

The Lancaster Intelligencer.

Volume XIX--No 14.

LANCASTER, PA., SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 1882.

Price Two Cents.

A CLOTH SEASON.

Recognized authorities admit that more CLOTHS will be worn during the coming FALL and WINTER than ever before. Particularly LADIES and CHILDREN. Based upon these facts, our importations and purchases have been very large.

Special attention is invited to our lines of LADIES' DRESS CLOTHS, which we have in all grades of domestic and imported fabrics, in over one hundred shades and colorings, including all the latest and newest designs.

FALL SAOQUEINGS AND WINTER CLOAKINGS, For Ladies, Misses and Children.

VELVETEENS, For Ladies' Suits and Skirts, and Heavy TWILLED VELVETEENS for BOYS' SUITS.

HANDSOME IMPORTED CLOTHS, For Ladies' Wraps, Suits, Bedding, etc. Mantles, etc.

BUYERS OF CLOAKINGS will please note that we have very handsome assortments of new PLESHIES, in all lengths of pile, from the short Molekin Plush to the long-napped Mohair goods, to match the various shades of cloth, for TRIMMINGS.

OF THE SEAL-SKIN CLOTHS, that are now daily arriving, we will speak in our next advertisement.

MEN'S WEAR—Gentlemen's Suits take a wide range this season, and our selections include most of the handsome and durable styles. Our special lines for dress and business suits, and our fine TROUSERS, are well worth examination by intending buyers.

PURCHASERS will find our prices more advantageous than for the same fabrics at any other establishment. Dealing exclusively in WOOLENS, our facilities for buying all kinds of cloths are better than the varied interests of other houses will allow.

SAMPLES are cheerfully sent, with prices and widths, on request, and MAIL ORDERS are filled EXACTLY, and to the satisfaction of the customer.

SNODGRASS, MURRAY & CO., CLOTH HOUSE, Market and Ninth Streets, Philadelphia.

AUTUMN CLOTHING.

FALL OVERCOAT.

A. C. YATES & CO., LEDGER BUILDING, CHESTNUT AND SIXTH STS., PHILADELPHIA.

WATER CLOSETS AND BATH TUBS, Iron and Wooden Hydrants, Plumbers' Earthenware, Gas and Steam Fitters' Supplies, Gas Fixtures at Reduced Prices, Plumbers' Supplies, Tinners' Supplies, SLATE ROOFING.

JOHN L. ARNOLD, Wines and Liquors.

S. CLAY MILLER, Wines, Brandies, Gins, Old Rye Whiskies, &c., No. 33 PENN SQUARE, LANCASTER, PA.

GIBSON'S WHISKY BOTTLED A SPECIALTY.

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE, NEW BUILDING, 9-11 SOUTH QUEEN ST., MARSHALL & RENGIER, DEALERS IN BUILDING AND CABINET HARDWARE, STOVES, HEATERS, RANGES, PAINTS, OILS and GLASS, House Furnishing Goods, CARPETS.

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE, ACADEMY FOR YOUNG MEN AND BOYS, MEDIA, PENN., 12 Miles from Philadelphia. SCHOOL YEAR OPENS SEPTEMBER 12.

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE, ACADEMY FOR YOUNG MEN AND BOYS, MEDIA, PENN., 12 Miles from Philadelphia. SCHOOL YEAR OPENS SEPTEMBER 12.

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE, ACADEMY FOR YOUNG MEN AND BOYS, MEDIA, PENN., 12 Miles from Philadelphia. SCHOOL YEAR OPENS SEPTEMBER 12.

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE, ACADEMY FOR YOUNG MEN AND BOYS, MEDIA, PENN., 12 Miles from Philadelphia. SCHOOL YEAR OPENS SEPTEMBER 12.

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE, ACADEMY FOR YOUNG MEN AND BOYS, MEDIA, PENN., 12 Miles from Philadelphia. SCHOOL YEAR OPENS SEPTEMBER 12.

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE, ACADEMY FOR YOUNG MEN AND BOYS, MEDIA, PENN., 12 Miles from Philadelphia. SCHOOL YEAR OPENS SEPTEMBER 12.

