









Mr. Beecher has made an explicit and sweeping denial of the truth of the charges contained in the statement Mr. Tilton laid before the investigating committee. But he accompanies the denial with explanations that are confusing and suggestions that involve the whole matter in a deeper mystery. They will hardly satisfy anybody till cleared up by further revelations and supported by confirmatory facts. The main thing, however, is that he positively and emphatically denies the accusations. His letter is addressed to the American people. It asks for a suspension of judgment till all the facts are brought out and the case is made up. This is certainly far from as it goes. But what assurance has the public that all the facts will be made known, and that the verdict will be absolutely fair and just? The men on the committee are undoubtedly fair-minded and mean to be just. But they were chosen by Mr. Beecher. They are his personal friends. They represent Plymouth Church. They have great social and moral interests involved in the case. And in a matter like this, which takes such deep hold of the passions of human nature, and involves so many reputations and excites the whole community as nothing before has ever done, it is obvious that a committee constituted as this one is, meeting in a private parlour with closed doors is hardly adequate. It is like trying to measure a tornado with a yardstick or weigh an earthquake in a pair of apothecary's scales.

This matter is altogether too large, too complicated in its entanglements, and too terribly serious to be dealt with satisfactorily in this petty fashion. Even should this committee make a report completely exonerating Mr. Beecher its verdict would not help him a whit, save with those who are determined to believe him innocent, unless it is backed with an overpowering array of evidence. In justice to himself and his friends he should have placed the matter in the hands of a tribunal whose investigation would have been open and in accordance with the admitted rules of legal evidence, and whose judgment would have been beyond suspicion and final. If Mr. Beecher is innocent of the terrible charges made against him, if his conduct has been above reproach, as he claims, he has been cruelly and criminally wronged, and the man who has dogged his steps and blackened his reputation, and finally struck at his very heart, ought to be punished to the fullest extent of the law, and driven out of society as a ghoul unit to exist within the precincts of civilization. If Mr. Tilton's charges are untrue—if he has defamed his own wife and struck what is dearer than his life at another's honor—he is guilty of a crime for which the law provides no sufficient penalty, and should be driven from the face of society as an enemy of mankind. But if Mr. Tilton's statement is substantially true—if Mr. Beecher has seduced his wife by playing on her religious emotions and blinding her conscience; if he has been guilty of violating the sanctity of Mr. Tilton's home and destroying his happiness and blasting his life by guilty practices continued for years; if he has tried to efface the footprints of his guilt by a course of duplicity almost as bad as the crime he sought to hide, and finally conspired to crush the man he had wronged—no punishment can be severe enough to expiate the enormity of his offence. The case is too terribly serious to be shut up in a box of which evidence is in dribs and drabs to protect suspicion and mislead the public. Both Mr. Tilton and Mr. Beecher are public men. Both of them have appealed to the public for defence and vindication. And justice to both parties requires that this case should be fairly tried before the public, if not in an open court of law, at least before some fairly constituted, impartial tribunal.

STANDERS—ON THE HON. GEORGE BROWN.—During the absence of Mr. Brown in Washington, some of the Conservative newspapers chose to label him, by a charge of immorality, of something of the same kind as that made against Mr. Beecher. Mr. Brown, however, was not so well disposed as the Divine to allow such scandals to remain without contradiction and punishment. He has accordingly printed the following notice at the head of the editorial matter of the *Globe*:

"I find that during my absence at Washington, my personal character appeared in an obscure weekly paper in this city, and has since been repeated in that and other newspapers with aggravations.

"These infamous statements are utterly false from beginning to end. They are pure inventions, without a shadow of truth to palliate them.

"I was not aware that any such serious stories had been published, until Tuesday evening last, when instructions were instantly given by my solicitors to prosecute all the journalists who have given them currency through their papers. That is now being done; and this note has only been delayed until copies of the several papers containing the slanders could be secured.

Geo. Brown."

The best kind of a salesman in those dull times is an advertisement in a newspaper. It never tires in its labors, and never shirks its duty; it talks to customers when they are in the best mood to be favorably impressed. It has access to the merchant, the scholar, the artist, the mechanic, and the farmer. It goes unquestioned into the most private and sacred of retreats. The lawyer listens to it while working up his case; the doctor drives into it when not dividing diseases; the ladies have it in their laps while idly telling in their boudoirs. It is present in thousands of places at the same moment.

