

MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE.

Ira Green and William Dillon Must Suffer the Death Penalty Unless a New Trial is Granted Them or the Board of Pardons Saves Them from it by Commuting to Life Imprisonment for the Killing of Jerry Condo. Took the Jury 18 Hours to Reach a Verdict. The Case in Full. Motion for a New Trial Made Immediately Upon the Hearing of the Verdict, which Was Presented at a Sunday Morning Session.

"Guilty of murder in the first degree," was the verdict of the twelve good and lawful jurors of Centre county in their rendering against Ira Green and William Dillon for the murder of Jerry I. Condo, the turkey in the Centre county jail.

Judge Love finished his charge to the jury Saturday afternoon at 2:50 o'clock and swearing stipstaves Thomas McCafferty, James McMullen and Vinton Beckwith to take charge of them the twelve men were sent into the jury room for deliberation. Court remained in session until 5 o'clock, when Judge Love announced that if the jury reached a verdict by or before 10 o'clock that night they were to ring the court house bell and he would convene court to take the verdict. Ten o'clock came and no verdict was reached and it was not until 9 o'clock Sunday morning that the jury sent out word that they were ready. Judge Love, the counsel on both sides, and others were at once notified and quietly they made their way to the temple of justice. Quite a number of people were congregated nearby and everybody flocked into the court house. The prisoners were brought in by sheriff Taylor and deputies Harry Jackson and George Everhart.

It was just 9:25 o'clock when court was duly convened and the judge gave the word for the jury to come in. Slowly and very solemnly, the twelve men filed in and took their places in the jury box. When all were in their places the court ordered a roll call of the jury, after which court clerk M. I. Gardner asked, "Gentlemen of the jury, have you agreed upon a verdict?" "We have," replied Mr. J. H. Sands, of Bellefonte, who, being the oldest man on the jury had been chosen foreman, and in conjunction with his reply the other men bowed their heads in acquiescence. The verdict, sealed, was handed to the court who opened it and examined it then handed it to clerk Gardner, who, in a voice that trembled, announced the verdict of first degree. Counsel for the defendants at once requested a poll of the jury and as each man's name was called he arose in his place and responded, "Guilty of murder in the first degree."

It took just eight ballots to reach a verdict. When the jury retired, and on the first two ballots, they stood six for first degree and six for second. On the following five ballots they stood seven for first and five for second. This was about eleven o'clock Saturday night. They then decided not to take another ballot until in the morning, Sunday morning, after a not very refreshing sleep, the twelve men discussed the case again, and especially their duty as jurymen, then sent for their breakfast. Immediately after they were through eating they took another and final ballot, and when the votes were counted it was found that there were twelve for first degree and, save the announcement of the verdict, their duties as jurymen were at an end.

When the verdict was announced there was no sign of flinching noticeable in the demeanor of the prisoners, save perhaps a slight flushing of the face and just a momentary twitching of the lips. Otherwise they sat as apparently unmoved and stolid as they did throughout the entire trial.

As soon as the jury was polled Judge Furst filed an application for a new trial, and the court allowed the counsel ten days, dating from August 29, in which to prepare their reasons for same. At that time a date will be named for argument on the case.

When the WATCHMAN went to press last week the jury in the murder case against Green and Dillon has just been empaneled and court adjourned until Friday morning. No murder in years has excited the same interest and created such intense feeling as was manifested at this trial last week. All week there were many strangers in town, and the court house was constantly crowded. On Friday the crowd was so large that guards had to be placed in the aisles and at the doors to hold the people in check, and several hundred people stood around the outside of the court house unable to get in because of the throng inside.

Court convened Friday morning at 9 o'clock. At that hour the court house was already crowded. The prisoners, Ira Green and William Dillon, looking somewhat careworn and as if they had passed a sleepless night, were brought into court in the custody of sheriff Taylor and deputies Harry Jackson and George Everhart. Following close in the rear came Mrs. Condo, the widow of the murdered turkey, with her son and daughter. They took seats within the bar at a place where they were easily in sight of the prisoners at the bar. The jury were already in the box and the case was at once called for trial.