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE, ACADEMY FOR YOUNG MEN AND BOYS, MEDIA, PENN., 12 Miles from Philadelphia. SCHOOL YEAR OPENS SEPTEMBER 12.

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE, ACADEMY FOR YOUNG MEN AND BOYS, MEDIA, PENN., 12 Miles from Philadelphia. SCHOOL YEAR OPENS SEPTEMBER 12.

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE, ACADEMY FOR YOUNG MEN AND BOYS, MEDIA, PENN., 12 Miles from Philadelphia. SCHOOL YEAR OPENS SEPTEMBER 12.

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE, ACADEMY FOR YOUNG MEN AND BOYS, MEDIA, PENN., 12 Miles from Philadelphia. SCHOOL YEAR OPENS SEPTEMBER 12.

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE, ACADEMY FOR YOUNG MEN AND BOYS, MEDIA, PENN., 12 Miles from Philadelphia. SCHOOL YEAR OPENS SEPTEMBER 12.

CLOTHING! CLOTHING!

D. B. HOSTETTER & SON, No. 24 Centre Square.

A RARE CHANCE TO BUY WELL-MADE CLOTHING AT LESS THAN COST.

We must close out the balance of our SPRING AND SUMMER STOCK

—BY— SEPTEMBER 1st,

There are many about to purchase should call on us for bargains.

Along with this Closing Sale are many Garments suitable for

FALL AND WINTER WEAR.

Remember our All-Wool Suits for Men at \$10.00 is still the best as to Style and Quality.

D. B. Hostetter & Son, 24 CENTRE SQUARE, LANCASTER, PA.

H. GERHART'S Tailoring Establishment, NO. 6 EAST KING STREET.

I hereby inform my customers that my stock of

SPRING AND SUMMER SUITING, SPRING OVERCOATING & FANCY VESTING

is now complete. I have now the largest and choicest assortment of

WOOLENS.

H. GERHART.

BOYS' SCHOOL SUITS.

AL. ROSENSTEIN'S ONE PRICE HOUSE, NO. 37 NORTH QUEEN STREET.

Having a large assortment of Boys' School Suits on hand I will dispose of them at prices far below their value in order to close them out.

The suits are all made of pure Woolen Goods, well made and handsomely trimmed, and will be sold at very low prices; call and see them.

MERCHANT TAILORING DEPARTMENT.—Having in my employ one of the best cutters in the state I can guarantee a perfect fit.

Call and examine the latest styles of FALL AND WINTER GOODS. They are now ready and can be seen at

Al. Rosenstein's, Merchant Tailor and Clothier, 37 North Queen Street, Lancaster.

CARRIAGES, ETC. THE STANDARD CARRIAGE WORK OF LANCASTER COUNTY, EDGERLEY & Co., FINE CARRIAGE BUILDERS, MARKET STREET, Rear of Central Market Houses, LANCASTER, PENN.

We make every style Buggy and Carriage elegant. All work finished in the most comfortable and elegant style. We use only the best selected material, and employ only the best mechanics. For quality of work our prices are the cheapest in the state. We buy for cash and sell on the most reasonable terms. Give us a call. All work warranted. Repairing promptly attended to. One set of workmen especially employed for that purpose.

THE VERDICT SET ASIDE.

THE GOVERNMENT DOES NOT RESIST.

Miner and Rerdell, the convicted Star Route Complotors, Granted a New Trial and Released on Bail.

There were few spectators present when Judge Wylie's criminal court was called to order at 10 o'clock, Friday morning.

Miner and Rerdell, in the custody of the bailiffs, were early in attendance, but the court on either side were late in making their appearance.

Mr. Henkle, the counsel for Miner, filed with the clerk of the court various affidavits upon which he based his motion for a new trial. He then stated that he had called on Mr. Holmead, one of the Star Route jurors, in order to secure an affidavit as to the attempts made to corrupt him.

Mr. Holmead has stated that he had already filed an affidavit in the District Attorney's office and that Assistant District Attorney Moore declined to give him a copy.

Mr. Merrick—I have had no opportunity of personal communication with the attorney general, but in any emergency arising in a case his counsel must perform his duty for him and take the responsibility. Neither have I had much opportunity of communicating with Messrs. Ker and Bliss. I had some motions on file for a new trial in the case of the convicted defendants, accompanied by statements of a variety of reasons and by some affidavits. Among the reasons is one, namely, that the verdict is unreasonable.

