When he first applied he Watkins expressed his fears that he had the disease spoken of by the witness W. Brashears in answer to the second special interrogatory. The description Watkins gave of it was symtomatic of the gonnorrhoea and deponent prescribed for that disease accordingly. He came to deponent twice or three times a month during the period above mentioned. He gave Watkins quantities to last about two or three weeks. The conversation on the occasion of his visits were confined to the subject of his disease, its condition and the effects of the remedies used. The last visit was in March eighteen hundred and fifty one. His deportment the same as that of his previous visits, to procure medicine and talk about the disease.

And thereupon A. Randall solicitor for the defendant exhibited his cross interrogatories herewith returned, to which the witness answers:

To the said interrogatory, that he thinks it strongly improbable though a possible case might exist, of another disease or infirmity than that deponent then supposed and treated. He did not make a personal examination, but prescribed the remedies suited to that disease.

And thereupon A. B. Hagner solicitor for the complainant by way of re-examination addressed an additional interrogatory, herewith returned, to which the witness answered:

That Watkins expressed his apprehension to deponent that he had the clap. His description marked that disease more closely than any other. Deponent's impression was that he had that disease. There are other affections consistent with the patient's morality, to which the same remedy would be applicable, with some slight variation but the effective agent would be the same.

John W. Williams a witness of lawful age produced on the part of the complainant and being duly sworn and examined to the interrogatories filed and returned as

aforesaid, on the part of the complainant deposes and says:

To the first general interrogatory, that he knows the parties and has known them for about eight years.

To the second interrogatory that Watkins has been living near the deponent, and he has seen him very often. He knows Watkins habits. He has always looked upon Watkins as a man who neglected his duties. He is sometimes a drinking man He has seen him under the influence of liquor. He is not industrious nor attentive to his business

To the third interrogatory, that he does not know any thing about his treatment to his wife.

To the fourth interrogatory, that he never heard Watkins threaten violence to his wife

To the fifth interrogatory that he considers that he has managed his farm pretty badly. So far as deponent has been able to see, the crops have neither been well worked or well saved, and have been injured by the depredations of the stock. Corn, tobacco, wheat and oats have been raised upon the farm. If properly managed, deponent thinks with an additional hand the proceeds of the farm might have been doubled. Sometimes there has been an additional hand, but not generally.

The sixth interrogatory waived

To the seventh that he does not know any thing about it.

The eighth interrogatory waived

To the ninth interrogatory, that Mr Watkins is possessed of sixty five acres of land and the personal property described by Mr Brashears in his answer to the complainants ninth interrogatory. She has no other means of support than that the said property affords. The farm has lessened in value since the marriage of the parties, and seems to be still lessening. At present, the income is not sufficient for the support of the family, but if managed rightly, it would be abundantly sufficient.