Ellis L. Orvis opened the case on the part of the Commonwealth. After a few preliminary remarks to the jury as to why they were chosen to sit on the case, Mr. Orvis read the bill of indictment, defined the law on the various degrees of murder, then calmly and dispassionately gave in detail a history of the crime committed within the confines of the Centre county jail on the night of July 29th, when Jerry I. Condo, turkey, was so brutally beaten by the men on trial that he died thirty hours afterwards. During Mr. Orvis' opening

speech and recital of the crime the prisoners sat unmoved. Mr. Orvis talked one-half hour.

J. H. Wetzel, surveyor, was the first witness called by the Commonwealth. His testimony in brief follows: Live in Bellefonte, made a draft of the interior of the jail, also of the north side of the exterior. The draft of the interior was presented and properly marked by the court reporter, after which it was fully explained to the court and jury by the witness. The draft does not only show the interior arrangement of the jail as regards the upper and lower corridors, but showed the pool of blood where Jerry Condo was found, the blood spots on the stairs and the location of the imprint of the bloody hands. The exterior draft was presented to show the course the prisoners took after breaking jail and also the exact spot where the iron bludgeons were found the next morning.

Deputy Sheriff H. J. Jackson called. Have been deputy at the jail going on eight years. Witness then explained the exact location of the bathroom in the jail—was the first cell to the right on entering the lower corridor. The door of the bathroom had not been locked for years. Dillon and Green were in cell No. 8. The beds in that cell were painted white. In the other cells green. On the night of July 29, cell No. 7 was occupied by George Henderson and Dominic Comstance. Both cells, 7 and 8, were kept locked all the time. On July 29 I saw Condo last before the tragedy about 5 o'clock. It was his duty to take entire charge of the interior of the jail and have personal and entire charge of the prisoners. It was about 9 o'clock when I next saw Condo. Witness then narrated how and where he first heard the news of the beating of Condo and the escape of the prisoners. He further told the conditions at the jail as he found them upon his arrival there, being especially explicit in his explanations of the broken cell door. I saw the pool of blood on the floor and also blood spots at several other places. The mark of the pool of blood is yet distinct. Ed. McCullough found and brought in the irons supposed to be the weapons used by the prisoners in beating Condo. The irons have been in our possession ever since. When found one iron was in a stocking and the other bare. They were covered with blood. The one iron fit the bedstead in cell No. 8, while the other was evidently of a folding bed down stairs. The irons were shown the witness for identification.

Cross-examination of the witness was conducted by Judge Furst, but no new facts were brought out.

Edward B. McCullough called and sworn. Am 27 years old. Been in jail over a year. Was there on July 29. While there I became acquainted with all the prisoners. On July 29 was out all day until evening. About 8 o'clock I came in the jail and Condo came in after me. I saw no one anywhere at that time, but when I got to the top of the stairs and turned around I saw two men coming out of the bathroom, they were William Dillon and Ira Green. Condo was part way up the steps. They slipped up behind him and Dillon struck the first blow and Green the second. Don't know how often they struck him. All I heard was Green saying, "I won't hurt you." I went into my cell soon as I could because I was scared. One of the prisoners told me to keep quiet. Don't know how long I was in my cell. When I came out I saw Condo sitting on the floor, supported himself with his hands. Prior to the killing I heard Green and Dillon say they "would kill the old bald-headed s—."

They both said it. When I came out of my cell I saw Condo sitting on the floor with a big pool of blood alongside him. I found the irons Saturday morning under the jail and took them into the sheriff.

The cross-examination was conducted by Judge Furst who endeavored to throw doubt on the witness' testimony in chief by asking questions which disclosed the utter ignorance of the man. The witness, however, adhered closely to his original story.

George H. Kline called. Live at Oak Hall. Know by sight Green and Dillon. Was in jail July 29, in cell No. 6. It is near the head of the stairs. Do not know when Green and Dillon got out of their cell. I was in my cell when the tragedy occurred. I was aroused by the noise. Heard one of the men call out to "keep quiet or we will give you the same." When I went to the door of my cell the five men were just going out through the hall. Five men went out. Did not see Henderson and Constance get out of their cell. I saw Condo lying on the floor and went and picked him up. Saw the pool of blood on the floor, about a pint. Condo was also covered with blood. McKee and I carried Condo out front then I telephoned for a doctor. I cleaned up the pool of blood but the stains are all very plain yet. The night in question Ed. McCullough came in with Condo.

On cross-examination witness said he had not seen McCullough come in with Condo, but he came in or he wouldn't have been there. Don't know which one said not to make a noise or would get the same medicine. Witness denied that he had been approached and told to stand up for the Commonwealth.

