

**"Original Cheap Cash Store."**

**FIVE Seasonable Bargains!!**

Heavy Longer Double Shaws at \$3.00. Cannot be bought elsewhere under \$4.00.

10-4 Fine White Blankets at \$1.00 per pair. Cannot be bought elsewhere under \$2.25.

237 Pair of All-Week Hand, Knit Leggings for Women, Misses and Children at 25 cents per pair. Cannot be bought elsewhere under 45 cents.

Women's Heavy Merino Underwear, 58 cents per suit, or 44 cents per suit. Cannot be bought elsewhere under \$1.20 per suit or 60 cents per piece.

Rich Astrakhan Cloth in Black and Brown at \$2.50 per yard. Cannot be bought elsewhere under \$3.00 per yard.

**J. T. NUSBAUM,**  
Opposite Public Square, Bank Street, Lehighton, June 7, 1913-14.

**The Carbon Advocate**

**SATURDAY, JANUARY 15, 1887.**

**SPECIAL NOTICE**—Persons making payments on this office by money order or postal note will please make them payable to the WELSH PRINTER OFFICE, at Lehighton. This office is NOT a money order office.

**Current Events Epitomized.**

—Hereafter Wilkesbarre barber shops will be closed on Sundays.

—Over seven thousand miners and laborers are idle in the Wilkesbarre region.

—Spectacles of all descriptions. Big selection just received at E. H. Hohl's, Mauch Chunk.

—Mrs. Mary Williams, aged eighty-one years, residing at Summit Hill, was buried Sunday.

—For a smooth shave and a fine hair cut go to Erazar's shaving saloon, opposite the Advocate office.

—Go to F. R. Boler, under the Exchange Hotel, for a smooth shave and a fashionable hair cut.

—Don't fail to read the advertisement headed "Save time and money," and endow "All cheap for cash."

—Hazelton has a toboggan slide and a Salvation Army. The latter, however, is the greater of the two evils.

—Sheriff Gallagher, of Mauch Chunk, has issued an attachment on the lease of the famous Switchback railroad.

—Have your sale bills printed at this office. Cheapest and best place in the county for all kinds of job printing.

—County Superintendent Snyder, of town, has our thanks for a copy of the published proceedings of the late county institute.

—Dr. C. T. Horn has had the interior of his popular drug store nicely decorated. When in need of anything drop in and see Dr. Z.

—Dentist eye-glasses with patent cork nose piece. Strongest, lightest and best eye-glasses. See them at E. H. Hohl's, Mauch Chunk.

—Miss Amanda Wert, of Walnutport, died on Thursday, Jan. 6, and was buried on Monday. Relatives and friends of town attended the funeral.

—Rumor has it that a Philadelphia syndicate are making efforts to lease the Mauch Chunk, Mauch Chunk, and the Hah-nah-tah, at Glen Onoko.

—Captain C. G. Fulton, of Lehigh, Fulton Camp, No. 8, of V., of Mauch Chunk, installed the officers of Col. John Lentz Camp, No. 8, of V., of town, Wednesday night.

—The Glendon Company fired another large blast at their quarry near Easton Saturday. Twenty-two tons of powder were used and 200,000 tons of stone were thrown out.

—E. F. Luckenbach, 61 Broadway, Mauch Chunk, is selling off Wall Papers at largely reduced prices to make room for new spring stock. There are bargains for those who get them.

—Abraham Stroth of Mauch Chunk, father of C. O. Stroth, who was convicted of embezzlement sometime ago, is circulating a petition to be presented to the Board of Pardons to secure his son's pardon.

—For the week ending Jan. 8, there were \$1,812 tons of coal shipped over the Lehigh Valley railroad, making a total of 290,100 tons. And showing an increase of 11,227 tons compared with same date last year.

—We still have a fair selection of overcoats left which we have reduced to less than manufacturing prices in order to make room for spring goods. Now is your time to get bargains at the One Price Star Clothing Hall, Mauch Chunk.

—Memorial services in honor of the late Emanuel Everitt, will be held in the Packerton M. E. church, Sunday evening at 7:30 o'clock. Rev. John Hagen, of Lehighton, will officiate. Everybody is cordially invited to attend.

—The employees of Claus & Bro's, tailoring establishment, enjoyed their second annual "sleigh ride" Thursday evening of last week. They passed an evening of pleasant enjoyment at the popular hostelry of Diline Shnyder, Parysville.

—The attention of the people of Summit Hill, Lansford and vicinity is directed to the fact that George F. Hutzinger, of the popular Switchback Restaurant, is authorized by us to receive subscriptions and money for the CARBON ADVOCATE.

