THE LANCASTER WEEKLY INTELLIGENCER, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 22 1869.

Local Intelligence.

Court of Common Pleas.

Thursday Morning, Dec. 16.—Court met at 10 o'clock, Judges Hayes and Libhart on the bench. The first case called for trial was James M. Pettit vs. Charles E. Smith, being one of three suits against the President of the Reading Railroad Company for claims amounting on the aggregate to $140,000 on account of an appropriation, by the company of property belonging to James M. Pettit, Richard Baldridge, and James B. Minnich and Henry G. Brummer, Jr., (executors of George Minnich deceased,) all of whom are charged with having defrauded the Railroad Company in their capacity as conductors. The venue in these actions was changed from Schuylkill county to Lancaster, by special act of Assembly.

The following named jurors were empanneled to try the case:

George High, John Zimmerman, Wm. H. Keath, Sam'l Welsh, Joseph Engle, Cooper Stubbs, Jacob Kohr, Washington Righter, W. G. Bender, Henry Umble, Jr., James Davis, George Buckwalter.

The following named gentlemen appear as counsel. For plaintiff, Jacob Hoffman, Esq , of Reading, George Kaercher, Esq., of Pottsville and N. Ellmaker, Esq., of this city. For defendants, F. B. Gowan Esq., of Philadelphia, Hon. John C. Kunkel of Harrisburg, Thomas Hart, Esq., of Philadelphia and H. M. North, Esq., of Columbia.

The case was opened for plaintiff in a speech by Jacob Hoffman, Esq., of Reading.

Mr. James M. Pettit testified as follows: On the 29th of September 1863, I received a note from Mr. Nichols to call at 1 P. M. at the Co's. office in S 4th street, Philadelphia. Signed, truly yours, I. A. Nichols. I went to the office at that time and was shown in by Mr. Nichols. After I got inside the door was shut; there was a table in the room. Mr. Smith was seated on one side of the table, and Mr. Nichols handed me a chair to sit down on the other side, he also taking a seat at the table. There was a man in the room where we were that I did not know. Mr. Smith looking over some papers, said Mr. Pettit we have charges against you which can be refuted by reliable persons. Mr. Nichols said, yes, Mr. Pettit, the proof is positive and undeniable, and strong enough to hang you. Mr. Smith then said you have been on the road over seven years and you have taken from the company $42,000 at a low estimate. Mr. Nichols then said we have had detectives on the road for the last three months, and the proof is positive. Mr. Smith said if you do not pay the money we demand of you, you've got to go from this office to jail. Mr. Smith then left the room. Mr. Nichols then said that I had better pay over the money; that my friends would all advise me to do so, and that he as a friend would advise me to do the same. I asked Mr. Nichols if he would let me go out and see a friend and I would be back in half an hour. He said I could not leave the office till I had made that settlement. If I did not settle I would have to go to prison from that office. Look at the disgrace that will be brought on your family by going to prison. I told Mr. Nichols and Mr. Smith each time I went to settle that I had not one dime of the company's money and did not owe them anything. Mr. Smith again came in and asked me if I was going to pay over the money I had taken from the company. I told him I had none of the company's money and would not pay them any. He asked me what I had done with the money I was charged with taking. I told him I had no money belonging to the company. He then asked me who my broker was. I told him Mr. Fox, 34 street, below Market. He asked me to write him an order to Mr. Fox to show him my account in his books. I refused to do so. He then went to the other side of the room, and spoke to the man I didn't know. The man came up to me and said "I must search you." He took my port monnaie and counted the money in it, and looked at 5 coupons I had in it cut by the Camden and Amboy railroad, Oct. 1863. He then took out my watch and looked at it, and then left me all over, my coat and pockets, and gave the watch to me. I then asked Mr. Smith if he would let me go to the water closet? He let me go but sent with me that man that was in the office. After I had returned, Mr. Smith asked me if I was going to give him the order for Mr. Fox. I said no. He then said from this room to prison you must go. Mr Nichols then said I had better give him an order to Mr. Fox. After some conversation between us, Mr. Nichols wrote an order and I signed it. Mr. Smith came in and got it and left the room and was gone half an hour or more before he returned. He said that he had seen Mr. Fox's books and knew all I had in bonds, and if I would pay them over $30,000 they would leave me off, and if I did not, I would have to go to jail from that office, and the law must take its course. Mr. Nichols then said that Mr. Minnich had been there and had to pay a great deal more than that. Mr. Smith then said are you going to pay back the money you have taken from the company. I said no, I had none of the company's money. Mr. Smith seemed very angry and left the room, slamming the door as he went out. Mr. Nichols then said that I had better pay over the money, for the sake of the disgrace that would be brought on myself and family if I was sent to prison. He said if I would pay over to them $10 000 of the Camden & Amboy it, it would, $2,000 of Lehigh Valley bonds, $8,000 of the Allegheny Compromise bonds, the matter would end there, and nobody outside of the office would ever know why I was off the road, and I could get a situation on some other road. After some further conversation between Mr. Nichols and me about disgrace and imprisonment, sooner than go to prison, I said I would give him $10,000 of the Camden and Amboy bonds, and $8,000 of the Allegheny Compromise bonds. Mr. Nichols said he would send up and see if Mr. Smith would take that or not. After a short time Mr. Nichols said Mr. Smith would take that amount. I asked Mr. Nichols to give me a receipt to show what money they had taken from me He said no, he would not give me a receipt. I asked Mr. Nichols to let me go and get those bonds. He said no, Mr. Smith would send some one with me. In about five minutes a stout man, who had been in and out of the office, came and took me out to the office door where a carriage stood. This man and me got inside the carriage and the man who had me in charge in the office got on the outside of the carriage. When we got to my house the stout man went into the house with me and went up stairs in the presence of my wife—the other man stood outside of the house. After I had handed him the bonds, he said I had some coupons in my pocket and he must have them. I told him I would not give them to him. He said if I did not he would take me back to the office again—it was his orders to go them. Sooner than go back I gave them to him; there were 5 of them—$30 each. He then left the house.