George Henderson called. Was an inmate of the jail July 29. Occupied cell No. 7. Have known Green and Dillon since I have been jail. July 29 there was a jail delivery and five prisoners escaped. I saw Green and Dillon in the corridor about 8 o'clock, perhaps a half hour before Condo came into the jail. I saw them go down stairs. Livingston came up to my cell and unlocked the door.

Nothing new on cross-examination.

Samuel Mulberger called. Live in Bellefonte, north of the jail. Was on the front porch on the night of July 29. Saw four men come out of the jail and run up along the north side of the jail wall. I ran over to the jail and found a man helping up Condo in the back part of the jail. We carried him out to the front part of the jail and I washed his head.

Nothing new on cross-examination.

Mrs. Elizabeth Mulberger was called and testified to practically the same facts as her husband. Witness stated that when

the men were running along the wall she heard a noise as of falling iron.

Nothing new on cross-examination.

R. R. Osterreich called. Witness boards at Mulberger's and his testimony was substantially as that of Mr. and Mrs. Mulberger. No cross-examination.

Court adjourned until 1:30 p. m.

A dramatic incident occurred Friday morning just when the first witness for the Commonwealth, J. H. Wetzel, was called. There was a sudden whirl and swish of skirts and Green's wife came into the courtroom on a run, rushed up to him, threw her arms around his neck, kissed him and sobbed loudly until she was led away and given a seat alongside of William Green, the prisoner's father. She remained during the day. Her appearance in the courtroom caused Green to show the first bit of feeling exhibited since the opening of the trial.

Court convened Friday afternoon at 1:30 o'clock. Bartholomew Fleming, who in jail was known as Simon McGhee, was called but refused to take any kind of an oath and was stood aside for the time being.

J. W. Rightour called. Am county detective. Was on the train bringing the

prisoners from Mill Hall to Bellefonte after their recapture. Had Ira Green in charge and held a conversation with him. At this point Judge Furst objected to the admission of any testimony given by Detective Rightour, on the grounds that he was the officer in charge of the prisoner. (Objections not sustained.) All statements made him by prisoner were voluntary. (Written objections to the admission of such statements as evidence filed by the attorneys for the defense. The objection was overruled and the testimony admitted.) I asked Green if he knew Condo was dead, and he said he did. I said to him "I didn't tell you to behave yourself." (Attorneys for the defense again objected and this time the objection was sustained.) The witness was then excused.

Charles R. Kurtz sworn. (Counsel for defense objected to the admission of witness' evidence on the grounds that it occurred at the time that Green was handcuffed to Detective Rightour and therefore not competent evidence because the prisoner was under duress. Objections overruled for the time.) Green told me he didn't know Condo was dead until after they were captured and were being taken to Lock Haven.

Green asked me if, when one man was killed they could have more than one man and I told him they could have the whole bunch.

Cross-examination. Was not a deputy. Was not in company with Detective Rightour.

Re-direct examination. I took a photograph of the interior of the jail after the escape of the prisoners and the killing of Condo. I also photographed the broken cell door. (Admission of photographs not considered material to the case.)

Dr. W. F. Feidt called. Live in Bellefonte. Was called to the jail Friday evening, July 29, to dress the wounds of Jerry Condo. There were seven or eight distinct wounds on his head. There was considerable bleeding, largely from the back of the head, also bleeding and serum from the ears. In addition to the cuts there were two fractures of the skull. Saturday morning an operation was performed and the skull trephined. The injuries on Mr. Condo's head were undoubtedly the cause of his death.

Dr. L. J. Seibert called. Was called in consultation with Dr. Feidt, on Jerry Condo, early Saturday morning, July 30th. The injuries on the head were the direct cause of Condo's death.

Dr. R. G. H. Hayes called. Witness corroborated the testimony of Drs. Feidt and Seibert.

H. S. Taylor called. Deputy sheriff H. J. Jackson and myself had constant charge of the iron weapons found from the time they were brought into the jail until they were brought into court. When found the one in the stocking was covered with blood and patches of hair adhered to the stocking.

George Everhart called. I helped move the cots from cells 7 and 8. There was an iron brace missing from cot in cell 8. With deputy Jackson I fitted the one iron weapon to the cot and it fit perfectly.

Nothing new was elicited on cross-examination.