As counsel for the government of the United States I am not disposed to put on file a consent to the granting of the motion; but my counsel for the United States feel it to be my duty not to oppose it. The government of the United States itself is not entirely satisfied by any means with this verdict. It is a verdict which subjects the masters to a retrial and convicts the servants and minions. The jury presumably found evidence of a conspiracy to defraud the United States of an overt act, so as to create a completed crime under the statutes of the United States. That having been found by the jury prior to their determination of a conviction of guilt, the government of the United States cannot consistently with its dignity object, by practical resistance, to the motion made to set aside such a verdict, and bring to trial the defendants again, and so forth, in order that full justice may be done.

The government of the United States seeks no victim. It seeks simply justice, and when a verdict apparently trifles with justice it cannot meet the full approval of the government of the United States. With these brief remarks the government consented to leave the subject of this motion to the discretion of the court, not consenting, but not resisting, hoping for the purity of its records, resolved on the prosecution of criminals to the fullest extent, and trusting that whatever your honor may decide or witnesses may hereafter come, full justice will in the end be done.

Mr. Henkle read the grounds upon which he based his motion for a new trial, stating, however, that he had taken no evidence except the affidavits of jurors upon the ground, "Misbehavior of the jury."

Mr. Merrick stated that he had looked over the affidavits and had seen none that had alleged the fact that Dickson had related to the other jurors the circumstances attending the alleged attempt to bribe him, notwithstanding his honor's directions to the contrary.

Mr. Henkle—One of the jurors said to me that the jury had been polled they would have said that that was not their verdict.

Mr. Merrick—The verdict rendered by the jury is perfectly consistent with logic and correct principle as so far as the nine are concerned who voted consistently "Guilty as to all." Their principle was right. The logic from that principle was right. The others may reconcile it as best they can.

Mr. Henkle—I concede that. Mr. Henkle then read Foreman Dickson's sworn statement, which has been already published.

Mr. Merrick stated whether Dickson had not said that he did not believe that Bowen was authorized to make the offer?

Mr. Henkle said that he had not conversed with Dickson; but Mr. Carpenter admitted that such was the fact.

The court stated that he had directed the jury not to converse on the subject of the alleged bribery. Whether or not the jury had transgressed the rule laid down by the court, did not appear from Mr. Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Henkle said that he would appear in Mr. Henkle's affidavit. He then went on to argue that the verdict should be set aside upon the evidence contained in Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Merrick said that he would resist setting aside the verdict on that ground.

The court stated that he had directed the jury not to converse on the subject of the alleged bribery. Whether or not the jury had transgressed the rule laid down by the court, did not appear from Mr. Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Henkle said that he would appear in Mr. Henkle's affidavit. He then went on to argue that the verdict should be set aside upon the evidence contained in Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Merrick said that he would resist setting aside the verdict on that ground.

The court stated that he had directed the jury not to converse on the subject of the alleged bribery. Whether or not the jury had transgressed the rule laid down by the court, did not appear from Mr. Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Henkle said that he would appear in Mr. Henkle's affidavit. He then went on to argue that the verdict should be set aside upon the evidence contained in Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Merrick said that he would resist setting aside the verdict on that ground.

The court stated that he had directed the jury not to converse on the subject of the alleged bribery. Whether or not the jury had transgressed the rule laid down by the court, did not appear from Mr. Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Henkle said that he would appear in Mr. Henkle's affidavit. He then went on to argue that the verdict should be set aside upon the evidence contained in Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Merrick said that he would resist setting aside the verdict on that ground.

The court stated that he had directed the jury not to converse on the subject of the alleged bribery. Whether or not the jury had transgressed the rule laid down by the court, did not appear from Mr. Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Henkle said that he would appear in Mr. Henkle's affidavit. He then went on to argue that the verdict should be set aside upon the evidence contained in Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Merrick said that he would resist setting aside the verdict on that ground.

