

TOBACCO NEWS.

LOCAL TRANSACTIONS OF THE PAST WEEK.

How a Victim Had Caught the Tale of a Crop in the Lower East—Trade Improving in the New York, Philadelphia and Other District Markets.

The week has passed without any special local event. A large number of buyers, both foreign and domestic, are in the field picking up the crop, but there is no excitement for the moment.

Our Millersville correspondent reports the following sales for this week: Benjamin Eschleman, of Millersville, sold to Herschke, 15 cases of Havana tobacco at 18 1/2; Henry Hough, of Millersville, sold to Herschke, 15 cases of Havana at 17 1/2.

From the southern townships the following sales are reported: To John Schner, Mr. Lennox, of Part, 1, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100.

To Oppenheimer—J. T. August, Drummer, 1 case, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100.

To Oppenheimer—J. T. August, Drummer, 1 case, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100.

To Oppenheimer—J. T. August, Drummer, 1 case, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100.

To Oppenheimer—J. T. August, Drummer, 1 case, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100.

To Oppenheimer—J. T. August, Drummer, 1 case, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100.

To Oppenheimer—J. T. August, Drummer, 1 case, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100.

To Oppenheimer—J. T. August, Drummer, 1 case, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100.

To Oppenheimer—J. T. August, Drummer, 1 case, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100.

To Oppenheimer—J. T. August, Drummer, 1 case, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100.

To Oppenheimer—J. T. August, Drummer, 1 case, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100.

To Oppenheimer—J. T. August, Drummer, 1 case, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100.

THE AFGHAN WAR CLOUD.

RUSSIA CONCENTRATING TROOPS IN CENTRAL ASIA.

The Moscow Telegram to the London Times says the Russian government has sent an official order to England to withdraw the Russian frontier from the hills bordering on Herat, but states that it will not retire the troops from the positions occupied at Herat or Peshawar, which Russia claims are essential to an effective hold on the Turkmenistan.

Late advices show that there can be no doubt that Russia is rapidly concentrating troops in Central Asia. An active dislocation or breaking up of the smaller scattered and unimportant military posts is progressing, and the main body of troops is being sent to the Central Asian batteries, and troops are moving in from the Caucasus.

Sir Peter Lumsden, British commissioner on the Afghan frontier question, and his surviving family have been ordered to leave the Persian territory. Sir Peter has sent to Meshed, the capital of Khorassan, for a large amount of supplies. Several members of his commission have taken quarters in Meshed.

The Afghan frontier question is the principal topic of discussion in London at the moment. It is expressed as a result. All classes are satisfied with the determined attitude of the English cabinet, and there is a remarkable unanimity of opinion throughout the country.

The reported project to send a Russian army from Baku to the Afghan frontier was grossly exaggerated. The number proposed is not 35,000 men, but 5,000.

A COMPROMISE PROPOSED. Mr. Lassar has been instructed to remain in London another week. Sir Peter Lumsden has been instructed to withdraw the Afghan forces from Peshawar. M. DeGiers, Russian minister of foreign affairs, has offered to withdraw the Russian troops from Herat and Akrotai during the deliberations of the frontier commission, provided Earl Granville accepts the principles of delimitation proposed through the Russian agent.

Letters from Madeira state that advices from the West coast of Africa to the effect that the German flag was hoisted at the head of Ambos Bay, adjoining on the South the Cape Verde Islands, were the English consul, protested against such an act, but his opposition was unheeded.

THE CHAMBERSBURG MYSTERY. Identification of the Young Girl and Her Mother as a West Chester Girl. The mystery surrounding the disappearance of the young woman who died at Chambersburg, Penn., on Friday night of pueral fever, and whose death gave rise to so much speculation and rumor, was made plain by the identification of the young woman and the girl who was found in the trunk of a trunk at West Chester, Penn. A special dispatch from West Chester, Pa., says: "This evening the funeral services attending the burial of Miss Williams, took place at the residence of Dr. J. W. Warren, in that place. Owing to the popularity of the young woman and the sad as well as somewhat mysterious circumstances attending her death, the attendance at the service was very large, and the many tearful eyes and sad faces indexed the feelings of those present.

AGAINST FREIGHT DISCRIMINATION. The Millers and Grain Shippers of Lancaster County for the Enforcement of the Constitution. At the Monday meeting of the board of the Commercial Exchange of Lancaster, Pa., D. B. Landis, president, and J. T. Uible, secretary—the following preamble and resolution were passed:

WHEREAS, The Commercial Exchange of Lancaster, notices with satisfaction an agitation in this county, looking towards legislation for preventing discrimination in freight rates for the benefit of the few as against the many; and whereas, the representatives of the business interests of Lancaster county, a county first in agricultural importance, and second in population, feeling that we need legislative protection in the matter and believing in this belief, we have petitioned the legislature for such anti-discrimination laws as shall put in force the provisions of the new constitution formulated by the people of this Commonwealth, and nearly unanimously adopted two years ago, which specially provides against discrimination in rates of freight by railroad companies.

Four Terrific Fatalities. While Mrs. Jane Stoppa was at church in Pennsylvania, Sunday night, her three little boys, the eldest being four years of age, perished by the burning of her house. Four men were drowned at Minocock Landing, Louisiana, on Saturday. A fire broke out on the Red river in an overworked skiff. While Joseph Bohling was making some repairs on the roof of his house at Cambridge, Monday evening, he caught hold of an electric light wire and was instantly killed by the shock.

What Tomorrow's Spring Comes. Joe Emmet came out of the Pittsburgh hospital Monday afternoon to be confronted by an officer of the court with a precept in a suit for damages, instituted by John Elliser, manager of the opera house. "Frits" got naturally excited, and, after an hour later called at the opera house, and affected a complimentary air. The amount paid him is given variously at from \$1,200 to \$3,000. In the evening he started for Albany, N. Y. A reporter he said he would not appear again this season, but to another he declared he would be on the boards again in a week. He is now in the city, and is reported in Pittsburgh under pay until further notice.

Parasitic Loss. On Saturday evening a party of amateur variety artists from the city swooped down upon Paradise and gave an entertainment. They were not greeted by an overflowing house and the receipts did not cover the expenses by \$10. The manager is not discouraged. He says that they were put to a heavy expense by hiring a bus, but when the warm season opens they will walk from town to town.

Wm. Boone had a hearing last evening before Alderman Sturrier on the charge of stealing laundry from Isaac Hinehart. He was held for trial at court.

SALAMINA OF COUNTY OFFICIALS.

An Important Test Case Won by the Recorder of Luzerne County.

As early as last September the sheriff, recorder and register of Luzerne county, put their heads together and agreed that as Luzerne county had a population of over 150,000 they were entitled to be paid under the act of March 31, 1874, which provides a distinct salary, instead of that of June 22, 1883. In order to test the matter the recorder, for the month of January, presented his bill to the county commissioners, asking to be paid under the act of 1874. The commissioners refused to comply with his request. It was then agreed that the matter should be laid before Judge Rice for his consideration. After hearing argument on both sides Judge Rice rendered an opinion on Monday, giving judgment in favor of the recorder.

Judge Rice says the admitted facts are that the county had a population, when the recorder went into office, of 150,000, and the ratio of taxables to population according to the 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 taxables, and that the ratio of 1880 census being applied in ascertaining the population for the purpose of the act of 1874—the only known number—in 1883. The commissioners held, however, that this is not proof and asked the court to decide. It is decided by Judge Rice that the ratio admitted that when the plaintiff entered upon the duties of his office the county contained 150,000 tax