F. E. Nagloey called. Am in the undertaking business. I prepared the body of Jerry Condo for burial. In addition to the cuts on the head I found finger marks on both arms and a mark on the back about eight inches below the shoulder. The mark was in the form of a T. The flesh was bruised and black.

Commonwealth then offered in evidence the two drafts of the jail and the two iron bludgeons, after which they rested.

It was just 2:50 o'clock when Henry C. Quigley opened the case for the defense. He spoke only twelve minutes and while he did not make any pretense of denying the killing or shifting the blame therefore, he did allege that the prisoners had no intention of killing the turn-key, but merely wanted to stun him so that they could take his keys and make good their escape from the jail, which was their prime object.

William Dillon was the first witness called. Am one of the defendants in this case. Am 22 years old. Was born in Clearfield county. Parents are both dead. Never was in a court house before this in my life. I knew Jerry Condo only after I was put in jail. Condo was turn-key. He locked up the prisoners at night, generally from 8 to 9 o'clock. I escaped from jail on

the night of July 29th. We got out of our cell by sawing the rivet of the hinge on the inner door with the knives they gave us to eat with at meal time. Sawed the hinge when we were first put in. Edward McCullough gave us the one piece of iron we used to break the hinge on the door. We got out about 8:15 o'clock and hid in the bathroom. It was our intention to simply knock Jerry out and put him in a cell and make our escape. Saw McCullough and Condo come in. Followed them and when on the stairs I struck Condo on the back of the head with my fist; had the iron in my left hand. Condo turned around and I jumped down the stairs and went to the bathroom for my shoes. The next thing I saw was Green catching hold of Jerry's coat and hitting him over the head with the iron in the stocking, at the same time telling him to keep quiet and he wouldn't hurt him. Had no intention of killing Condo. Had no ill-will or spite against him, my only intention being to escape from jail. I did not hit Condo with the iron in the stocking. The stocking was put on the iron to keep it from hurting Condo.

Cross-examination by Orvis. Was born in 1885. I gave my age as 22 because so many people asked me how old I was.

When court convened in the afternoon District Attorney N. B. Spangler made the closing address for the Commonwealth. Mr. Spangler spoke in a calm and impressive manner, confining himself entirely to a comprehensive review of the evidence and a declaration of the law governing this particular case. He closed at 2:18 and the court at once began the delivery of his charge which lasted until 2:45, when the jury was sent out for deliberation of the case.

THE PRISONERS AT THE BAR, WILLIAM DILLON AND IRA GREEN, STAND CHARGED IN IT IS INDICATED WITH THE CRIME OF MURDER.

This is probably the most serious offense charged in the law of the Commonwealth which imposes upon both the Court and Jury a grave responsibility. When we are so careful of human life, and when defendants are undergoing a trial involving their life, it becomes the duty of the Court and the Jury to consider all the evidence in the case, and to determine whether or not the evidence in the case and to be controlled by it and by the law of the land.

We do not deem it necessary, Gentlemen of the Jury, to define the crime of manslaughter in greater extent in this case, inasmuch as the prisoners at the bar, by their counsel, have admitted the facts of the case, and it is their argument that the only question here is as to the degree of the crime of murder under the evidence introduced in this case and that the Commonwealth has made out a case of murder in the second degree.

The facts in this case, so far as the establishment of the commission of the crime is concerned, are comparatively simple. There is comparatively little dispute as to the facts. On the night of July 29, 1905, on the night of the 29th of last July I was assaulted by these two defendants, the defendant Green, which was the cause of a little over one day. It is not denied that these defendants inflicted the wounds that resulted in the death of the deceased, and that the defendant Green was the person who inflicted the injuries which resulted in the death of the deceased.

These two defendants were incarcerated in the jail of Centre county, charged with certain offenses, and were confined in their cells on the evening of the 29th of last July, they got out of their steel cell, as has been detailed here, and they went into the bathroom, and there they were waiting for the deceased, who was the turn-key of the jail, to enter with a view of assaulting him, and to take from him the keys of the jail whereby they might be enabled to make good their escape.