—Mrs. E. H. Snyder announces to the ladies of Lehighton and vicinity that she is now fully prepared to do all work in the dress-making line in the latest fashion and most durable manner; at popular prices. Your patronage is respectfully invited. 2nd Ave. Are your eyes failing? Try the Australian lace spectacles and eye-glasses; every pair guaranteed. Money refunded if they don't give the expected benefit. The company will guarantee glasses only on the above conditions. E. H. Hohl, agent, Mauch Chunk.

—We direct the attention of our numerous readers to the advertisement of H. Gutz & Son, the popular Allentown merchants, which appears in another column of to-day's paper. This firm offers unusual bargains to the buying public which makes it a pleasure to advise our readers to investigate the same.

—When your horse or other domestic animal has brought him his Day's Horse Powder, an infallible remedy for this disease. Price 25 cents.

—Serious results often proceed from slight causes. Dr. Bull's Baltimore Pills will always remove the slight causes leading to headache, dyspepsia, &c.

—Mildness conquers; and hence it is that the gentle yet positive influence of Dr. Bull's Baby Syrup overcomes so quickly the disorders of babyhood.

**OUR MAN ABOUT TOWN.**

The things our people find time to talk about from day to day.

—The result of lay payments have been made doubly apparent this week if we are to judge by the number of falls occasioned therefrom. Along both sides of Bank street, Lehigh street and Northampton street, the pavements, with but few exceptions, are covered with snow and ice, which renders travel actually dangerous.

—The "Man About Town" would kindly advise the residents along the different streets to sprinkle icy pavements with ashes or saw dust, and would, also, gently remind the town council of the fact that in case a man, woman or child falls and sustains a broken limb or an injury of any nature that the borough of Lehighton is liable for damages. Considering this fact it behooves the gentlemen composing the council to take prompt action in the matter by empowering the supervisor to clean all pavements within a limited time after every snow fall, adjusting the costs incurred thereby upon the resident whose pavement has been cleaned.

—We were informed recently that in the course of a year or two the large and commodious school hall, now used for school entertainments, &c., will be partitioned off into school rooms. This is an evidence that our population is on the increase; and the question now presents itself how long will the \$45,000 building accommodate the growing population of Lehighton? Speaking of the amount expended on the structure now used as a school building brings to mind, in a manner, the expensive habits of the school directors of the long ago. That the creation of the school building on the hill was an unwise piece of business becomes more forcibly apparent every year as the repairs become more frequent. There is still a debt of some \$28,000 on the building, and long before that amount dwindles down into lesser figures an additional debt for a new school building will be upon us. So moves the world along.

—The communication which appeared in the CARBON ADVOCATE several weeks ago regarding the County Superintendent of Schools has been the source of considerable comment among our prominent citizens of late. The conversion of Horace D. Heydt's name into a probable candidate for the position has caused a very noticeable ripple of excitement in several quarters. Mr. Heydt is recognized here as a promising young lawyer, and having had the advantage of a superior education was in every respect qualified to fill the position with credit to himself and the county generally. Judging from the tenor of the communication which recently appeared in these columns, one is led to believe that the present incumbent will not be a candidate for reelection—whether he will or not we are unable to say. The election of a County Superintendent of Schools should not be a matter of political favor or political prejudice, but of fair, impartial action by the school directors of the county. If Mr. Heydt is deemed more worthy and intelligent, more capable and consistent than the present County Superintendent, it behooves the proper authorities to elect him in preference to the person now holding that office. The election of County Superintendent takes place some time during the month of May, and no doubt the question will be fully and satisfactorily discussed before the election of a new incumbent, and the result will be the election of a man who is deemed most capable and worthy for the position.

—Aroq Weidaw, long a respected resident of this place, and employed as an engineer on No. 80 Lehigh Valley freight, met an untimely and cruel fate near Bethlehem Saturday night. While looking out of the cab window to see if everything was all right in the vicinity of the numerous switches, his head came in contact with a post, embaring his skull, bruising and disfiguring his face in a horrible manner. When discovered Weidaw's body was found protruding half way through the cab window, the blood flowing in torrents down the side of the engine. He was taken to St. Luke's Hospital, South Bethlehem, where he died Sunday afternoon. Mr. Weidaw had been in the employ of the Lehigh Valley Company for many years, and was a faithful and efficient employee. He was buried in the Lehighton cemetery Wednesday afternoon, the funeral services being conducted by Rev. G. Grass and Subitt; a large concourse of sorrowing relatives and friends, including John D. Hertzelt Post, No. 484, G. A. R., of town, was a member, following the casket to their last resting place. Deceased served in the late war as a private in Company E, 28th Penna. Vols. He enlisted July 6, 1861, and was discharged on Surgeon's certificate May 31, 1862. He leaves a wife and six children to mourn the loss of a kind husband and an affectionate father. The family have the entire sympathy of the community in this hour of their bereavement.

