AMUSING THEATRICAL CASE.

Mrs. Conover and Miss Amy Roselle.

In the Queen's Bench Division on Wednesday, the case of Roselle v. Conover, which had occupied the court for the two previous days, was concluded. The plaintiff, Mrs. Dacre, better known as Miss Amy Roselle, was an actress, and the defendant was Mrs. Conover, of the Olympic Theatre. The action was brought to recover damages for slander of the plaintiff in her professional character, and also for wrongful dismissal. The defendant to this pleaded privilege, and also exoneration and discharge from the contract. Mr. Lockwood, Q.C., and Mr. H. Kisch were for the plaintiff; and Mr. Kemp, Q.C., and Mr. Boxall for the defendant.—Mr. Lockwood, in opening the case, said that the plaintiff had married Mr. Arthur Dacre, and in October, 1885, she was staying with her husband in the Isle of Wight. At that time Mr. Buchanan, in conjunction with his sister-in-law, Miss Jay, had written "Alone in London," and this play was to be produced at the Olympic. Under these circumstances Miss Amy Roselle was communicated with with the view of her taking the leading part of Nan, and there was an agreement entered into on the 10th of October, 1885, between the plaintiff and Mrs. Conover. By this agreement Mrs. Conover engaged the professional services of Miss Amy Roselle to play at any theatre in London for the run of "Alone in London," commencing on the 24th October, six weeks' run guaranteed. She was to play the leading rôle, and she was to have £30 a week. It happened that the commencement of the performance was postponed from the 24th of October till the 2nd of November, and the plaintiff accepted half salary in reference to that time. Miss Jay took the part of a London street boy, which was not the leading rôle. The play fell flat, and about the middle of November there was a morning performance, for which Miss Amy Roselle was entitled to payment in full. She was, however, asked by Mr. Boss, the acting-manager, to accept half salary in respect of it. Mr. Dacre objected to this, but it was said that the management were losing something like £200 a week. A letter was soon afterwards written by Mr. Dacre to Mr. Boss, in reference to the condition of the plaintiff, though her child was not born until March following, but the management seemed to have fastened upon this. The plaintiff was asked to take less than her full salary, and upon this a correspondence ensued. She continued to play till December 2nd, and upon that occasion the plaintiff by some mistake unfortunately

Went Off the Stage at the First Cue

—the kissing of a hand by another player—instead of at the second kissing of the hand. The consequence of this was that Miss Jay was left upon the stage without the opportunity of expressing her moral sentiments. (Laughter.) On December 3rd, Mr. Martin, the defendant's solicitor, wrote to the plaintiff:—"In consequence of your conduct last night, when I understand you purposely cut off part of an act, and thereby seriously interfered with the proper performance of the play, I am instructed by Mrs. Conover and Mr. Buchanan to enclose you bank notes for £30, in full discharge of your salary to the 4th inst., the date on which your engagement expires." Statements of this kind were repeated about the theatre, and this was the slander complained of.—Mr. Justice Grove feared that the jury did not understand what was meant by the word "cue."—Mr. Lockwood: If they did not they ought to do—(laughter)—and he understood them that they did know. He did not know whether his lordship was equally familiar with it. (A laugh.)—Mr. Justice Grove: Yes, but I did not become acquainted with it until I was in somewhat advanced life, and I thought that perhaps the jury were equally ignorant.—Mr. Lockwood: If your lordship should tell me to leave the court, my cue would be "court." (Loud laughter.) He trusted that it would be long before his lordship would say that, however.—Miss Amy Roselle then gave evidence to the effect that there was never any complaint as to her playing in "Alone in London." The defendant said that she did not know what the piece would be worth without her acting. She added that they were losing £200 a week, and that she was losing so much that her trustees would not allow her to continue much longer. The witness added that her condition at the time in no way interfered with her performance. On the night of the mistake Miss Jay was playing Chickweed. Her part was to kiss witness's hand. She then had to go to the gate and then ought to have stopped and said, "Oh, you will come again promptly." Instead of stopping she mistook the first good-bye, and went straight off the stage. Her omission did not in the slightest interfere with the action of the piece. Such a thing frequently happened, and no complaint was made to her upon that occasion. The performance continued under Mrs. Conover's management until the 15th January, 1886. What witness claimed was for six weeks' salary, £180. There were also three matinées, which were £5 each. She had been paid for one, and she claimed for two, that was £10, making together £190 as special damage. During all the time that she played she satisfactorily performed her part, and she did not suffer from fatigue or any other ailment. Her son was born on the 26th March, 1886. No announcement was made in public as to her sudden dismissal. It came to her knowledge that Miss Jay was to take her part in the provinces. Before she undertook the part in the play, it was read over to her by Miss Jay, and she knew the character of the part that she had to perform. The piece was