## SMITH VS. SANGSTER.

To the Editor of the *Herald*.

Ma. Editor.—Dr. Sangster's immoral and worthless character has been so undeniably established that any one who will not support him must either be as lost to virtue as himself, or so senselessly stubborn that facts and arguments cannot move them. Consequently, instead of wasting time in the bootless labor of convincing those who refuse to be convinced, I desire, with your permission, to show the majority of the teachers (whom I take to be too virtuous and intelligent to support Sangster,) that Prof. Goldwin Smith is worthy of their warmest support and confidence.

He is an M. A., and a Fellow of Oxford, one of the most famous universities of Europe, and for several years he was professor of history in that university—a position which he filled with great marked ability that Cornell University held out special inducements to procure his services in the United States; and those who read for themselves must still remember the high eulogiums of the English press on the occasion of his departure for America.

But, in addition to the eminence he has reached in his own professional department, he has been a diligent and successful student in the varied paths of literature, and as a necessary result he is a most accomplished scholar, and possessed of large, liberal and comprehensive views of all subjects that engage his attention.

His moral character is so spotless that even unscrupulous Dr. Sangster and his satellites have not dared to make a single definite charge against him. And surely it is needless to enlarge on the virtues of one whose bitter foes are unable to assail except by cowardly hints—the approved weapons of the immoral emulor.

Moreover, he is so thoroughly wedded to the British Crown and British institutions that he has decided to become a Canadian, and in doing so has chosen Toronto, in our own beloved and noble Ontario, as his future home. From the general statements now made, in which I should have mentioned that he is one of the greatest lecturers and orators of the day, there can be but one opinion as to his general fitness for the office he is willing to accept from the teachers of Ontario.

And now we come to his special fitness for this office. His late letter in the *Globe*, refusing to lend his sanction to the official exposure of the Sangster scandal shows him to be possessed of the highest ideas of honor, whilst Sangster's contemptible strictures on that letter show his honor to be as rotten as his morals. Some say that education, on account of his recent arrival among us. Now, those who have read his late lectures and addresses, must admit that he mastered Canadian politics, which certainly present a much wider and more difficult field of investigation than the school system of Ontario. But to those holding this view I wish to say in plain terms, that Prof. Smith has had special training in this respect, which places him far above his unworthy rival. So much attention has he given to popular education that years ago the Queen appointed him as one of the commissioners to examine the various school systems of Europe and America (in which ours was included). Who then is the better man? The one who has studied the school systems of Europe and America, or the one who has studied in some measure the Ontario school system and paid special attention to the divorce laws of Illinois. I might say much more, but as a pamphlet fully presented Prof. Goldwin Smith's claims is likely to be in the hands of teachers as my letter, it is unnecessary to occupy more space.

Let me in conclusion advise all teachers to obtain and read the pamphlet, and to vote on the side of morality, ability and honor. Not to vote is almost as bad as to vote wrong.

TEACHER.

"TAKE CARE OF YOURSELVES OR GO TO CANADA."—The Philadelphia *Inquirer* says "the Agricultural Laborers Union of England thank their members who are 'locked out' in the eastern counties, during the harvest, with cool unkindness. They are informed that the Union does not feel itself justified in appealing to the public for their support. It is to be presumed that the Union has no funds with which to help these people. They are, therefore, candidly apprised that they must either take care of themselves or emigrate. If they will go to Canada efforts will be made to obtain better terms for them in that country than have yet been conceded."

The Dominion Government has appointed the Rev. Mr. Manning and Mr. Frederick Davis, as Commissioners to enquire into the working of the prohibition liquor laws in the United States. As to the fitness of the two gentlemen for the duty we know nothing. One thing is certain; that persons undertaking such a task should have no preconceived ideas on the subject, one way or the other. Those who have prejudged a question, are gifted with a preternatural keenness of vision for spying out facts which square with their theories, and are afflicted with a morbid blindness as to those which have an opposite tendency. The question of Prohibition is a very difficult one to answer.

The annual prize meeting of the Dominion of Canada Rifle Association will be held at Ottawa about the 15th September next.