The court stated that he had directed the jury not to converse on the subject of the alleged bribery. Whether or not the jury had transgressed the rule laid down by the court, did not appear from Mr. Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Henkle said that he would appear in Mr. Henkle's affidavit. He then went on to argue that the verdict should be set aside upon the evidence contained in Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Merrick said that he would resist setting aside the verdict on that ground.

The court stated that he had directed the jury not to converse on the subject of the alleged bribery. Whether or not the jury had transgressed the rule laid down by the court, did not appear from Mr. Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Henkle said that he would appear in Mr. Henkle's affidavit. He then went on to argue that the verdict should be set aside upon the evidence contained in Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Merrick said that he would resist setting aside the verdict on that ground.

THE VERDICT SET ASIDE.

THE GOVERNMENT DOES NOT RESIST.

Miner and Rerdell, the convicted Star Route Complotors, Granted a New Trial and Released on Bail.

There were few spectators present when Judge Wylie's criminal court was called to order at 10 o'clock, Friday morning.

Miner and Rerdell, in the custody of the bailiffs, were early in attendance, but the court on either side were late in making their appearance.

Mr. Henkle, the counsel for Miner, filed with the clerk of the court various affidavits upon which he based his motion for a new trial. He then stated that he had called on Mr. Holmead, one of the Star Route jurors, in order to secure an affidavit as to the attempts made to corrupt him.

Mr. Holmead has stated that he had already filed an affidavit in the District Attorney's office and that Assistant District Attorney Moore declined to give him a copy.

Mr. Merrick—I have had no opportunity of personal communication with the attorney general, but in any emergency arising in a case his counsel must perform his duty for him and take the responsibility. Neither have I had much opportunity of communicating with Messrs. Ker and Bliss. I had some motions on file for a new trial in the case of the convicted defendants, accompanied by statements of a variety of reasons and by some affidavits. Among the reasons is one, namely, that the verdict is unreasonable.

As counsel for the government of the United States I am not disposed to put on file a consent to the granting of the motion; but my counsel for the United States feel it to be my duty not to oppose it. The government of the United States itself is not entirely satisfied by any means with this verdict. It is a verdict which subjects the masters to a retrial and convicts the servants and minions. The jury presumably found evidence of a conspiracy to defraud the United States of an overt act, so as to create a completed crime under the statutes of the United States. That having been found by the jury prior to their determination of a conviction of guilt, the government of the United States cannot consistently with its dignity object, by practical resistance, to the motion made to set aside such a verdict, and bring to trial the defendants again, and so forth, in order that full justice may be done.

The government of the United States seeks no victim. It seeks simply justice, and when a verdict apparently trifles with justice it cannot meet the full approval of the government of the United States. With these brief remarks the government consented to leave the subject of this motion to the discretion of the court, not consenting, but not resisting, hoping for the purity of its records, resolved on the prosecution of criminals to the fullest extent, and trusting that whatever your honor may decide or witnesses may hereafter come, full justice will in the end be done.

Mr. Henkle read the grounds upon which he based his motion for a new trial, stating, however, that he had taken no evidence except the affidavits of jurors upon the ground, "Misbehavior of the jury."

Mr. Merrick stated that he had looked over the affidavits and had seen none that had alleged the fact that Dickson had related to the other jurors the circumstances attending the alleged attempt to bribe him, notwithstanding his honor's directions to the contrary.

Mr. Henkle—One of the jurors said to me that the jury had been polled they would have said that that was not their verdict.

Mr. Merrick—The verdict rendered by the jury is perfectly consistent with logic and correct principle as so far as the nine are concerned who voted consistently "Guilty as to all." Their principle was right. The logic from that principle was right. The others may reconcile it as best they can.

Mr. Henkle—I concede that. Mr. Henkle then read Foreman Dickson's sworn statement, which has been already published.

Mr. Merrick stated whether Dickson had not said that he did not believe that Bowen was authorized to make the offer?

Mr. Henkle said that he had not conversed with Dickson; but Mr. Carpenter admitted that such was the fact.

The court stated that he had directed the jury not to converse on the subject of the alleged bribery. Whether or not the jury had transgressed the rule laid down by the court, did not appear from Mr. Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Henkle said that he would appear in Mr. Henkle's affidavit. He then went on to argue that the verdict should be set aside upon the evidence contained in Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Merrick said that he would resist setting aside the verdict on that ground.