The Story of a Brutal Husband

ill-treating his wife, and on one occasion he attempted to murder her. She was not aware that Mrs. Conover wished Miss Jay to perform her part.—Mr. Kemp: You had to fall down, and then to be carried over a bridge to be murdered? No; not to fall down, but into Mr. Standing's arms, and he had to lead me off.—Did you instead of that trip off the stage or walk off? No. She did not at the rehearsal faint away in consequence of the physical exertion required. Her husband did not suggest that another lady should be engaged to play her part. She did not complain of or sneer at Miss Jay, and she had no knowledge that the lady complained of insulting language from the witness's husband. Her husband required to be in the theatre while she was playing, but she did not remember whether he forbade her to play unless he was there. She did not thteaten to wreck the "sluice act" if her husband was not admitted. She said that it was part of her agreement that her husband should be admitted, and unless he was admitted she should refuse to play. She was not on speaking terms with Mrs. Conover. The latter had caused a very unpleasant letter to be written. That was on the 21st November, and a few nights after the witness refused to act unless her husband was admitted. Her husband wrote to the management of the theatre. He referred to the gross, coarse, and indelicate letter which had been written about the witness, and to the manager being "contemptible enough." She did not consider that rude under the circumstances.—Your husband said in his letter that he did not expect much from Mrs. Conover? She thought that just after the treatment the witness had received.—He also complained that "such utter want of principle was shown?" That referred to a conversation her husband had with Mr. Buchanan. He asked her husband if she would go on acting after the six weeks at a smaller salary, and Mr. Dacre called upon Mr. Buchanan, and said that so far as he was concerned he should not insist upon carrying on her engagement after the six weeks, but would accept a fortight's notice. Her husband said, "But how will you do with the other actors?" and Mr. Buchanan said, "I can break the engagement in many ways. I could shut up the theatre for a night; the theatre could be transferred to me, and they could play 'Anatomy.'" This was what was meant by want of principle. She did not know that it was in consequence of her husband insulting Miss Jay that he was refused admission to the theatre.—Was there any justification for saying that you [illegible] left the stage on purpose? Certainly not. I should not have dared to do as suggested, even if I had been malicious enough to think of it. Mrs. Conover never said anything to her about her condition before the manager wrote his letter. The witness did not herself know of her "condition" when she entered into her engagement. Nothing was said about it being detrimental to her health until after she had been asked to play at a reduced salary.—Mr. Herbert Standing said that he had been for many years in the dramatic profession, and he played in "Alone in London," at the Olympic. He played

The Villain of the Piece.