Q.—What were the value of the bonds delivered? Objected to by defendant.

Question allowed and exception taken.

Answer—The Camden and Amboy bonds sold at 102½ and 103, on the day they were taken from me. The Allegheny bonds were not then selling, but in April 1861, they brought 72.

Adjourned to 2½ o'clock, P. M.

Thursday Afternoon—Court met 2.30. Mr. Mitchell was again put on the stand, and testified that he had no knowledge of what was called into the railroad building for, on the day his money was taken from him by Mr. Nichols. I would like to know what they wanted to see, when you asked Mr. Nichols for permission to go out? Objected to by Mr. Gowan, unless the name of the friend had been stated to Mr. Nichols. Mr. Ellmaker wished to have the question answered, to prove that witness had desired to consult Judge Knox, his counsel. Mr. Hoffman did not press the question, and it was withdrawn.

Q. State whether you consented, of your own free will and consent, to deliver up the bonds which you did deliver to Mr. Smith? Objected to by Mr. Gowan. After argument the court ruled that the question would be answered, stating that the principle of duress consisted first in the facts or circumstances of the case, and secondly, how far these facts would be likely to operate on an ordinary mind. Mr. Gowan excepted to the ruling.

A. I did not deliver them of my own free will and consent.

Cross examined by Mr. Gowan.

Q. Were you not, at the time named, a conductor on the passenger train?

A. I was.

Q How many years?

A. I was appointed by Mr. Nichols in the May, 1858. Mr. Smith was President of the company. Mr. Nichols was Superintendent of the company. The building was known as the company's main office.

Q. Was there any one in the room at the time you first went in except Mr. Smith, Nichols and yourself?

A. I am not certain. There was a man there shortly afterwards.

Q. Was not that man first called when you wanted to go to the water closet?

A. After he had searched me, I then asked to go to the water closet. I did not go there until after I was searched. I am not certain that I asked to go before the man was called in, but the man searched me before I was allowed to go. There was a big stout man, Mr. Bangs, who came in after wards. They called him Pinkerton's Superintendent. Pinkerton was chief detective.

Q. Did not Mr. Smith charge you with having taken the company money?

A. He charged me with having taken $42,000. I supposed him to mean the company's money. I found out the market value of the bonds from Mr. David Fox about two weeks ago He looked over the books, and showed me the value of the bonds on the day they were taken from me.

By Mr. Kunkel—Mr. Smith and Nichols did not say I could go out with the detective and consult any body I pleased. Mr. Smith did not say I could go out and consult a friend with Mr Bangs. Mr. Smith said I must go to prison or pay over the money.

Q. You said you were afraid. What were you afraid of?

A. I was afraid of being sent to prison, and disgracing my family.

Q. Did you not know a man could not be sent to jail unless he had committed some offence?

A. Yes, I knew he ought to have done something before being sent to jail. I was told by Mr. Nichols that there had been detectives on the road.