—A preliminary meeting was held on Wednesday evening by an enterprising citizen for the purpose of considering the much talked of water question and the organization of a Board of Trade. B. F. Hofford was made chairman of the meeting and spoke in detail as to the water question, both the organization of a Board of Trade and a water company. John F. Semmel was elected secretary. Both questions were argued pro and con and a committee consisting of the following named gentlemen appointed to interview the town council and effect permanent organization of the Board of Trade: A. J. Durling, Wm. Kemmer, C. M. Sweeney, W. H. Nusbaum, M. O. Brian, Reuben Fenstermaker, Wm. Montz, E. H. Snyder and J. L. Gabel. We are pleased to note that a move has been made by our citizens in regard to the water question and also as regards the organization of a Board of Trade, and we sincerely hope that the gentlemen comprising the committee will spare no effort in pushing the objects in question to a success. Progression move on.

**Beat Paper Planting.**

The following letter, which we are permitted to copy, speaks for itself:

BETHLEHEM, Dec. 31, 1886.

MR. E. F. LUCKENBACH—MY DEAR SIR:—I have yours of the 30th inst. and bill for papering and painting my house, and it gives me a great deal of pleasure to say that the work was done to our entire satisfaction. The papering is very artistic—every one that has seen it admires it very much indeed, and this gives me the opportunity of saying to you, that you should feel proud of your work—it could not have been done better. Your bill is made out according to agreement and it is satisfactory to the work. Yours truly,

JOHN FAYLOR.

—All grades and styles of ladies Coatings, at prices to astonish the most economical buyer, at Claus & Bro., the Tailors; Bank street.

**People as They Come and Go.**

Our people who have relatives or friends visiting them will greatly oblige us by sending in their names and residence for publication under this head.—EDITH.

—A. L. Lutz, of Tanamung, was in town last week.

—R. D. Diehl and wife, of Bank street, spent Wednesday at Allentown.

—Mrs. Jacob Brownmiller, of town, spent several days at Mahanoy City last week.

—Miss Minnie Peters, of Bank street, spent several days at Fairview, Luzerne county, last week.

—Mrs. M. A. Weiss, of Wilkesbarre, was visiting relatives and friends here during the past week.

—Our young friend "Will Water at home" of "Pittston," was visiting "the folks at home" during this week.

—G. B. M. Stocker, of the Carbon House, circulated "amongst Wilkesbarre friends" several days last week.

—Mrs. Mary Darling, of San Francisco, Cal., is visiting her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Fred Miller, on Bank street.

—Miss Aggie Reichard, an estimable young lady of Northampton street, is visiting relatives and friends at Allentown.

—Oscar Schwartz and wife, of Lehighton, spent several days with his father, Wendal Schwartz, on Lehigh street, last week.

—Miss Maggie Strockel, of Statington, was sojourning with Miss Laura and Sallie Hoffer, on Bank street, during the week.

—Charles P. Shinzinger and wife, of Mahanoy City, spent several days with Daniel Walp and family on Bank street.

—The Diehl and family and Mrs. H. V. Morheimer of family spent last Tuesday with Mr. Diehl's parents in Townsensing township.

—A. Lincoln Albright and wife, of Philadelphia, were the guests of Enos Albright and family, on Lehigh street, during the past week.

—Hon. A. W. Raudenbush, returned home upon the adjournment of the State Legislature last week. He left for Harrisburg again this week in time to be present at the convening of the House.

—Rev. Mr. Stultz, the able pastor of the Reformed church, Lehighton, Pa., stopped off in Lehighton on his way to Easton, Girardville, this week. He was accompanied by his wife, who is a sister to Mrs. Reuben Jasper, of this town. Rev. Stultz spoke in the Reformed church on Monday evening before the missionary society and on Thursday evening he delivered an able sermon on prayer.—Weatherly Herald.