(A laugh.)—And my friend has suggested that you were satisfactorily disposed of at the end of the piece. I was killed. (Laughter.) Witness was on the stage when the plaintiff was there in the part of Nan nearly the whole time. He persecuted Miss Roselle for nearly the whole of the play. He noticed no omission on her part on the evening in question. He asked Mrs. Conover the reason for the dismissal when the plaintiff left.—What did she say? Am I to use the exact words?—I must leave that to you; I must put the question in that way. Mrs. Conover said, "This is a pretty fine d—d thing." (Loud laughter.) He said, "What fine thing?" and she replied, "Why, Miss Roselle walked off the stage last night with the intention of deliberately insulting Miss Jay and to spoil the piece, and to shut up my theatre." She said that the plaintiff had deliberately cut out part of the scene. In the witness's opinion the omission of a few words was not important to the action of the piece or the success of the particular scene. Such an omission was a thing that frequently happened. —Cross-examined: He did not carry Miss Roselle off the stage—he dragged her—and she assisted him with her feet.—Why did you not carry her; she is a little, light thing—(loud laughter)—and you are a fine, strong man? (Laughter.) Thank you. It was a dangerous scene; they had to go over a bridge; and if they had fallen they would have gone down some eight or nine feet, and might have been very seriously injured.—For any lady not in strong health? For any one. She realised it, and he did so, too. He carried Miss Jay one night, and she was so nervous that she begged him not to do it again, and he was very glad not to do it. (Laughter.) She was not "a little, light thing;" she was a fine woman. (Laughter.) She did not wobble with her toes to assist him.—Mr. Dalton Towers said he was stage manager to Mrs. Conover, and he took part in "Alone in London." He played the part of Charles Johnson. The plaintiff's representation of her part was simply perfect. There was not the slightest indication of weakness or ill-health in the plaintiff down to the 2nd of December. Mrs. Conover said that on a previous evening Miss Roselle had purposely cut out part of a scene.—Other witnesses deposed to the plaintiff having played her part thoroughly.—Mr. Alfred Burnham said that he was an acting-manager at the Olympic, nominated originally by Mr. Buchanan, who was the author of the piece. He told Mrs. Conover that Miss Roselle would be willing to accept a fortnight's notice after the six weeks had expired, provided that her husband was treated properly by being admitted to the theatre. He heard of an arrangement that Miss Jay should take the plaintiff's part. It was said that Miss Roselle had purposely insulted Miss Jay. The performance of the plaintiff was excellent.—In cross-examination, he said that he bought "Alone in London" of Mr. Buchanan, and after that there were differences between them. He also said that if it had not been for the meanness of Mr. Buchanan witness would still have had "Alone in London" now, and have made a good deal of money out of it, and Mr. Buchanan also would have more money if he had not been so beastly mean. (Laughter.)—Mrs. Patty Ephgraves, a dresser at the Olympic Theatre, saw the performance on the 2nd December, and noticed nothing exceptional. She saw no confusion upon the stage, no insult, and no interference with the performance. Miss Roselle acted her part as well as upon the first night. Afterwards Mrs. Conover said of Miss Roselle,

"That Woman is not going to Play."

The witness asked whom she meant, and she said, "Miss Roselle." She said that the witness must get the room ready for Miss Gourley, who would play Miss Jay's part, and that Miss Jay would take Miss Roselle's part. After the performance Mrs. Conover said to Miss Jay, "You played the part capitally; even better than that other woman did; and you ought to have played it from the first night." Some gentlemen expressed their surprise that Miss Roselle did not appear, and Mrs. Conover said, "Oh, no; she cut Miss Jay out last night purposely, and crabbed her." (Laughter.) Miss Jay did not appear "crabbed" when this was said to have happened. Mrs. Conover, before the 2nd of December asked Mr. Boyne whether he knew the plaintiff was going to have a baby. He said, "No." Mrs. Conover said, "What a fool you are—(laughter)—can't you see?" The witness had not noticed anything in that direction to attract her attention. The witness, in reply to Mrs. Conover, had said that Miss Roselle was well, and she had not heard her complain of anything. Mrs. Conover and the witness had a "row"—(laughter)—and she left. She had 12s. a week as housekeeper, and Mrs. Conover said she would give her 20s. a week, and send her husband to a convalescent home if she would stay.—Cross-examined: She never told Mrs. Conover that she had noticed Miss Roselle's condition while dressing her.—Mr. James Mortimer, a dramatic author, Miss Annie Rose, an actress, and Mrs. Louisa Stirling, a member of the theatrical profession, all spoke as to the excellence of the plaintiff's representation of her part.—Mr. J. L. Toole said he was an actor and the manager of a theatre in London.—You have some experience of theatrical matters and of the management of theatres? I think so. (Laughter.)—It does sometimes happen that there occurs the leaving out of lines by an actor? Occasionally.—It has happened to yourself occasionally? Yes.—To leave out some lines and introduce others? (Laughter.) Yes.—It happens in playing long parts like Hamlet or Macbeth? Yes.—Mr. Kemp: Mr. Toole's favourite characters. (Laughter.)—Mr. Toole: Not yet. (Loud laughter.)—Mr. Lockwood: Look at the extract from this play. The stage practice is kissing of the hand of a lady? "Two or three kisses of the hand." Yes, I notice it.—It was said, "There are people coming; good-bye"—kissing her hand. Looking at that piece of the dialogue, do you think it improbable that an actress might mistake to utter some of the words. —Yes; they were very similar.—It is suggested that Miss Roselle purposely left out these lines. What effect would that, in your opinion, have upon her professional position?—Mr. Justice Grove: That is asking a matter which the jury have to decide.—Mr. Arthur Dacre,