The court stated that he had directed the jury not to converse on the subject of the alleged bribery. Whether or not the jury had transgressed the rule laid down by the court, did not appear from Mr. Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Henkle said that he would appear in Mr. Henkle's affidavit. He then went on to argue that the verdict should be set aside upon the evidence contained in Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Merrick said that he would resist setting aside the verdict on that ground.

The court stated that he had directed the jury not to converse on the subject of the alleged bribery. Whether or not the jury had transgressed the rule laid down by the court, did not appear from Mr. Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Henkle said that he would appear in Mr. Henkle's affidavit. He then went on to argue that the verdict should be set aside upon the evidence contained in Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Merrick said that he would resist setting aside the verdict on that ground.

The court stated that he had directed the jury not to converse on the subject of the alleged bribery. Whether or not the jury had transgressed the rule laid down by the court, did not appear from Mr. Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Henkle said that he would appear in Mr. Henkle's affidavit. He then went on to argue that the verdict should be set aside upon the evidence contained in Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Merrick said that he would resist setting aside the verdict on that ground.

The court stated that he had directed the jury not to converse on the subject of the alleged bribery. Whether or not the jury had transgressed the rule laid down by the court, did not appear from Mr. Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Henkle said that he would appear in Mr. Henkle's affidavit. He then went on to argue that the verdict should be set aside upon the evidence contained in Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Merrick said that he would resist setting aside the verdict on that ground.

The court stated that he had directed the jury not to converse on the subject of the alleged bribery. Whether or not the jury had transgressed the rule laid down by the court, did not appear from Mr. Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Henkle said that he would appear in Mr. Henkle's affidavit. He then went on to argue that the verdict should be set aside upon the evidence contained in Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Merrick said that he would resist setting aside the verdict on that ground.

The court stated that he had directed the jury not to converse on the subject of the alleged bribery. Whether or not the jury had transgressed the rule laid down by the court, did not appear from Mr. Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Henkle said that he would appear in Mr. Henkle's affidavit. He then went on to argue that the verdict should be set aside upon the evidence contained in Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Merrick said that he would resist setting aside the verdict on that ground.

THE VERDICT SET ASIDE.

THE GOVERNMENT DOES NOT RESIST.

Miner and Rerdell, the convicted Star Route Complotors, Granted a New Trial and Released on Bail.

There were few spectators present when Judge Wylie's criminal court was called to order at 10 o'clock, Friday morning.

Miner and Rerdell, in the custody of the bailiffs, were early in attendance, but the court on either side were late in making their appearance.

Mr. Henkle, the counsel for Miner, filed with the clerk of the court various affidavits upon which he based his motion for a new trial. He then stated that he had called on Mr. Holmead, one of the Star Route jurors, in order to secure an affidavit as to the attempts made to corrupt him.

Mr. Holmead has stated that he had already filed an affidavit in the District Attorney's office and that Assistant District Attorney Moore declined to give him a copy.

Mr. Merrick—I have had no opportunity of personal communication with the attorney general, but in any emergency arising in a case his counsel must perform his duty for him and take the responsibility. Neither have I had much opportunity of communicating with Messrs. Ker and Bliss. I had some motions on file for a new trial in the case of the convicted defendants, accompanied by statements of a variety of reasons and by some affidavits. Among the reasons is one, namely, that the verdict is unreasonable.

As counsel for the government of the United States I am not disposed to put on file a consent to the granting of the motion; but my counsel for the United States feel it to be my duty not to oppose it. The government of the United States itself is not entirely satisfied by any means with this verdict. It is a verdict which subjects the masters to a retrial and convicts the servants and minions. The jury presumably found evidence of a conspiracy to defraud the United States of an overt act, so as to create a completed crime under the statutes of the United States. That having been found by the jury prior to their determination of a conviction of guilt, the government of the United States cannot consistently with its dignity object, by practical resistance, to the motion made to set aside such a verdict, and bring to trial the defendants again, and so forth, in order that full justice may be done.