## THE LEAL ASPECT OF DR. SANGSTER'S CASE.

15th June, 1874.

Dr. Sangster's case is at first declared his purpose of getting an English divorce from his wife—on the ground of her adultery; but in his last will, he has admitted that he had no intention of doing so, but that he had adopted the expedient of procuring a divorce in the States.

On page seven of the pamphlet, in Mr. Carter's opinion, the following words, put in italics, occur:—"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 the [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.

"Some days ago I gave 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 my divorce and marriage."—p. 22.

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.

New matter that follows in consequence of discussion 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 8th inst., on Dr. Sangster, and his opinion on the divorce, and alleged to be mine, on the validity of a divorce from his 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 divorce from his 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 of the facts as stated, to a divorce obtained by Dr. Sangster."

"J. HILLYARD CAMERON, 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 does he mean by his own statement, and those of his friend "Hastings," incorporated in his pamphlet? Is the equivocation they display a 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 divorce obtained by Dr. Sangster. What then does he mean by his own statement, and those of his friend "Hastings," incorporated in his pamphlet? Is the equivocation they display a 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 divorce obtained by Dr. Sangster. What then does he mean by his own statement, and those of his friend "Hastings," incorporated in his pamphlet? Is the equivocation they display a 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."

"J. HILLYARD CAMERON, 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 does he mean by his own statement, and those of his friend "Hastings," incorporated in his pamphlet? Is the equivocation they display a 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."

"J. HILLYARD CAMERON, 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 does he mean by his own statement, and those of his friend "Hastings," incorporated in his pamphlet? Is the equivocation they display a 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."

"J. HILLYARD CAMERON, 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 does he mean by his own statement, and those of his friend "Hastings," incorporated in his pamphlet? Is the equivocation they display a 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."

"J. HILLYARD CAMERON, 10th July, 1874."

## THE LEAL ASPECT OF DR. SANGSTER'S CASE.

15th June, 1874.

Dr. Sangster's case is at first declared his purpose of getting an English divorce from his wife—on the ground of her adultery; but in his last will, he has admitted that he had no intention of doing so, but that he had adopted the expedient of procuring a divorce in the States.

On page seven of the pamphlet, in Mr. Carter's opinion, the following words, put in italics, occur:—"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 the [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.

"Some days ago I gave 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 my divorce and marriage."—p. 22.

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.

New matter that follows in consequence of discussion 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 8th inst., on Dr. Sangster, and his opinion on the divorce, and alleged to be mine, on the validity of a divorce from his 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 divorce from his 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 of the facts as stated, to a divorce obtained by Dr. Sangster."

"J. HILLYARD CAMERON, 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 does he mean by his own statement, and those of his friend "Hastings," incorporated in his pamphlet? Is the equivocation they display a 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 divorce obtained by Dr. Sangster. What then does he mean by his own statement, and those of his friend "Hastings," incorporated in his pamphlet? Is the equivocation they display a 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 divorce obtained by Dr. Sangster. What then does he mean by his own statement, and those of his friend "Hastings," incorporated in his pamphlet? Is the equivocation they display a 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."

"J. HILLYARD CAMERON, 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 does he mean by his own statement, and those of his friend "Hastings," incorporated in his pamphlet? Is the equivocation they display a 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."

"J. HILLYARD CAMERON, 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 does he mean by his own statement, and those of his friend "Hastings," incorporated in his pamphlet? Is the equivocation they display a 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."

"J. HILLYARD CAMERON, 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 does he mean by his own statement, and those of his friend "Hastings," incorporated in his pamphlet? Is the equivocation they display a 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."

"J. HILLYARD CAMERON, 10th July, 1874."

## 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,'

"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 the [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.

"Some days ago I gave 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 my divorce and marriage."—p. 22.

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.

New matter that follows in consequence of discussion 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 8th inst., on Dr. Sangster, and his opinion on the divorce, and alleged to be mine, on the validity of a divorce from his 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 divorce from his 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 of the facts as stated, to a divorce obtained by Dr. Sangster."