The Plaintiff's Husband,

who said in the course of his evidence that he was a medical man, spoke to an interview that he had with Mr. Buchanan. On that occasion Mr. Buchanan said that all parties had agreed to take less salaries; and unless the plaintiff consented to do so the theatre would have to be closed. The witness said that his wife would not take less salary, and the witness mentioned at the same time that she was *enceinte*. He also said that her time was so little advanced that she could go on playing for months. Before this not a single word had been said as to his wife's incapacity for playing her part. The witness repeated that she was able to play for months, but rather than have such a matter talked about his wife would resign a fortnight after the six weeks. Then Mr. Buchanan talked about the state of the plaintiff's health. The witness positively denied that he had ever insulted Miss Jay in any way. He always took off his hat when he passed.—Mr. Kemp then addressed the jury in opening the case for the defendant, and congratulated the jury that they had at length got to the end of the first act in this domestic drama. He submitted to his lordship what was said to be slanderous was really a privileged communication, the words having been spoken to persons who were engaged with the defendant in carrying on a particular business, the persons to whom the defendant was almost bound to communicate it. He knew that his lordship would not stop the case upon this objection, and that the matter must go to the jury. He asserted that Miss Roselle was not in December in a fit state of health to perform so onerous a part as that of Nan. She certainly was not in a condition in which she was fit to be dragged about the stage and to undergo great physical exertion. She, in fact, tripped off the stage instead of being dragged off by the "accomplished villain," who had appeared before them. Complaints were made of this, but still she was not dismissed for that. She was dismissed because she omitted wilfully part of one scene for the purpose of annoying Miss Jay. She had acted the part for many nights; she had never omitted that part of the scene before; and she could hardly have done it by accident. He asked the jury to exercise their common sense upon the matter. The plaintiff was at that time becoming annoyed by Miss Jay; the omission spoilt her as to a very good bit of acting, and the best of women could become extremely catlike upon occasion. (Laughter.) He put it to the jury that whatever amount of jealousy there might be among women outside, there was even more among women in the theatre. She said Mr. Dacre had previously annoyed Miss Jay in the course of her work, the plaintiff was about to leave the theatre, and all this gave rise to the exhibition of a bit of spite against Miss Jay. If Mrs. Conover had desired to get rid of the plaintiff she could have done so by giving a fortnight's notice, but she did not avail herself of this opportunity, therefore there would hardly have been this desire. The annoyance of the plaintiff and his wife was perfectly apparent, and he asked the jury to assume that they must be willing to put that annoyance into action in the way which he had suggested. He should bring before the jury a considerable body of evidence to make out the case which he had mentioned to the jury.—Mr. Lockwood said that it was only inability to act that was pleaded as a justification for dismissal.

Mrs. Conover in the Box.

