LIVERPOOL ASSIZES.

CROWN COURT.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE MELLOR.

FRIDAY, MARCH 24.

The criminal business of the Liverpool Spring Assizes commenced to-day, in the Crown Court, St. George's Hall, before Mr. Justice Mellor. The calendar contained the names of 76 prisoners for trial. Of these it was recorded that 13 could neither read nor write, 10 could read only, 21 could read and write imperfectly, and 6 were well educated.

The following gentlemen were sworn on the

GRAND JURY:

Sir Robert Talbot Gerrard, New Hall, Ashton-in-Mackerfield, Baronet, foreman.
William Michael Juce Anderton, Euxton Hall, Euxton.
John Ireland Blackburne, jun., Appleton Hall, Warrington.
Thomas Brocklebank, Spring Wood, Allerton.
David Bromilow, Harefinch House, St. Helen's.
Thos. Ashton Bushby, Prince's Park, Liverpool.
William Cliff, Claremont, West Derby.
Richard Assheton Cross, Hill-cliff, Warrington.
Frederick William Earle, Edenhurst, Prescot.
Richard Cardwell Gardner, Newsham House, West Derby.
Holbrook Gaskell, Birkdale Park, Birkdale.
George Theophilus Robert Preston, Rock House, West Derby.
Robert Gladstone, Liverpool.
Samuel Holme, Birklands, Southport.
George Henry Horsfall, Larkfield, Liverpool.
Robert Hutchison, Liverpool.
Edward Lawrence, Liverpool.
William Moseley, Liverpool.
Robert Neilson, Halewood.
Benjamin Pierpoint, St. Austin's, Warrington.
William Pilkington, Eccleston Hall.
Richard Smethurst Ellerbeck, Chorley.
Richard Medowcroft Whitlow, Southport.

THE JUDGE'S CHARGE.