"J. HILLYARD CAMERON, 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 does he mean by his own statement, and those of his friend "Hastings," incorporated in his pamphlet? Is the equivocation they display a 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 divorce obtained by Dr. Sangster. What then does he mean by his own statement, and those of his friend "Hastings," incorporated in his pamphlet? Is the equivocation they display a 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 divorce obtained by Dr. Sangster. What then does he mean by his own statement, and those of his friend "Hastings," incorporated in his pamphlet? Is the equivocation they display a 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."

"J. HILLYARD CAMERON, 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 does he mean by his own statement, and those of his friend "Hastings," incorporated in his pamphlet? Is the equivocation they display a 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 divorce obtained by Dr. Sangster. What then does he mean by his own statement, and those of his friend "Hastings," incorporated in his pamphlet? Is the equivocation they display a 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."

"J. HILLYARD CAMERON, 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 does he mean by his own statement, and those of his friend "Hastings," incorporated in his pamphlet? Is the equivocation they display a 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."

"J. HILLYARD CAMERON, 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 does he mean by his own statement, and those of his friend "Hastings," incorporated in his pamphlet? Is the equivocation they display a 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."

"J. HILLYARD CAMERON, 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 does he mean by his own statement, and those of his friend "Hastings," incorporated in his pamphlet? Is the equivocation they display a 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."

"J. HILLYARD CAMERON, 10th July, 1874."

office, I found it longer and more abstruse than I thought desirable, and I vainly endeavored to see Mr. Cameron to have it condensed. On my third call to see him, I was told he would return to town for some days, and my pamphlet had been delayed, longer than I wished, I ventured to leave, on the ground that he was a more extraneous matter, and to give in his own words what I myself regarded as the substance of Mr. Cameron's opinion."

Dr. Sangster reminds us vividly of a fly caught on one of those fly papers so useful now in the effort to get one leg free, and another leg and a wing become entangled. If, instead of giving this explanation, he had published the original document he would have shown a disposition to deal fairly with those he wished to represent. He did not hesitate to regale us with a long and not very lucid opinion of Mr. Carter's, but when it is the opinion of one who is almost venerated throughout the land as a lawyer, and an upright man, it must needs be garbled to suit our dull intellects. We may be sure that Mr. Cameron would not put in one unnecessary word to cloud the clearness of his statement, and we have no doubt it was as unobscured as he could make it. Perhaps Mr. Cameron's next statement throws some light upon his client's suspicious proceedings. He says, the opinion he did not send to me."

Then Mr. Cameron's words are arranged to bear a meaning he never intended, so that his legal opinion is still in doubt. We must not hesitate to regale us with something put before us not at all. We are vividly reminded of Lord Bacon's words:—"These winding and crooked courses are the goings of the serpent, goeth basely upon the belly, and not upon the feet." And what shall be the result of this deception?

Fellow teachers are not Dr. Sangster's conduct in connection with this divorce a sufficient justification for preparing this pamphlet for your perusal. We would have been content to our duty had we remained silent. It is painful that all enjoying the franchise should know of such strange proceedings on the part of one who is seeking our suffrages.

It is to be regretted that Dr. Sangster did not publish Mr. Cameron's opinion at first. It is to be regretted that he does not publish it now and in full, to save his name from the bitter aspersions, that are cast upon it. While we lament that a man who held such an honorable name and position among us, should have done this to merit reproach, we must not yield to any mistaken pity, for we owe it a duty to ourselves to preserve our good name from the imputations that would be cast upon it if we elected him to be our representative. He claims to be a fit person, which no one denies, but we deny that he is a proper person.

THE BEECHER CASE.

Teachers Tilton's reply to the request of the Beecher Committee to furnish the documents referred to by him in his letter to the Beecher Committee, under date August 3rd, by advice of Council, he declines to furnish papers or hold any further communication with the committee in any form, and that he has instructed his Council to proceed at once at his own discretion to carry out the jurisdiction of the committee to a Court of law.

Frank Moulton returned to Brooklyn from the east this morning. He says he has received neither notification from the Investigation Committee nor a letter from Mr. Beecher asking him to give his testimony, but is willing to appear if both sides desire it.

MRS. TILTON'S TESTIMONY.

Mr. Tilton's testimony before the Plymouth Church Investigation Committee will be published to-morrow. The following is a synopsis, embracing all that is of interest, and not heretof