By Mr. Gowan—I did not see the detective's papers on that day in the office. I saw Mr. Smith have some papers on the table before him.

Q.—What salary did you get from the Company? Objected to by Mr. Ellmaker as irrelevent.

The Court preferred that this question should be asked after the defence had opened, but thought it made but little difference whether the examination was gone into now, or hereafter. Mr. Gowan withdrew the question.

Q.—What salary did you get as Conductor from the Reading Railroad Company? Objected to on the ground that the reason for the question is not stated, and it is not properly evidence on cross-examination, and therefore irrelevent.

The Court overruled the objection.

A.—We got $2 30 a day. If we ran the regular trips for the month it amounted to about $60. If ran the Sunday train about 3 years, and got additional $4 per trip a part of the time and $3 the balance of the time.

Q.—If these bonds that you handed over to Mr. Smith did not belong to the company, where did you get the money to buy them with.

Objected to and modified thus:

Q.—Did not you use the money that you got from passengers on the road to buy these bonds with?

A.—No.

Q.—Where then did you get the money? Objected to.

Objection sustained. Exception noted.

Q.—In what capacity were you in the employ of the North Penn'a R. R. before you were employed by the Reading Company?

A.—A passenger conductor.

Q.—What salary did you receive?

Objected to and objection sustained.

Q.—Where did you live when in the employ of the Reading Railroad Company?

A.—In Ninth above Willow; afterwards in Poplar above 13th; and then in Broad below Passayunk Road, almost out of the city.

Q.—What business are you now engaged in?

Objected to.

Objection sustained and exception noted.

Q.—Mr. Kunkel—On the day you went to the Company office, was your brother with you?

A.—No. I did not know where he was.

Q.—What prevented you from going out of that office at any time, if you had wanted to?

A.—I asked to go out, and they would not let me. The door was shut. I don't know whether it was locked or not. I did not tell Mr. Smith I had no money. I told him I had no Company money. I did not tell him the house on Broad street was my wife's. It is mine. I gave up the property rather than go to prison. I have a fear of going to prison. I would not like to go there even if I was innocent. The property was taken from me in September, 1863.—This suit was brought less than six months afterwards. I employed Mr. Hoffman as my lawyer. Mr. Hoffman told me he would bring the suit when the proper time came. He said he wanted to bring the suit in Schuylkill county. I think two years were found before the suit was brought. I don't know that Mr. Hoffman ever told me why he did not bring suit sooner. I think I know that a criminal suit could not be brought against me after two years.

By Mr. Ellmaker—

I do not know that I told Mr. Nichols I had a house in Broad street worth $10 000. I had a house there. I did tell Mr. Nichols that I had Camden and Amboy bonds belonging to Lehigha. I did not tell him I had bonds amounting to $19,000, and my wife $22,000. Mr. Minnich was also a Conductor. The fear operated on me both at the house and the office.

At 6 o'clock Court adjourned until 9 to-morrow morning.

Friday Morning.—Court met at 9 o'clock and resumed the case of Pettit vs. Smith. Mr. Pettit took the stand and was under cross examination testified that since he left the company's employ he had resided in Philadelphia: Mr. Chas. E. Smith had also resided in Philadelphia. This suit was brought in Schuylkill county.

Re-examined by Mr. Hoffman—I will be 51 on the 10th day of next April. When I told Mr. Kunkel yesterday that I would rather make restitution then go to prison, I meant that I would rather give up my own property than go to prison.

Q. Circumstanced and situated as you then were in that building would you rather have given up all you had, than went to prison?

Objected to and overruled.

By Mr. Kunkel—Have you asked anybody since you answered my question yesterday anything about the answer you gave me.

A.—I asked Mr. Hoffman and Mr. Ellmaker the meaning of the word restitution?

Mr. Gowan asked the Court to strike out of Mr. Hoffman's question all that related to the value of the bonds, as his information on that subject was derived from Mr. Fox, and was clearly not evidence.

The Court ordered the testimony to be stricken out as being only hersay, and having been communicated to him within the last two or three weeks.

Mr. Pettit recalled.

Q.—By Mr. Hoffman—Do you know without Mr. Fox's books whether the Camden and Amboy Railroad bonds were above par?

A.—I looked at the newspapers and knew that they were generally above par. I looked at the quotations in the *Ledger*.

Objected to, but answer allowed by the Court.

Q.—By Mr. Ellmaker—How about the Allegheny Bonds?