The usual proclamation against vice and immorality having been read,

His Lordship proceeded to charge the grand jury. He said—Gentlemen of the grand jury, I congratulate the county of Lancaster upon your full attendance here to-day, and I am very happy to see that full attendance, because it gives assurance to the county of the interest which you all feel in the administration of justice—and scarcely anything can be more important, especially in a county like this. Though the calendar does not present the number of very aggravated cases which it has been my lot on one or two former occasions to find in it, still I regret to say that when we consider that there has been a recent gaol delivery at Manchester for the hundred of Salford it is undoubtedly a very heavy calendar. Gentlemen, at Lancaster I had the misfortune to have to try two murder cases, and I believe Mr. Justice Shee has had three at Manchester, but I am happy to say there is only one case in which that charge is preferred here. That certainly is very light in comparison with previous occasions. The case to which I refer, gentlemen, is one of those to which it will be my duty to direct your attention, because it is a case in which it may turn out upon examination of the witnesses who will be summoned before you, to be a case of manslaughter, although of a very bad character, and not a case of murder. That you will probably be able to determine when you have examined the principal witness, who appears to be the chief mate on board the vessel on which the occurrence took place. It was on board a British ship, on a voyage, and that, as you know, is just the same as if the offence was committed on British ground. A dispute, it seems, arose between the deceased—a coloured seaman—and the prisoner, and the latter, either with a knife, or, as he himself said, with a marlinspike, being very much provoked, inflicted a serious wound, of which the man died the next day. There was a wound in the belly, the bowels protruded, and it appears to have been a case in which there was no hope that the man could possibly survive. It may turn out that this was the result of reasonable provocation. In one sense no provocation can be reasonable, but it may have been such provocation as the law, in condescension to human infirmity, allows as an apology, as it were, or at all events to reduce the crime from murder to that of manslaughter. Murder means killing with malice prepense and aforethought; manslaughter is killing without malice; and if there be provocation which in the estimation of a jury is reasonable, so as to account for the heat of passion in which the man was at the time he inflicted the blow, then it is manslaughter, and not murder; but in order to reduce homicide from murder to manslaughter the provocation must be such as in the opinion of the jury was calculated to produce the excitement under which the person acted. A matter of mere words or mere gestures, unless they are of a threatening character, is not sufficient to reduce homicide from murder to manslaughter, and I think, gentlemen, you will probably be able to determine this more satisfactorily than I can when you examine for yourselves the chief mate—for it is really upon his evidence and that of the captain that this mainly depends. The mate appears to have been the principal witness of the scene, and he will be able to give you more information than the captain can; and those two appear to me to be the witnesses who will have to appear before you before you find either one bill or the other. There are one or two other cases to which I will call your attention. I do not profess to call your attention to the great majority of them, because, first of all, the exigencies and duties in which I have been engaged have prevented the possibility of my reading all the depositions. I have therefore taken those which appeared to me most likely to call for observation on my part, and have left the others, feeling quite safe that you, gentlemen, in your experience of these matters, would be very well able to determine them without any assistance on my part. There is one case, No. 6 in the calendar, against a man named Joseph Whittle. It is a curious case, and appears to me to be a case of manslaughter, and can hardly be said to be misadventure simply. A man was irritated by the absence of his wife, and on her return he found she had been drinking. He had a shoe in his hand at the time, and threw it at her, but missed her and hit a baby in the arms of a woman who happened to be passing the door at the time. Now, if a man throws an instrument which is likely to do injury, in a careless manner, even if he throws it at one person and hits another it will not make it pure misadventure simply because he does not hit the person he throws at, for he does not do it as an accident—he does it with the intention of hitting some one. It is such neglect in the unlawful use of a weapon which makes the manslaughter. There is another case to which I will call your attention. It is No. 9 in the calendar, against a man named Thomas Roughsedge. This, I think, will require your attention for this reason—it may be very questionable whether the man did not die from natural causes. It is rather a singular case, because the prisoner appears to have had some words with a workman of the district who had casually spoken to him. He took offence, struck him a blow, and the man fell, but the blow does not appear to have been one of sufficient violence to do any serious mischief. The appearances, according to the evidence of the surgeon, rather show that the man died of apoplexy. Now, if he died of that, unless it was caused by the blow it would not be manslaughter, because if there are any words between men and one strikes another, unless it is the blow and not the excitement and mere dispute that caused the apoplexy, then it would be clear that the man could not be convicted of manslaughter, because the man does not die from the violence of the other, but from other causes beyond his control. The case will therefore depend entirely upon the evidence of the doctor. There is another case of manslaughter, No. 11 in the calendar, against Patrick Callaghan, and it appears to me to be a very serious case. The prisoner saw a carriage, which was used for the delivery of ginger beer or something of that kind, the driver of which he knew or thought he knew. The driver got down to go to some place, and this man got up and drove off at a furious pace. An old man who was crossing the street, which he had a lawful right to do, was run over and killed by the wheel of the vehicle running over his head, and not only going forward but backward again over his head. I have to remark upon the extreme danger incident to careless, negligent, and furious driving. You must be sensible in a large town like this—as I have been every day in London—of the utter indifference with which persons who are driving vehicles of this description seem to disregard the rights of persons on foot. They seem to suppose that foot passengers have no right on the street, and that if they do not keep on the causeway they may be run over with impunity; but they have as much right to cross the middle parts of the street as to walk on the sideways. It is a question of give and take, and of what is reasonable; but one's experience shows that if a man is driving and says "holloa!" he thinks he has done a work of supererogation. He is bound, however, to take care that he does not run over people, and at the same time foot passengers must use every precaution. This careless driving takes place in private as well as public vehicles. Now, if the prisoner was negligent, as it appears he was, and the deceased man was crossing the road in a lawful manner, then it was culpable negligence which caused his death, and in that case it would be manslaughter. His lordship next directed the attention of the grand jury to a charge of highway robbery against three persons, the only evidence in support of the charge being that the prosecutor's knife was found in the possession of one of the prisoners; and his lordship remarked that that might be a suspicious circumstance, and might be evidence against one of the prisoners, and if the jury thought proper they could ignore the bill against the other two prisoners. His lordship pointed out that there were two cases of rape, and directed the attention of the grand jury to one of them as a case of a remarkable character. So far as he could learn, not only from the assistance which he had derived from a summary of the cases which had been prepared for him by his excellent and learned friend Sir John Bailey, who was connected with the northern circuit as one of the officers, he had now gone over all the cases which appeared to him from that summary it was at all necessary he should call attention to, and he should therefore at once dismiss the grand jury to the performance of their duties.

The grand jury then withdrew, and having, after the lapse of a few minutes, returned "true bills," the trial of prisoners was proceeded with.

BIGAMY AT LIVERPOOL.

William Pilkington (aged 23), charged with having at Liverpool, on the 11th of December last, married Alice Jane Shaw, his former wife being then alive, pleaded guilty, and was sentenced to twelve months' imprisonment, with hard labour.

ASSAULT AT PRESCOT.

