

**MONEY WIGG**  
(ward) **LONDON LINE** of  
to passengers per the N  
MELBOURN

Angers are requested to emb  
w, (Saturday, the 31st  
tenball-street.

[illegible]

CHARLES MATHIESON, his ship is a regular trader known for the quickness.

[illegible]

years, JAMES BRIDIE, locks. This unrivalled vessel is the fastest ship afloat, and

[illegible]

ZEALAND.—The

[illegible]

and 1,000-horse power; the  
AUGH, 2,500 tons, and  
captain LUDLOW, 2,000 tons.  
on Governor for NEW YORK

[illegible]



NONB  
ALEX. B  
August 1st  
e 11. and is  
BARN.  
CHURCH  
e clergy  
ental to t  
ed cheques  
on and Co  
all place, F  
INGSLS  
—Attent  
KHART's  
Henderson

Following  
Bracey,  
Poulton,  
price 2d.  
W. B. M.  
J. H. HALL  
ington Pro  
LAISTO  
-The fo  
KNOWLE  
id of the P  
ion, Clergy  
Moore, Esq  
H. Aubert  
Right H  
wis ...  
Grace the

B. G.  
Exeter-h  
ester, will  
ck. Ticker  
body of th  
T a M  
MEXIC  
don Tavern  
olutions we  
at this M  
tributories  
winding-up

PROTEST  
SUBSCRIPTION

The Romish  
 Hatchards,  
 all the 11th  
 Thomas F  
 THE SO  
 stead, f  
 ighters of  
 ETING of  
 ne United  
 , at 3 o'clo  
 The H  
 ONDO  
 CRIMI  
 of Friend  
 day, it wa  
 ebt, and t

BRITISH

e Most No  
 clarricarde  
 e Rt. Hon  
 Sir  
 e Rt. Hon  
 e Lord Cha  
 Joseph Ba  
 e Rev. M.  
 e Rev. Cha

**BRITISH**  
Council  
the follow  
That the In  
the widow  
rior rank o  
it has held  
7.  
The total

the total in this period has been a continuity of £3 million, which they by recent numbers. The Institute had most people hopeful that the success of the Institute had taken annual subscription. The Council annual subscription number of the end of the year to annuitants made, 200 guineas. It is to be drawn.

the British  
is sum of 2  
scribers  
e co-operat  
The follow  
Willoughby  
Dowager  
omkinson,  
nderson, M  
ates, Miss  
arner, Miss  
awbridge,  
everley, th  
ordon, Mrs  
llis, Rev. V  
Gordon  
utchinson

**A T S A**  
**OFFER**  
of Education  
Girls, from  
being employed  
to 15 years  
farm, or gas  
work of us

**MET**  
shire-  
Further pe  
of the war

**THE**  
BRO  
ACKNO  
vacant ma

**EXIN**

**K**ING des  
have so la  
\$4,653 108.  
penses to  
excite in t  
should be t  
A small  
would in a

July 23,

**S**AMA  
and  
to the larg  
has been E  
In-patients  
ent-patients

is entirely  
new premit  
tan Hosp  
Secretary.

**D**EST and  
making b  
PITAL,  
foreigner,  
ness and c  
Institution  
dation bel  
gates of th  
race. Con  
Nicholas-l  
Herries an  
Payne an

**C**LERK asked  
—"We have  
long given  
W. G. Je  
falgarsqu  
**K**IN  
Th  
and Scho  
the 30th i  
**K**IN

**K** SO  
this Colle  
to the en  
young m  
notice, th  
for comp  
King's Co  
applicatio

---

**G R**  
Pr  
Vice-Prin

The va  
Terms,  
from £20

**S**CHMA has been capable of and drawings, sent immediate addresses

---

**C**HU cle sentation prospect where the nals and

particula



Agents for chairs, armchairs, and ottomans, in leather, velvet, and  
tinted bolsters.























Mr. Parkinson was examined. They were satisfied of his testamentary capacity, and acted as attesting witnesses. Mr.

Watson, Mr. Nichols, another surgeon, and Mr. Simpson were also present. Mr. Parkinson died on the 25th of April.

Mr. Freeman and Mr. Watson were to-day examined for the purpose of proving the above facts.

The Court's report of the will was not closed when the Court adjourned.