—Mrs. Ann Conover, the defendant, was called, and said that in 1885 she was, unfortunately, the lessee and manageress of the Olympic Theatre. She had played there "Alone in London," and Mr. Buchanan selected the actors and actresses, while the witness found the funds and did a lot of the work. She became personally responsible for the payment of the performers. Miss Jay suggested that Miss Roselle should perform the principal part. The witness suggested that Miss Jay should make an inquiry, and in consequence of her report of the result the engagement was entered into. The part of Annie Meadows as Nan was a very difficult one, and required a great deal of physical exertion to play it properly. She thought Miss Roselle played the part very well, but she noticed her *embonpoint* figure, and thought she was too matronly for the part. She had to be carried over a bridge, while she was unconscious. She played this scene as if not unconscious and assisted herself to help Mr. Standing to carry her within. Could not say if she appeared fatigued, but it was a part that would make any one tired. She liked her very much indeed, and tried to make her comfortable, though she appeared somewhat "high." She tried to make everybody comfortable at her theatre. She was afraid too much so. (Laughter.) About the middle of November she noticed the plaintiff's figure, and how she played her part, and she suggested that Miss Jay should make further inquiry. She, however, learnt the plaintiff's condition from Mr. Buchanan, and was rather pained that it had not been communicated to her before. This was about ten days before the dismissal. She said to her business manager that she was making little money, and the actors ought to take half salary. This was said after a matinée. Miss Roselle was spoken to, and refused. The witness met her in a passage, and said she was sorry she had been spoken to. She got her full salary. The witness respected the plaintiff's susceptibilities in every way, and she did not think that Miss Roselle herself had anything to do with this matter. The witness dictated a letter to her business manager on the 21st of October, and she was afraid that he tried to improve upon it instead of sending just what she dictated. Mr. Dacre answered that letter. After what took place on the 24th of November she was desirous of putting an end to the engagement at the end of the six weeks, because she found that Miss Roselle was unfit to play the part in her then condition. That was the only reason. She felt that she had been duped and made use of; a catspaw or a scapegoat. (Laughter.) Miss Jay made a complaint as to Mr. Dacre, and afterwards the witness requested that he should not be admitted to the theatre, because his manner to the witness was rude. He was afterwards admitted, but only to his wife's dressing-room. Miss Jay on the 2nd of December complained that the plaintiff had left out a part of a scene. Miss Jay said——.—Mr. Lockwood objected that this was not evidence.—The Witness: My dear sir, you must allow me.

I am "Alone in London,"

and a foreigner. (Laughter.) It is necessary for my own protection, for I am accused of slander, when I have not uttered slander.—Mr. Lockwood: Excuse me, madam, I am not under your management yet. (Laughter.)—Mr. Kemp: What a pity you are not. (Renewed laughter.)—The witness, in continuation, spoke to some conversations which she was said to have had, and which she did not well remember, but in substance she denied having uttered any slander. She added that in the theatrical profession one never knew who were friends or enemies. (Laughter.) She could not remember the words which she spoke to Mr. Standing; and she might have used the words he spoke yesterday. She was in one continual temper because she had a great deal of worry. (Laughter.) Mrs. Ephgraves spoke to her, and she said she had observed——well, coming events which cast their shadows before them. (Loud laughter.) This she had observed while dressing the plaintiff.—Cross-examined: She became inclined to stop the piece, but Mr. Buchanan wished it to go on. The performance did not pay.—Mr. Kemp: There was money made in the country.—Mr. Lockwood: I dare say there was, or we should not have the pleasure of seeing you here. (Laughter.)—The witness said she considered that the plaintiff had entered into her service under false pretences, knowing all the time that she was *enceinte*. The witness spoke to several married members of the company on the subject.—Mr. Lockwood: Why did you not go to Miss Roselle?—Why did she not speak to me? I treated her with the greatest courtesy, but she kept me at a distance, and treated me like a child—like nobody in the theatre. She thought the plaintiff a charming person, but she did not treat the witness charmingly. She treated her simply as a bank to draw her money from. (Laughter.)—Miss Harriet Jay said she was an actress and an authoress also, principally an authoress. She had written, besides this play, about eight novels. When the piece was to be brought out she was offered the part of Nan, but she herself suggested that Miss Roselle should play the part. Soon after she came the witness asked her if she was *enceinte*, and she said, "No." The witness asked this question because Miss Roselle did not throw enough exertion into the part. She appeared so exhausted on several occasions that the witness sent her some wine, and the witness observed that she was not carried over the bridge. The witness never asked Mr. Standing not to carry her. He always carried her. When the witness afterwards asked the plaintiff the question again, she admitted it. The witness remembered part of the scene being left out. Miss Roselle never before omitted it. She did not behave very well to the witness. She was very insulting to her on the stage. Their parts were very sympathetic, and the coldness of the plaintiff's demeanour and her looking at the witness so disdainfully utterly unnerved her and prevented her from acting properly. In the particular scene that was in question