Bernard Black, a middle-aged man, was charged with having at Prescot, on the 1st of January, feloniously wounded Peter Coyle, with intent to do him grievous bodily harm. Mr. Torr prosecuted; the prisoner was undefended. It appeared that on the night in question the prosecutor and the prisoner were drinking together at a beerhouse. They were good friends, having known each other for 14 years, and left the house in company, the prosecutor's daughter, who had come to fetch him home, being one of the party. Shortly after they left the house the prisoner asked the prosecutor to go a little way down the road with him, as he wished to speak privately to him. They linked arms and walked down the road, but had not proceeded far when the prisoner struck the prosecutor a blow on the head with a heavy stick, which rendered him insensible. The jury found the prisoner guilty of unlawfully wounding, and he was sentenced to seven months' imprisonment, with hard labour.

BURGLARY AT GARSTON.

John Tracey (aged 29) was charged with burglariously breaking into the house of Thomas Peers, a gardener living at Garston, and stealing two pairs of boots and other articles. Mr. Williams prosecuted; the prisoner was not defended by counsel. About half-past nine o'clock on the night of the 20th of February the prosecutor retired to bed, and on coming down stairs about seven o'clock next morning he found that the house had been entered through the kitchen window, and a pair of boots belonging to himself, another pair belonging to his wife, and a tobacco box, stolen. About half-past four o'clock that morning a policeman met the prisoner in Aigburth-road carrying a basket, which contained the stolen property, and as he could not give a satisfactory account as to how it came into his possession he took him into custody. The prisoner, who had no defence to offer, was found guilty, and, a previous conviction having also been proved against him, he was sentenced to imprisonment with hard labour for 18 months.

GARROTTE ROBBERY AT LIVERPOOL.

Daniel M'Keown (aged 27) was charged with having assaulted Patrick Hand, at Liverpool, on the 29th of January, and robbed him of 14s. 6d. Mr. Gardner prosecuted, and Mr. Edwards defended. The prosecutor, a plasterer, living in Birchfield-street, stated that on Sunday morning the 29th of January, having been spending the evening at a friend's house, he was returning home through Collingwood-street, when a row took place. He stopped to see what it was about, when the prisoner and another man came up to him, one on each side, and seized him by the throat. The prisoner then cut away his pocket, containing 14s. 6d., and handed it to the other man, who ran away. He seized the prisoner by the throat and held him until a police-officer came up and took him into custody. In cross-examination the prosecutor stated that he was pushed into the row by the prisoner and the other man, and he laid about him with his stick right and left. He did not spare the prisoner. He did shout "faugh-a-ballaugh," which meant "clear the way," and suited the action to the word too, or he would not have got out safe. He did not rush into the row flourishing a shillelah. He wished it had been a shillelah: it was only a bamboo. The prisoner was found guilty, and having been previously convicted was sentenced to penal servitude for seven years.

ANOTHER CHARGE OF GARROTTING AT LIVERPOOL.

John Simpson alias Griffiths (aged 28) was charged with having at Liverpool, on the 7th of January last, feloniously assaulted Michael Keating and stolen his hat. Mr. Heaton conducted the prosecution; the prisoner was undefended. The evidence of the prosecutor, who is a tobacconist, carrying on business in Peover-street, was to the effect that on the evening in question he was walking quietly along that street, when the prisoner came behind him, put his arm round his neck, and nearly strangled him. He struggled and they fell, the prisoner undermost. The prosecutor got on to his feet again, and the prisoner then jumped up, seized the prosecutor's hat, and ran away. He was shortly afterwards apprehended with the hat in his possession. His story was that he had been drinking, and had been himself garrotted and robbed; that mistaking the prosecutor for one of the men who had attacked him, he seized him by the collar, and they fell together; that he then perceived his error, and on rising walked away, accidentally taking with him the prosecutor's hat instead of his own.—The jury found him guilty of assault with intent to rob, and his lordship sentenced him to five years' penal servitude, remarking that he had been already 13 times imprisoned for various offences.

BURGLARY AT WALTON-ON-THE-HILL.