The counsel of the Jury, the main question that will arise for your consideration under this evidence will be as to the intent of these defendants. That you are to determine. Their intent is a matter entirely for the consideration and determination of the jury, and the intent of a man in committing a crime of the nature of the one here on trial may be inferred and determined from the character of the assault, from the kind of weapon used and whether the instrument, in inflicting the wounds, was directed against a vital part of the body with intent so to use it as to cause death, or with intent to result in death. If so, then the law presumes that the person intended the natural and probable consequence resulting from his act. One clause of the Penal Code of 1860 refers to murder being committed by lying in wait, and by striking, shooting, poisoning, or by any other means, with intent to kill, or with intent to strike a man in wait for another, or with a dangerous instrument, and assaults and murders by means of a deadly weapon, or by striking a man with an axe, or with some other instrument, and such shooting or striking was intended to produce death, and the killing was committed under such circumstances, then it would come under that provision of the Act of Assembly which would constitute the crime of murder in the first degree.

If, however, a man lying in wait were to assault another with a deadly weapon, or by any other means, with intent to produce death, or if some controversy should arise which might lead to a heated discussion and a contest which might result in blows, subsequently resulting in the death of the party assaulted, then the question would arise as to whether it was done with malice premeditated or not.

The reason why lying in wait is put in the class of murders of the first degree is that a man who lies in wait for the perpetration of that crime is prepared for it, and that it is thus done willfully, deliberately and premeditatedly.

So that you were to find under this evidence, and it satisfies you beyond a reasonable doubt, that these defendants were armed, that they assaulted the deceased with instruments which were of a dangerous character, on a vital part of his body, and thus killed him, and you are satisfied that the character of the weapons used and the nature of the wounds inflicted were likely to cause death and that such was their intent, then you will find that you would be warranted in finding a verdict of murder in the first degree. You are not so satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt that the intent of the defendants was to produce death, and the killing was committed under such circumstances, then it would come under that provision of the Act of Assembly which would constitute the crime of murder in the second degree.

No particular length of time is required for malice premeditated to be shown in the commission of the act. A man may in a few moments of time frame such a purpose. Neither the jury nor the court can determine the operation of a man's mind or the impulse which leads him to the commission of the crime of murder. That which is to control the jury in their verdict is to determine the intent. This is to be determined from the facts and circumstances detailed in evidence, the nature and character of the weapons used, and the manner in which they were used, and the circumstances surrounding the killing may be taken into consideration in determining the intent. The law indicates the character of evidence which will warrant the jury in inferring the intent to kill. If, as I have stated, a deadly weapon is used and aimed at some vital part of the body, so that the logical and probable result of the stroke or shot would be the death of the person at whom it was aimed, then the law presumes that the person inflicting such an injury in such a manner intends to produce that result.

Now, Gentlemen of the Jury, these two defendants were planning to escape from the county jail, and they were not planning to commit a crime of the nature of any of those recited in the Act of Assembly, the taking of life in the perpetration of which renders the person guilty of murder in the first degree, yet they were engaged in an attempt to escape from the county jail, and they were using force which might be opposed to them in so doing, and that the main obstacle in carrying out their purpose was the presence of the turnkey, then you will determine what their purpose was, and if their purpose was to overcome the turnkey, in order to effect their unlawful purpose of escape, then it would be such murder as would come under the Act of Assembly and be willful and deliberate.

You will determine then, under the rules we have laid down, what was the character of this killing. You have the testimony of Edward McCullough, the first witness called on behalf of the Commonwealth, and who stated to you that Mr. Dillon struck the first blow, using the larger iron

which has been introduced into evidence in this case. You have also the testimony of Mr. Nagloey as to the marks he discovered on the back of Jerry Condo's body, just below the left shoulder blade. You have the testimony of the defendants, and they corroborate Mr. McCullough's testimony as to the character of the assault made on the defendant being in the bath room on the night of the 29th of last July. Mr. Condo was party to the assault on the head with his fist, green do on the back of the head with the other iron some five or seven times over the head.

You are to determine whether, from the manner of their concealment, the fact of Dillon taking off his shoes and coming up and assaulting the deceased when his back was turned to the jury, this assault was willful, deliberate and premeditated. When the testimony of the instruments used were calculated to produce death and a blow inflicted by them would probably be fatal.

Then, if you are so satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt, the presumption under the law would be that they intended to produce death in their own act and would constitute it murder in the first degree. If you are not so satisfied, but are of the opinion that they intended to produce death with the intention of inflicting serious injury, if you doubt their intention was to kill under all the evidence, then the result of the infliction of the degree of crime from that of murder of the first to that of murder of the second degree. You are to consider all the evidence in reference to their coming up fairly and impartially without regard to any other influences.