She Behaved Most Abruptly,

and the part which she omitted was most important. There was no appearance of forgetfulness. The witness thought she was angry. Mr. Dacre behaved rudely to her. He came into the passage near her room and spoke in a very insulting way of the management, which consisted of her brother-in-law and Mrs. Conover. The witness remained in her room as long as possible, hoping that he would go. She had to come out, however, to go on to the stage, and Mr. Dacre remained in the passage and turned his back upon her. Afterwards the thing occurred again in a very insulting way, and the witness told Mrs. Conover that she would rather go out of the bill than be insulted so.—Mr. Robert Buchanan, the next witness, said that he was the author of many works besides plays, and he was joint author with Miss Jay of the particular piece now in question. He took part in the bringing out of the play, and also in its management, both in America and at the Olympic. He did not notice the exhibition of any fatigue on the plaintiff's part at rehearsals. There was naturally a reluctance to go through the laborious parts at rehearsals in the case of a lady of her position on the stage. He, however, wished her to be carried over the bridge, but he was asked by Mr. Standing not to insist upon it, as if this was done she would faint away. The witness had expected that she would be carried at night, but she was not carried. She did the best she could to assist Mr. Standing with her feet. She assisted herself up the stairs and over the bridge. She was supposed to be in a dead swoon; and he did not think that a person who was in a dead swoon would walk to the place of her own execution. This sort of thing continued throughout the whole of her performance. He could not give the precise date when he became aware of the cause of this; but it was within a week, he thought, of the production of the piece. He saw Mr. Dacre. He came to the witness's room at the theatre after the proposition to reduce his wife's salary had been made by Mrs. Conover. There was a little shadow of truth, a little verbal truth in the conversation spoken to as having taken place with him. He said that Mrs. Conover could readily break the engagement, and then he instanced what had sometimes been done. He said what she could do if she were dishonourable, which he knew her not to be. He never in any way suggested that she should so act. The witness added that another action had been brought against him for the same slander.—Mr. Mansell Griffiths, a solicitor, who had been present at rehearsals and performances of the piece, said that among others he witnessed the performance on the 2nd December, and she was not carried over the bridge. Further, when she was supposed to be tied to the stake, she did not scream so long or so loud as she should have done. (Laughter.)

She had to Scream about Three Minutes.

In the course of his cross-examination, the witness wished to give reasons for various answers that he gave, a liberty that Mr. Lockwood declined to allow him. At length he appealed to his lordship, and asked, "May I give a reason for that one."—Mr. Justice Grove: You had better not. They say solicitors always make the worst possible witnesses, except barristers. (Laughter.) —Mr. Lockwood: You noticed that her screams had got fainter; are you a judge of screams? (Laughter.)—The Witness: I can assure you that after having seen some twenty performances, I was a very good judge. (Much laughter.) The screams were not so rich as they should have been—(laughter)—they did not last so long; and they were jerky screams. (Laughter.)—Mr. Lockwood: Perhaps my friend would like to give us an example of the screams. (Laughter.)—Mr. Kemp: I would rather that you should do it. (Laughter).—Mrs. Frank Sutherland said she witnessed the plaintiff's performance, and she spoke to Mrs. Conover as to the personal appearance of Miss Roselle.—Mr. Lockwood: Suppose that you and I were playing the bridge scene together—(laughter)—and that, instead of carrying you—[the lady was somewhat stout]—I were to drag you away?—The Witness: I think as a matter of fact you would drag me. (Laughter.)—And that would be as effective? No; not at all. —But do you think it would bring down the house? Not at all in that position.—Mr. Henry Boss, in evidence, said he was at the theatre called the acting-manager, but in reality he was secretary.—What did you call yourself? Well, I was always there when I was called. (Laughter.) He believed that he had a conversation with Mr. Dacre, and he believed that it was in reference to the reduction of salaries all round. He could not remember that anything was said about the plaintiff leaving.—Mr. Lockwood: Mr. Boss, you may return to your important duties.—The Witness: Well, they are important.—This concluded the evidence for the defence, and thereupon Mr. Kemp summed up the evidence, which he had presented to the jury, and Mr. Lockwood after that replied upon the whole case.—His lordship summed up, and the jury retired to consider their verdict. In half an hour they returned, and said that they found that the slander was uttered, but that it did not injure the plaintiff; and as to the wrongful dismissal, they gave a verdict for the plaintiff for £190.