A. They were not in the market then, but in the spring of 1861 they sold at 72.

Q.—By Mr. Gowan—Were not the bonds you call Camden and Amboy bonds in reality the Delaware and Raritan Canal bonds?

A.—They are one and the same thing. I think they have the name of Delaware and Raritan upon them.

Mr. Hoffman offered in evidence an Act of Assembly passed on the 20th of March, 1868, changing the venue of the case of Pettit vs. Smith from Schuylkill to Lancaster county, which was admitted.

Q. by Mr. Gowan.—Have you not now pending in Schuylkill county another case against the Reading Railroad Company?

A.—I have a suit there. It has not been tried. It has never been removed. I was not examined there.

The evidence on the part of plaintiff here closed.

Mr. Gowan opened for the defence. He recapitulated the facts connected with the case, and gave an outline of the evidence he expected to produce.

Mr. G. A. Nichols was sworn and testified on behalf of the defendant. The drift of his evidence was that Pettit was under no such constraint as would amount to what is known in law as *duress*.

Samuel Bradford, Treasurer of the Railroad Company, testified to receiving the bonds delivered up by Pettit from the detective Pinkerton, and the transfer of the amount they brought when sold to the treasurer of the company.

Depositions of Pinkerton and his detectives were read, showing how they had watched and made a note of fares received by Pettit. They rode in the trains, noticed every passenger who paid, where he got on, and where he got off. They also entered into conversation with such passengers occasionally. The depositions showed much skill management, and according to their tenor Pettit was in the habit of keeping a considerable portion of the money received each trip.

The Court adjourned on Saturday pending the production of various voluminous depositions. The death of Emanuel C. Reigart, Esq., interfered with the trial on Monday afternoon.

Monday, Dec. 20, 2½ *P. M.*—The Court met and on the reminder of the afternoon was occupied with reading the depositions of the several detective officers, who ran upon Pettit's train and observed the fares which were collected in money by him.

These were followed by the depositions of Wm. H. Webb, the Secretary of the Reading Railroad Company, proving six packages of conductor's checks, which were the issue to Pettit. Pettit was employed by the Company as representing the fares such he had received.

Mr. Gowan then read further the depositions of Messrs. Webb, Bangs and Welch, which were taken in the city of Philadelphia, showing the loss of the original returns of way fares received by Pettit, with the view of offering true copies of the same which had been made by other witnesses.

Mr. Hoffman objected to the admission of the copies on the ground that the loss of the originals had not been sufficiently proved, but the Court ruled otherwise.

All the checks and returns made by Pettit to the Station Agents were then given in evidence.

Adjourned till Tuesday at 9 o'clock.

Tuesday, 9 A. M.—Court met.

Mr. Hoffman again called the attention of the Judge to the testimony of Mr. Bangs on the subject of the loss of the original returns alluded to yesterday, and in view of the importance of the testimony, asked the Judge to reconsider his ruling upon the subject. Bangs' testimony was unreliable, he having stated in the cross-examination of his deposition, that he had not been in the room with Mr. Pettit on the afternoon of the 29th of September, during the time Pettit and Smith were in the room with Nichols and Smith; which was false, as Mr. Nichols testified in this case that Mr. Bangs was in the room and searched Pettit's person; after wards went with him to the water closet and came back with him into the room but the Court refused to exclude the evidence.

Mr. Gowan was about reading further depositions when Mr. Ellmaker, interfered and said they had an application to make. Mr. Ellmaker then read the following affidavit:

Jacob Hoffman being sworn and Nathaniel Ellmaker affirmed, according to law say that on Saturday last after the Court adjourned, and after all the jurors trying the case had left, except one Washington Righter. Hewaited for some time to meet Mr. G. A. Nichols, and there got into conversation with him, and they walked out of the Court House together.

That Mr. Nichols is not only an important witness for defendant, but supposed to be his agent at this time, and also a chief officer of the Philadelphia and Reading Railroad Company, which it is believed is bearing the expenses of this controversy for defendant.

That an affidavit was prepared for presentation at the opening of the Court, yesterday, but on consultation it was agreed to proceed with the case.

But that again last evening after the adjournment of the Court, the same person remained behind after all the other jurors left; got into conversation with Mr. Nichols and the two walked together towards the door of the Court House.

J. HOFFMAN,
N. ELLMAKER.

Sworn and affirmed before me, Dec. 21, 1869. W. D. STAUFFER Pron'thy

J. Hoffman further says that on each of the occasions referred to, Mr. Righter approached Mr. Nichols to commence the conversation. J. HOFFMAN.