James Killeen, aged 16, and John Reed, aged 24, were indicted for breaking into the house of Robert Norris Jones, Walton-on-the-Hill, and stealing two silver flower stands and other property. Mr. Pope prosecuted; the prisoners were not defended. The prosecutor is a cotton broker, residing at Walton Priory. On the night of the 11th of January, before retiring to bed, he saw that all the doors and windows were secure. On the following morning the breakfast room window was found open, and two flower stands, a card case, and other articles were missed. On the same afternooon the prisoners offered one of the flower stands for sale to Mr. Podmore, publican, Vauxhall-road, who, suspecting that it formed part of the proceeds of the robbery at Mr. Critchley's pawnshop, purchased it for 18s. Reed then said they were going off to Bangor to commit a burglary, and they would sell him the proceeds at 2s. 6d. an ounce. He told them he would buy it if they would bring it to him, and they went away. He then went to the police office and gave information, and the prisoners were shortly afterwards apprehended.—Reed was found guilty of the burglary, and Killeen of feloniously receiving the stolen property, and they were each sentenced to 18 months' imprisonment with hard labour.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE SHEE.

Mr. Justice Shee took his seat in the Nisi Prius Court shortly after twelve o'clock, and in accordance with a previous arrangement, proceeded with the trial of prisoners.

HIGHWAY ROBBERY NEAR ORMSKIRK.

Luke Winrow (aged 20) was indicted upon a charge of having, at Burscough, on the 30th of December last, feloniously assaulted Thos. Berry, and with violence stolen from him his pocket knife and other articles. Two other persons named John Huyton and William Orritt had also been committed on the same charge, but the grand jury ignored the bill against them. Mr. Pope appeared for the prosecution, and Mr. Cottingham appeared for the prisoner. The prosecutor stated that he was the son of a farmer living at Burscough, and having been at Ormskirk, he was returning home about two o'clock on the morning in question, when he was attacked on the road by three men near the stiles at Norman-heys. They asked him if he was going to "deliver or die," and upon his declining to do either, they violently assaulted and robbed him, cutting away his trousers pocket, containing his knife and about 8s. in money. The prisoner and his two companions were arrested on the following day, and the prosecutor's knife was found upon the prisoner. For the defence it was contended that it was a case of mistaken identity; and though the prisoner had himself stated that he found the knife two months before, when visiting his sister at Liverpool, his counsel, admitting in effect that the knife belonged to the prosecutor, urged that it might have been picked up on the road after the attack upon the prosecutor. The jury, after an absence of about half an hour, returned a verdict of "Not guilty," and his lordship dismissed the prisoner with a caution, telling him that if he had been found guilty his sentence would have been a very severe one.

GAROTTE ROBBERY AT WARRINGTON.

William Parry (aged 30) was indicted for having at Warrington, on the 17th of December last, together with another person whose name is unknown, feloniously assaulted and robbed David Knight. Mr. Pope appeared for the prosecution, and Mr. Torr defended the prisoner. The prosecutor, the captain of a flat, had been drinking at a public house on the evening in question, and he asked the prisoner and two other men to accompany him home. They started with him, but on the way they assaulted and robbed him, one of the men holding him tightly by the throat, whilst the others rifled his pockets. The prosecutor identified the prisoner as one of the men who assaulted and robbed him.—For the defence Mr. Torr ridiculed the idea of a drunken man being able to swear positively to anything which occurred to him whilst he was drunk.—The jury returned a verdict of "Not guilty."

ASSAULT AND ROBBERY.

Michael Martin (aged 21) was indicted for having, at Eccleston, on the 23rd of January last, feloniously assaulted and robbed Thomas Evans. Mr. Addison appeared for the prosecution, and Mr. Torr for the defence. The prosecuter on the night in question had been drinking in a public house in Eccleston, in which the prisoner and some other men were also drinking. When the prosecutor left the house his watch was hanging loose from his pocket, and the prisoner followed him out, snatched the watch, and ran away with it. The prisoner was found guilty, and a previous conviction for a similar offence being admitted, he was sentenced to 18 months' imprisonment, with hard labour.

MANSLAUGHTER AT LIVERPOOL.