DEATH AT A WEDDING.

A happy party entered the church of St. Vincent de Paul, on the corner of Fifty-ninth-street and Ninth Avenue, a few afternoons ago, says a New York paper. John Hinchliffe, a wealthy brewer of Paterson, N.J., was to be married to Mary Masterson, a daughter of Detective Masterson, and a relation of the dead alderman of that name. The ceremony was about over when Kate C. Bergin, of Paterson, a young lady who was present as a guest, was taken ill. Mr. and Mrs. J. McCrystal, relatives of the groom, assisted Miss Bergin out of the church and took her to a neighbouring drug store. Among the wedding guests was Dr. James W. Smith, of Paterson, and he was summoned to attend the young lady. She was made as comfortable as possible on a lounge in a front room over the drug store, and when she had fallen asleep Dr. Smith hastened back to the church and accompanied the newly-married couple to the bride's residence in 123rd-street. Then he returned to his patient and was counting her pulse when something interrupted him. When the doctor resumed his seat at the lounge and again took up the hand of the patient he discovered that Miss Bergin was dead. The neuralgia, which had been thought slight, had reached her heart, and she died of angina pectoris. —Coroner Harold was summoned, and gave a burial permit, and shortly afterwards Dr. Nagle gave a permit to convey the remains to Paterson. The sudden death of Miss Bergin created a great deal of sorrow in Paterson, where she was known as a very accomplished and pleasant young lady.

REMARKABLE CASE OF MISTAKEN IDENTITY.

At the Dudley Police Court, a respectably dressed man, named Robert Oakes, of Shaw-road, was charged by Mary Turner with being several years in arrear under an affiliation order.—The woman stated that seven years ago her child was born, and at the time the defendant worked at Miss Owen's shop. His name was William Harcourt. The man against whom the charge was made here explained, as he had done before, that his name was not Harcourt, but Oakes, and that he knew nothing of the woman who was testifying against him. The father of the man Harcourt was fetched into court, and stated that the accused was not his son.—Oakes now stated that he came from Bungay, in Suffolk, and he thought his case was a very hard one. He had been locked up two days, and had to bring a witness from Bungay to show who he was.—The bench told the girl it appeared to them that she had made a grievous mistake, and the man would be discharged.

TOBACCONISTS.—Illustrated Guide (reg. 136 pages). "How to commence from £20 to £2,000," 3 stamps.—MYERS & Co., 107 to 111, Euston-road, London.—[Advt.]

PERRY AND CO., Limited,
STEEL PEN MAKERS, WATCH IMPORTERS,
AND PROPRIETORS OF THE "VIADUCT" AND OTHER REGISTERED WATCHES.
HOLBORN VIADUCT, LONDON.

WONDERFUL BARGAIN.
NOTICE.
"THE PEOPLE" WATCH.
Price 14s. 6d.

THE Greatest Bargain ever offered to the public.

MESSRS. PERRY AND CO., Limited, beg to inform the readers of THE PEOPLE and the Public generally that they have bought the Stock of "THE PEOPLE" WATCH, by which they are enabled to supply a
REAL SILVER KEYLESS WATCH
at the extraordinary low price of
14s. 6d. each.
PERRY AND CO., Limited, Holborn Viaduct, London.

"THE PEOPLE" WATCH, PRICE 14s. 6d.,
IN SOLID SILVER CASE.
Keyless Action, Horizontal Movement, Jewelled in four holes, Crystal glass, and with movement gilt and finished as finely as many other Watches that are sold at much higher prices. Every Watch is guaranteed to be a thoroughly good Timekeeper. Price 14s. 6d. each.
PERRY AND CO., Limited., Holborn Viaduct, London.