**COURT FOR DIVORCE AND MATRIMONIAL CAUSES, JULY 29.**  
(*Before the JUDGE-ORDINARY.*)

**WELLS V. WELLS—JUDGMENT.**

This was a suit for divorce brought before the board in the Consistory Court by George Wells against Elizabeth Amelia Wells, his wife, on the ground of adultery, as charged in the bill of complaint, to this Court. It was argued early in the present month.

Sir O. CRESSWELL, this morning gave judgment. It was proved by the evidence that in 1847, the wife was living with her husband, and was born in 1801, and being above 64 at the time, and was born in 1801, and another in 1803. In March, 1853, George Wells was married to Amelia Wells, and the marriage was solemnized the following July. In 1854 he was living with his wife Peckham-road. The sixth article of the bill charged that three years before the date of the marriage, the wife had a quarrel, and went with her two children to the house of her mother at Kennington-cross, where she remained for three years, and during that time she was guilty of committed adultery with a man named Berryman. This was supported by the evidence of a servant, who stated that she saw the wife and the man in the house, and bed together. It was denied by Mrs. Wells, and her denials was supported by the evidence of some inmates of the house, who stated that they saw the wife as a wife, and part of Mrs. Wells, but he refused to be examined. He

was necessary to find a decree upon this part of the evidence, and that such a decree was an examination of the evidence, in satisfying himself as to the truth or falsehood of the charge of adultery. But the 10th and 11th articles charged adultery with one Thomas Wells, and the 12th article charged adultery with one Harriet Handcock. Wells was produced as a witness upon the articles, and it appeared from her evidence that Williams was not the man who committed adultery with her, and in spite of his strongly indicated disapprobation; that he frequently stayed out with Mrs. Wells until a late hour of the night, and that he was not the man who committed that one night, during Mrs. Wells's absence, he was found locked up in a bedroom with Mrs. Wells, and that when she was awakened, she was seen lying on the bed, and that she was not the person who committed adultery with Mrs. Wells. It was therefore clear that the evidence upon this statement was correct, there could be little doubt that Williams committed adultery, and although Mrs. Wells said that she was not the person who committed adultery, she conducted to confirm it, and to establish the credibility of Handcock. He was satisfied upon this evidence that Williams committed adultery, and that he was therefore bound to pronounce, in substance, a decree for judicial separation. There was a plea of condonation in substance, that the husband had forgiven the wife the costs of that plea ought not to be allowed, because it would never have been pleaded if reasonable care had been taken to prevent the adultery, and the husband was not to be supported. But a proctor who refused to bring before the Court any defence set up by his client incurred a serious responsibility, and he therefore thought the costs ought to be allowed. The Court was satisfied that the husband had been concocted in order to entrap the wife into furnishing evidence of condonation. If he had been the man who committed adultery, the Court would have thought that doubt would have been removed by the statement to defeat it.

This was a petition by a wife for a judicial separation, the ground of her husband's desertion without reasonable cause for two years and upwards. The parties were married in 1840, and the wife had been deserted for more than five months ago, a day or two before the filing of the marriage petition, the husband wrote to his wife, offering a return of her husband's desertion, and offering her a return of her husband into furnishing evidence of condonation. If he had been the man who committed adultery, the Court would have thought that doubt would have been removed by the statement to defeat it.

This was a petition by a wife for a judicial separation, the ground of her husband's desertion without reasonable cause for two years and upwards. The parties were married in 1840, and the wife had been deserted for more than five months ago, a day or two before the filing of the marriage petition, the husband wrote to his wife, offering a return of her husband's desertion, and offering her a return of her husband into furnishing evidence of condonation. If he had been the man who committed adultery, the Court would have thought that doubt would have been removed by the statement to defeat it.

section gave the wife a right to a judicial separation for reason of adultery, and there was no more reason to suppose that the husband could obliterate one offence than the other without condonation. This being his construction of the Act, it was unnecessary to consider whether the letter written by the respondent was *bona fide* or not. Assuming it to be so, the wife was entitled to the remedy for which she prayed, and he should therefore decree a judicial separation.

**COURT OF BANKRUPTCY, Basinshah-street, July 10.**

*In re The Royal Surrey Gardens Company*  
(Before Mr. Commissioner Fawcett.)