**OUR COUNTY COURTS.**

The January term of our county court convened in the Court House, at Mauch Chunk, on Monday morning with Judge Dreher and Associates present. The morning session was considerably taken up by the constables of the various towns and townships making their returns. There were twenty criminal cases on the docket for this week. The Grand Jury went out on Tuesday morning and remained in office, but for a brief part of the day. The afternoon was devoted principally to the consideration and granting of licenses. In the case of Fred Horlacher, of Statington, who sold intoxicating beverages on the Lehigh fair grounds last summer without a license; Horlacher was fined \$200 and the costs of prosecution. The first case Tuesday morning was a surety of the peace. Com. vs. James Gindler; prosecutors Amos Gindler and Thomas Ruch, school directors of East Penn township. Gindler was fined \$500 for the same. A Lancaster county man died recently from an overdose in whisky. Must be had "stuff" in that section.

—Daniel Miller who was shot by Howard Medler, of Mahanoy City, five weeks ago, died of his injuries last week.

—The McKeesport Galvanizing Works were destroyed by fire Monday, Dec. 29, 1886. The loss, it is estimated, is about \$100,000. The works will be rebuilt at once.

—A caboose on the Wilmington and Northern Railroad, north of West Chester, caught on fire and was burned to shreds.

—William Knapp, aged forty years, employed in a planing mill at Robersburg, Bradford county, was caught in the machinery and instantly killed on Saturday night.

—James Houston, aged twenty-six years, employed at the Coker Colliery, near Shenandoah, was instantly killed Friday afternoon. Houston was on the coal and iron conveyor, when he fell from the top of the same.

—The Italian who was stabbed at Harlick, Luzerne county, recently is lying at the point of death. His assailant has been arrested and is held in jail to await the result of the former's injuries.

—Governor Patton has appointed Lewis Moses sheriff of Chester county to fill the vacancy. The current term of Lewis Moses, who was killed on the Pennsylvania Railroad several weeks ago.

—Fannie Barlow, of Pittsburg, died recently. Her death is said to have been caused in which she was prostrated her head being in a beautiful basket amid flowers and surrounded by sorrowing friends.

—The current term of the National bank held at Lehighton, Pa., is in active revolt against the Central Railroad Company because of a peculiar method of running trains on the Nanticoke branch, which causes the merchants of Lehighton to suffer severely in consequence of the delay of their goods.

—An individual named Smith severely injured himself on the kind-hoofed residents of Northampton county. He was killed by the kind-hoofed residents of Northampton county.

—A Philadelphia laborer, named Perry, supposed to be worth \$200,000, was found frozen to death in the Erie river on Tuesday. A coroner's inquest was held and the body was buried in the Erie river.

—The Pennsylvania Railroad Company has completed thirty-two freight locomotives, weighing sixty tons each. They will have forty-five loaded cars each, against thirty-five cars by locomotives of the same weight.

—The new locomotives will be put in use. A hundred and forty-four dynamite cartridges were exploded on Saturday last on the Erie river, Philadelphia. The blast was blown fifty feet and killed. The cause of the explosion is unknown. Thousands of windows were broken in the neighborhood. A panic followed among the people living in the neighborhood. The shock was felt in Germantown, Mahanoy, Norristown and adjoining towns.

—The Pennsylvania Railroad Company has completed thirty-two freight locomotives, weighing sixty tons each. They will have forty-five loaded cars each, against thirty-five cars by locomotives of the same weight.

—The new locomotives will be put in use. A hundred and forty-four dynamite cartridges were exploded on Saturday last on the Erie river, Philadelphia. The blast was blown fifty feet and killed. The cause of the explosion is unknown. Thousands of windows were broken in the neighborhood. A panic followed among the people living in the neighborhood. The shock was felt in Germantown, Mahanoy, Norristown and adjoining towns.

**TOPICS DISCUSSED "Over the River."**

—At New Haven, Conn., on Saturday, Judge Pickett rendered a decision in the case of the Superintendent of the New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad who was accused of conspiracy by one Thomas Meany, who charged him with "blacklisting" him. The party accused was fined \$100. The Judge, in his decision, said that he was clearly of the opinion that a conspiracy designed to hinder any man from putting his labor on the market, when, where and for such compensation as he may agree for, is equally criminal with an conspiracy designed to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any other form of conspiracy, except that to take life. To convict of such conspiracy, circumstantial evidence is competent and may be conclusive. It is sufficient if it is shown that the parties had a mutual understanding to the common design and the part each was to perform in the attainment thereof. The Court is satisfied that Wallace and Ojady had a mutual understanding that a man not approved by one should not be employed by the other. This was to all intents and purposes a boycott upon the individuals. This should not be held as a conspiracy, but as a conspiracy to hinder the sale of goods to anyone, and that such a conspiracy, and is more disastrous in effect than any