"THE PEOPLE" WATCH, Price 14s. 6d., is the best and cheapest
SILVER KEYLESS WATCH
ever offered to the Public. This price is about 50 per Cent. less than the usual price of this Watch.
PERRY AND CO., Limited, Holborn Viaduct, London.

"THE PEOPLE" WATCH, PRICE 14s. 6d., is undoubtedly the cheapest SILVER WATCH ever offered to the public. It is a real SILVER WATCH, with Keyless Action, guaranteed to be a good timekeeper, and can be supplied in either Ladies or Gentlemen's size at the same price, 14s. 6d. each.
PERRY AND CO., Limited, Holborn Viaduct, London.

FIRST COME, FIRST SERVED! The FIRST and SECOND DELIVERIES have been made, and the Watches give every satisfaction. In consequence of the large number of orders, early application is desirable to secure quick delivery. When sending your Order, state whether a GENTLEMAN'S or LADY'S WATCH is REQUIRED.

THE WATCH CAN NOW BE HAD APART FROM THE PAPER. It is incomparably the CHEAPEST EVER OFFERED to the ENGLISH PUBLIC. SEND AT ONCE and SECURE the WATCH.
PERRY AND CO., Holborn Viaduct, London.

PERRY AND CO.'S "VIADUCT" WATCH,
Price 10s. 6d. each.
Special Terms for Watch Clubs.
Shippers and the Trade Supplied.
PERRY AND CO., Limited, Holborn Viaduct, London.

WONDER OF WONDERS!
A THOROUGHLY RELIABLE WATCH FOR 10s. 6d.
Nickel Horizontal Movement.
Quick Winding Keyless Action.
Setting Hands from Outside the Case.
Jewelled in Four Holes.
Enamelled Dial, Sunk Seconds.
Crystal Glass. In stout Nickeled Case.
Price 10s. 6d.
PERRY AND CO., Limited, HOLBORN VIADUCT, LONDON.

SEND AT ONCE FOR ONE OF
PERRY AND CO'S "VIADUCT" WATCHES.
Price 10s. 6d.
This is the cheapest reliable watch ever offered to the public.
PERRY AND CO., Limited, Holborn Viaduct, London.

PERRY AND CO'S KEYLESS SPORTING WATCH.
In Solid Gold Case .... £5 5s. 0d.
In Silver Case .... £1 10s. 6d.
These Watches are guaranteed perfect timekeepers, and sound in every respect. Numerous testimonials showing the satisfaction they have given. Send for sample to
PERRY AND CO., Limited, Holborn Viaduct, London.

MARBLE CLOCKS, CHEAPER THAN EVER!
THE "WONDER." PRICE 10s. 6d.
Warranted a good Timekeeper.

THE CHEAPEST MARBLE CLOCK IN THE WORLD.
PERRY AND CO.'s "WONDER."
A Solid Marble Clock, with Seconds' hand, for 10s. 6d. Send for list of Clocks.
A Large Selection, from 10s. 6d. to £20 each, always in stock.
PERRY AND CO., Holborn Viaduct, London.

PERRY AND CO.'S "AU SOLEIL" CIGARETTES.
Messrs. PERRY AND CO. beg to inform the public that they have made arrangements by which they are able to offer this well-known brand, in their patent boxes. Sample Box will be sent, post free, for 1s.
PERRY AND CO., Limited, Holborn Viaduct, London.

THE WELL-KNOWN BRAND OF "AU SOLEIL" CIGARETTES.
Unsurpassed for quality. Manufactured from the finest EGYPTIAN TOBACCO.
Sample Box, 1s., Post Free.
PERRY AND CO., Limited, 18, 19, and 20, Holborn Viaduct, London.

Send for Sample Box of
PERRY AND CO.'S EGYPTIAN CIGARETTES.
1s., Post Free.
PERRY and CO., Limited,
18, 19, and 20, HOLBORN VIADUCT, LONDON.