The court here read the eight points of law submitted by the counsel for the defense for the instruction of the jury, all of which were confirmed. Now, Gentlemen of the Jury, take this case and render a true and just verdict under the law and the evidence in the case, and the question of intent is based under the law and the evidence on the character of the killing, the use of the instruments, declarations made by the instruments and injuries inflicted upon a vital part of the body, so that if a person thus using a deadly weapon knows that the result of the infliction of such injuries as may be made is likely to produce death, then the law presumes he intended to kill, or intended the consequences of his own act.

Take all this evidence and consider it carefully. If you are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt that these defendants intended to produce death by their act, and that the result of the infliction of such injuries and that the death of Mr. Condo is the result of their act, then you are warranted in finding a verdict of murder in the first degree. If you are not so satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt, and conclude that the defendants did not intend to produce death, the case is now in your hands. Go over all the evidence carefully and render a verdict of murder in the second degree. We have not introduced anything of a collateral nature, but only what we deemed material and vital in the case, so that it has narrowed down to a comparatively few facts and the rules of law we have given you to guide you in your consideration of the evidence, and to a correct conclusion under the law and the evidence.

"PRAISE NOT THE DAY TILL IT IS OVER."

Thou shalt not praise the day till night is falling; However fair its dawn and noon may be; Oft-times at evening it doth come so appalling; Setting the lightning and the thunder free. Thou shalt not blame the day till it is ending; Though it has brought thee flood and hurricane; Full oft at nightfall comes deep peace, descending In sunset gold and roses, glorious gain. Praise each fair morn that calls thee up from sleeping; And through the hot day work with all thy might; Then leave the evening hour in Heaven's keeping; Which sent both winter cold and summer light. —Westminster Gazette.

Unconscious Kindness.

A young woman who had passed through deep sorrows said to a friend, in speaking of the comfort certain persons had given her unconscious kindness that she could not forget one! I often ride down in the same street-car with your father, and it has been such a help to me to sit next to him. There is something so good and strong and kind about him, it has been a comfort just to feel he was beside me.

Sometimes, when I have been utterly depressed and discouraged, he has seemed somehow to know just the right word to say to me; but, if he didn't talk, why, I just looked at his face, and that helped me. He probably has not the least idea of it, for I know him so slightly, and I don't suppose people half realize, anyway, how much they are helping or hindering others! There is a great deal of this unconscious kindness in the world. Moses was not that his face shone. The best people are not aware of their goodness. According to the old legend, it was only when it fell behind him, where he could not see it, that the saintly man's shadow healed the sick. This is a parable. Goodness that is aware of itself has lost much of its charm. Kindnesses that are done unconsciously mean the most. —Selectid.

Treated Only Now and Then.

The Baron de St. Mare was one of the distinguished patrons of the Atlantic City Horse Show. On a certain afternoon there, apropos of charity, he said: "In London I was walking down New Bond street when a beggar approached me, led by a dog on a string. "My dear fellow," I said, as I fished a shabby bit from my pocket, "you are blind, aren't you?" "Yes, your honor," he answered sadly. "Have you ever been treated?" I went on. "Only now and then, sir," said the beggar. "Polks are mostly too proud to be seen going into taverns with the likes of me."

Lived Six Score and Ten Years.

Mrs. Rachael Johnson, the oldest person on this peninsula, died Saturday of last week, at her home near Onancock. The woman, who was a negro of ebony blackness, claimed that she was 130 years old, and all the evidence seems to support her assertion. She was the mother of 17 children, and the youngest of them, who is still living, is 87 years old. Mrs. Johnson declared that her mother was captured in Africa and brought to America before the Revolution. Until a few years ago she could do fine needle work and never wore glasses. She detested tobacco, liquor and snuff.

Died Before Fiancee's Arrival.

A bright morning was blighted by death when Miss Harriet Irvin, of Highland, Adams county, about to board a train to visit her dying fiancé, was notified of his demise. She was engaged to marry a teacher at Westover, Clearfield county, and had her trousseau ready, when he suddenly became ill and died before she could reach him.

—Tom—"So Miss Turner refused you, eh? Did she give you any reason for doing so?"—Jack—"Yes, indeed; two of them."—Tom—"What were they?"—Jack—"Myself and another fellow."