John Billingham (aged 38) was indicted for having at Liverpool, on the 4th February last, feloniously killed and slain an old woman named Elizabeth Johnson. Mr. Hawthorne appeared for the prosecution, and Mr. Torr on behalf of the prisoner. The deceased, who was 82 years of age, lived with her daughter, Mrs. Irvan, the wife of a mate, residing at 18, Alfred-street. The prisoner and his wife also occupied apartments in the house of Mrs. Irvan. On the day in question it appeared Mrs. Irvan went out to receive her husband's monthly pay, leaving her mother in the house in her usual state of good health. During the absence of Mrs. Irvan the prisoner quarrelled with his sister-in-law and was abusing her, when the deceased interfered, and was subsequently crossing the yard to go for a police officer, when the prisoner followed her, seized her by the hair of the head and abused her, the old lady falling to the ground during the struggle which took place. She was much injured, and after lingering till the 12th she expired. On a *post-mortem* examination it was found she had sustained a fracture of the shoulder bone, severe contusions and fractures of the second, third, fourth, and fifth ribs. Those injuries, in the opinion of the medical men who attended her, were the cause of death, pleurisy having set in in consequence of the fracture of the ribs. The injuries, the doctors said, were not such as would have been caused by the deceased simply falling on the flags, but must have resulted from direct violence to the parts injured. When apprehended by the police and told of the charge against him, the prisoner said the deceased was "half a lunatic, and it would have little mattered if her neck had been broken long ago." The prisoner had been drinking, but was not drunk at the time he was alleged to have injured the old woman. When the old woman died the prisoner told the prosecutrix he was very sorry for what had occurred to the deceased, but he was running after his sister-in-law and accidentally knocked the old woman down.—For the defence, it was urged that the prisoner was in liquor at the time; that there was no conclusive evidence that he pushed the deceased down; and that possibly she had accidentally slipped down.—His Lordship, in summing up the case for the jury, pointed out that in order to convict the prisoner they must be quite clear that the death of the deceased was attributable to violence at the hands of the prisoner.—The jury returned a verdict of guilty, and the prisoner, when called upon in the usual manner by the clerk of the court, said he did not think there was evidence to prove it. The old woman, he said, had been stooping for 20 years, and she walked with a stick.—His Lordship expressed his entire concurrence in the verdict, and sentenced the prisoner to nine months' imprisonment with hard labour.

THE CAUSE LIST.

The civil business at the present assizes is unusually heavy. The cause list contains an entry of no fewer than 111 cases for trial, of which 60 are special jury causes. The civil cases will be commenced this (Saturday) morning, before Mr. Justice Shee.

DIVORCE CASE.

HEAVY DAMAGES.

The case of Thomas v. Thomas and Vigne was heard in the Divorce Court on Thursday. This was a suit for divorce by the husband against the wife, on the ground of adultery. The petitioner also claimed damages, and laid them at £5000. The respondent and co-respondent denied the adultery.

Mr. Lopes having opened the pleadings,

Mr. Sergeant Parry proceeded to state the case, which, he observed, would disclose very painful facts. The petitioner, Mr. Thomas, was the third son of Sir Godfrey Thomas, Bart., and the defendant, Mr. Vigne, was also the son of a gentleman of large property, residing at Notting-hill. In July, 1855, the petitioner was married to the respondent. She was Miss Walshe, and was the daughter of a clergyman of the Church of England, of the highest respectability, and well connected. The marriage was also a suitable one in point of years, and there were issue four children, of whom three are still alive. The co-respondent was about 28 years of age, and was also married (with three children), his wife being the niece of the petitioner. The marriage took place at Pevensey, in Sussex, and they lived for some time on affectionate terms. Mr. Vigne returned from Australia in 1861, and both families living within a few doors of each other, at Brighton, great intimacy existed between them. On the evening of the 19th of June, 1864, Mrs. Thomas left the house and remained from home all night. She returned the next morning about eleven o'clock, and stated, in answer to the reproaches of her husband, that she had spent the night on the beach with the co-respondent. The petitioner then sent for Mr. Vigne, with the view of obtaining from him a declaration on oath that nothing improper had taken place between himself and the respondent. When Mr. Vigne learned for what he was wanted, he observed to the messenger, "I will do so [make the required declaration] for her sake, but if I do I shall perjure myself." But this was at the time concealed from the petitioner. On the 24th of June, Mrs. Thomas again left her home and went to Worthing, where she took apartments at the house of a Mrs. Clarke. The petitioner followed her, and, believing still that she was not guilty, remained with her from the Friday until the following Tuesday, when he returned to Brighton. The day following, the 29th, she left with the co-respondent, and they visited Chichester, Havant, and Weymouth, at all of which places they passed as man and wife. The petitioner subsequently met the co-respondent at the Havant Railway Station, in company with his own wife (Mrs. Vigne), and, after upbraiding him on his conduct, administered to him personal chastisement in the presence of his wife and the public. And the respondent subsequently wrote to him in these terms:—

> I know not what to say, or how to ask you to forgive me for my dreadful conduct. I should never have done as I did had you not taken my children from me. I then felt alone in the world. I am most truly sorry that I have sinned in this worst way in the eyes of God and towards you and my children. May God forgive me if you never will. I know it is too late to ask you to take me back, but for God's sake do not let me be left in the world alone. May I ask you to give my love to the children? I dare not offer it to you.—From your unhappy and sinful wife.