The government of the United States seeks no victim. It seeks simply justice, and when a verdict apparently trifles with justice it cannot meet the full approval of the government of the United States. With these brief remarks the government consented to leave the subject of this motion to the discretion of the court, not consenting, but not resisting, hoping for the purity of its records, resolved on the prosecution of criminals to the fullest extent, and trusting that whatever your honor may decide or witnesses may hereafter come, full justice will in the end be done.

Mr. Henkle read the grounds upon which he based his motion for a new trial, stating, however, that he had taken no evidence except the affidavits of jurors upon the ground, "Misbehavior of the jury."

Mr. Merrick stated that he had looked over the affidavits and had seen none that had alleged the fact that Dickson had related to the other jurors the circumstances attending the alleged attempt to bribe him, notwithstanding his honor's directions to the contrary.

Mr. Henkle—One of the jurors said to me that the jury had been polled they would have said that that was not their verdict.

Mr. Merrick—The verdict rendered by the jury is perfectly consistent with logic and correct principle as so far as the nine are concerned who voted consistently "Guilty as to all." Their principle was right. The logic from that principle was right. The others may reconcile it as best they can.

Mr. Henkle—I concede that. Mr. Henkle then read Foreman Dickson's sworn statement, which has been already published.

Mr. Merrick stated whether Dickson had not said that he did not believe that Bowen was authorized to make the offer?

Mr. Henkle said that he had not conversed with Dickson; but Mr. Carpenter admitted that such was the fact.

The court stated that he had directed the jury not to converse on the subject of the alleged bribery. Whether or not the jury had transgressed the rule laid down by the court, did not appear from Mr. Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Henkle said that he would appear in Mr. Henkle's affidavit. He then went on to argue that the verdict should be set aside upon the evidence contained in Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Merrick said that he would resist setting aside the verdict on that ground.

The court stated that he had directed the jury not to converse on the subject of the alleged bribery. Whether or not the jury had transgressed the rule laid down by the court, did not appear from Mr. Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Henkle said that he would appear in Mr. Henkle's affidavit. He then went on to argue that the verdict should be set aside upon the evidence contained in Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Merrick said that he would resist setting aside the verdict on that ground.

The court stated that he had directed the jury not to converse on the subject of the alleged bribery. Whether or not the jury had transgressed the rule laid down by the court, did not appear from Mr. Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Henkle said that he would appear in Mr. Henkle's affidavit. He then went on to argue that the verdict should be set aside upon the evidence contained in Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Merrick said that he would resist setting aside the verdict on that ground.

The court stated that he had directed the jury not to converse on the subject of the alleged bribery. Whether or not the jury had transgressed the rule laid down by the court, did not appear from Mr. Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Henkle said that he would appear in Mr. Henkle's affidavit. He then went on to argue that the verdict should be set aside upon the evidence contained in Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Merrick said that he would resist setting aside the verdict on that ground.

The court stated that he had directed the jury not to converse on the subject of the alleged bribery. Whether or not the jury had transgressed the rule laid down by the court, did not appear from Mr. Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Henkle said that he would appear in Mr. Henkle's affidavit. He then went on to argue that the verdict should be set aside upon the evidence contained in Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Merrick said that he would resist setting aside the verdict on that ground.

The court stated that he had directed the jury not to converse on the subject of the alleged bribery. Whether or not the jury had transgressed the rule laid down by the court, did not appear from Mr. Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Henkle said that he would appear in Mr. Henkle's affidavit. He then went on to argue that the verdict should be set aside upon the evidence contained in Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Merrick said that he would resist setting aside the verdict on that ground.

The court stated that he had directed the jury not to converse on the subject of the alleged bribery. Whether or not the jury had transgressed the rule laid down by the court, did not appear from Mr. Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Henkle said that he would appear in Mr. Henkle's affidavit. He then went on to argue that the verdict should be set aside upon the evidence contained in Dickson's affidavit.

Mr. Merrick said that he would resist setting aside the verdict on that ground.

MEDICAL. BROWN'S IRON BITTERS.

BROWN'S IRON BITTERS

will cure dyspepsia, heartburn, malaria, kidney disease, liver complaint, and other wasting diseases.

By asking too much we may lose the little that we had before. "Kidney-Wort" asks nothing but a fair trial. This gives it no less a chance of success than any other medicine. It is a fair trial. It is a fair trial. It