THIS was an application made by Mr. Chester on behalf of the Governors and Guardians of the Poor of the parish of St. Andrew, in the County of Surrey, for an order assigning, for payment of the rates due in respect of the gardens since his appointment as receiver.

In support of the application it was alleged that the assessor of the parish had assessed the gardens having been

Mr. A. JONES, for the receiver, however, while denying the agreement for sale, the receipt of 1,500, on the part of the receiver, and the receipt of 1,500, on the part of Spurgeon, stated that the gardens had been generally unproductive, the receipts having been almost insufficient to pay the rent due to the estate of Brandon, who held the gardens under the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury. The payment of 1,500, was moreover, liable to a claim by the mortgagees.

THE RECEIVER complained that things had been included in the sale which might have been liable to the claim of the clients.

THE COMMISSIONER.—You cannot move the grass, or sell the trees.

(A laugh.)

THE RECEIVER.—If I get the execution, I shall get the money.

THE COMMISSIONER.—There is not the wherewithal to satisfy your claim. I shall decline to make the order.

THE RECEIVER.—I will not be satisfied with that.

MR. OSTEER explained that his clients had a remainder in the gardens.

elsewhere.—Application refused.

IN RE G. W. WATTS.  
The bankrupt was a wholesale chymomonger, of R. Lion-plao, Gilpin-street, this was the adjourned examination meeting.

The accounts—showing debts, 27,000.; assets, 6000.—have already been published in *The Times*.

The bankrupt now passed his examination.

Mr. LISKIATSKY, solicitor for the assignees, while submitting the accounts, and the investigation which had taken place, intimated an opinion that no good would accrue from any further adjournment.

IN RE J. A. SIKKES.  
The bankrupt was a timber-merchant, of 24, Montgomery-street, Spitalfields. This was a meeting for choice of assignees.

The debts and liabilities are stated at 12,000.; assets, 4000.; or 5000.

Mr. Benjamin Ingram, of 38, Beech-street, Barbican timber-merchant, was appointed assignee.

**INSOLVENT DEBTORS' COURT, July 29,**

IN RE HENRY JOHNSON.  
This insolvent, after carrying on business with Lotherby, applied to be discharged.  
Mr. Reed opposed for Mr. Jones, and four other creditors, who were not present, were not noticed.  
The complaint of Mr. Jones was that in February last the insolvent placed two bills of exchange in his hands, upon which he had received \$500, representing them as being perfectly good bills. Mr. Jones said that he had not received other money on account of them, but now the insolvent admitted that they were accommodation bills, but denied that he had ever represented them to be *bona fide* considerations for bills.  
Mr. Barber, a confederator at Stratford, complained that the insolvent had been guilty of fraud in procuring the bills at his house at New Winsted, but his account of \$2.11s. remained unpaid.  
The court said that Mr. Phillips thought the debt could never have been incurred by the insolvent if he had not the means of paying it; but, as the debt was under \$200, Mr. Jones had not the power of detaining the insolvent in custody.

The other creditors complained that their debts were covered by the insolvent's estate when the insolvent must have been aware of his inability to pay them. The court, however, held that the case was ultimately adjourned for the attendance of the acceptors of the bills held by Mr. Jones.

(Before Mr. Commissioner Murphy.)

IN RE W. W. HAZELL.

This insolvent, who described himself as a discount agent, applied to be admitted to bail until his hearing. It is apparent from the affidavits that he was indebted on account of judgment against him for \$54,586 damages in an action for libel, and the plaintiff's costs were 70%.

The learned Commissioner held that he had no power to grant bail, and therefore refused the application.

[Advertisement].—“Novels and Novelists from Elizabeth to the present time. 2 vols., with portraits, price 21s. 6d. bound. Now ready at all the bookshops. A new and complete history of the progress of the novel, and of singular instances of the genius and character of the novelists, with a full account of the progress of the novel in England, France, Germany, Italy, Spain, and the United States. The author is himself reading the sketches of our three great humorists, and has been enabled to collect a vast number of curious anecdotes which are exceedingly interesting, and as a whole, forms a valuable and interesting work.”

[illegible]

This image shows a blank, aged, cream-colored page, likely an endpaper or flyleaf of a book. The paper has a slightly textured appearance with some faint smudges and discoloration, characteristic of old paper. The left edge of the page is dark and textured, indicating the binding of the book. There is no text or other markings on the page.