She also wrote on the 14th July—

> Dearest Charles,—I have left you, and he has left me. I am at Worthing, at Mrs. Rea's. I have no place to sleep to-night, neither have I a farthing. Oh! Charles, for God's sake, come to me and forgive me. I will never leave your side again. Do come to me, and forgive and forget the past.—Your affectionate wife.

In conclusion, the learned counsel observed that the statement with regard to the want of money was not correct, inasmuch as she had a settlement of £400 or £450 a year, and urged that all the circumstances of the case called for exemplary damages.

Witnesses having been examined, who proved conclusively the commission of adultery at Chichester,

The counsel for the respondent and co-respondent intimated that they could no longer contest the case.

The jury, after deliberating for about half-an-hour, returned a verdict for the petitioner, and assessed the damages at £1500, with a recommendation that a portion of the sum should be applied to the use of the children.

His Lordship then granted the decree nisi, with costs.

CORONER'S INQUESTS.

BEFORE MR. P. F. CURRY.

On the body of Owen, son of John O'Neill, a porter, living in No. 11 Court, Marlborough-street. On Wednesday afternoon the deceased, who was between three and four years of age, was left alone in the house whilst his mother went to an adjoining shop. On her return she found the child near the door with his clothes on fire. He was removed to the Northern Hospital, where he died on Thursday, not having been able to say how his clothes were ignited.—Verdict, "Found burnt."

On the body of Ann Ashe, a widow, 50 years of age, who lodged at the house of Patrick Chapman, Bond-street, and gained a living by gathering cotton, bones, and rags. On the 8th instant, as she was passing along Grundy-street, she was accidentally crushed by a lorry belonging to Mr. Gainson, William Mould-street, and was taken to the Northern Hospital, where she died on Wednesday, having received a fracture of the skull. It did not appear that any blame was attributable to the driver of the lorry, and a verdict of "Accidental death" was returned. On the clothes of the deceased being examined at the hospital, twelve base sixpences were found in her pocket.

On the body of Ellen, daughter of Richard Rowe, a plasterer, residing in Bolton-street, Copperas-hill. On Monday week the deceased, who was between two and three years of age, was scalded by a cup of hot tea being accidentally upset upon her. The injuries thus caused resulted in her death on Thursday. Verdict, "Accidentally scalded."

On the body of Anne Williams, a widow, 73 years of age, who lived with her son, David Williams, a porter, living in Howarth-street. It was supposed that this poor old woman had for some time been in want of the common necessaries of life, and it was also intimated that her son had not treated her as he ought to have done. They lived together at the house in question, and the neighbours had frequently heard the deceased screaming whilst she and her son were alone in the house, though they could not say they had seen him strike her. The deceased had also been seen with black eyes, and she had no covering for her feet, and was wretchedly clothed. The inquest was adjourned until to-day, no evidence having been given.

HORRIBLE DEATH OF THREE GOLD DIGGERS FROM THIRST.—An Australian paper contains the following:—"A short time ago a party, consisting of James Offley, Thomas Garside, William Drummond, and George Atkinson, left Clermont on a prospecting tour to the westward. The leader of the party was Drummond, who professed to be acquainted with the country, and to have discovered while in Mr. Thorne's service at the Belyando some very rich ground. The party had but one horse among them, and were cautioned before starting as to the extreme scarcity of water in the region to which they were bound. After a few days' travelling water became alarmingly scarce, and to the dismay of the party their leader confessed not only of being ignorant of the whereabouts of the rich ground he had started in quest of, but also as to the way to water or any human habitation. Lost among the ranges, without a drop of water, the wretched men, it is said, wandered about for twelve days, the victims of raging thirst. The leader, Drummond, was the first to succumb, and was necessarily left to perish. The survivors killed their dog, and found temporary respite from drinking its blood, but at length were driven to open veins in their own arms and seek relief in swallowing the vital fluid. Soon after this, and after they had come upon a road, Offley and Garside dropped almost simultaneously and died. Atkinson covered the bodies with their blankets, and summoned all his remaining strength to follow up the road which happily brought him, in a state of complete exhaustion, to Mr. M'Master's station, nea Hurley's Rush, where we need hardly say he wa most hospitably cared for."