by the evidence of other stewards, or ladies or gentlemen who were pas-