Sworn and subscribed before me, Dec. 21, 1869. W. D. STAUFFER, Pron'thy.

After the reading of the above affidavit, Mr. Ellmaker asked the Court to have the jury discharged, and read in support of his motion the following opinion of Judge Long.

Wm. Diller vs. C. Johns et. al. August term 1863, No. 125. Rule for a new trial, grounded upon three reasons:

1st. That the Court erred in not permitting the plaintiff to prove the misrepresentations made by Jacob Rohrer, one of the defendants, as offered on the trial.

2d. The verdict was against law, the evidence and charge of the Court.

3d. It is believed some of the jurors who tried the case had been tampered with by defendants or their agents.

The depositions taken in this case disclose the fact that while the trial of the case was progressing, two of the defendants and one of the jurors empanneled, were in company at a lager beer saloon in this city, and, while there, engaging in some of the amusements and convivialities which are generally presented at such an establishment.

What the object of this social meeting may have been; whether it was designed merely as a matter of recreation, or whether the parties intended to ingratiate themselves in the good feelings of the juror, to elevate them in his affections, and thereby curry favors from him, it is not necessary for us to speculate upon. It is enough for us to know that the juror exposed himself to an influence which may have subjected him to an improper bias in favor of the party with whom he was then engaged, and awakens suspicions that his integrity of character, as a juror, may have been demoralized.

A juror ought not only to stand above all exceptions, but he ought to be above all suspicion that he has any leaning towards any of the parties. He ought not only to be above all reproach, but he ought to abstain from all appearance of wrong, and leave no room to any of the parties for suspecting that he has been influenced from sinister motives. It is not necessary that evidence should be produced to carry conviction to the mind of the Court that this was the case; the respectability of the parties and the juror would perhaps forbid a conclusion of this kind; but if the circumstances proven go to show that their conduct was of such a nature as to give color for suspecting that the juror was exposing himself to influences which might have an effect upon his decision, or to warp his judgment, it is our duty to grant a new trial. Such circumstances have, we think, been proven in this case.

The great light of the world has taught us to pray, not to be led into temptation, and the teachings of history have confirmed the wisdom of this prayer. It is therefore the duty of Courts to endeavor to take from parties all temptations to gain an undue influence over jurors. A party by such conduct ought to know that he has all to lose and nothing to gain; that if the verdict is against him, it will not be set aside on account of his conduct, but that it will be set aside.—

The trial by jury has been extolled as the best guardian of our rights, and the glory of the English law; but past history has shown that when this institution becomes perverted by jurors being misled by suffering any undue influence to operate upon them, it then becomes an instrument of tyranny, injustice and oppression. Courts are therefore required by a sense of duty to watch with jealousy all causes the sacred precincts of the jury box; and to prevent it from being invaded by any influence calculated to impair its usefulness, or to lessen the high respect which the people have for it. The conduct of a juror, when he is empannelled, ought to be susceptible of no impression but that which is produced by the testimony and the law. It is said of the late Judge Breckenridge, that when a member of the Supreme Court, he was invited by a suitor in that Court to take dinner with him. He politely declined, quaintly remarking, that he was afraid that by him taking hold of his throat, he might touch his fifteen cents. And the District Court of this county, when in existence, set aside a verdict where the successful party, after the rendition of the verdict, gave a complimentary entertainment to the jurors.

We do not by high authority, (3 Bik Com 38*) that next to doing right the great object in the administration of public justice should be to give public satisfaction; if the verdict be false in point of fact, and doubts in the opinion of his counsel, or even in the opinion of by-standers, no party would go away satisfied unless he had a prospect of reviewing it. Such doubts would not be unreasonable. If we would arraign the determination as manifestly unjust, and abhor a tribunal which he imagined had done him an injury without a possibility of redress.

The first reason is not decided but left for future adjudication.

Rule made absolute.

After some further discussion, Mr. Righter was called to the witness stand and was sworn, and testified that the only conversation with Mr. Nichols in regard to the case being tried, all that he had said to him was to ask if the Reading & Columbia Railroad intended to issue excursion tickets. According to his recollection he only walked as far as the Court House door with Mr. Nichols. He asked Mr. Nichols how his wife was.

Mr. Nichols was recalled and testified that while he was putting on his cape Mr. Righter was putting on his coat, and that the conversation commenced by Mr. Righter saying, "I think we will have a good deal of snow this winter," and I answered "Yes, it's likely." He then asked me if excursion tickets would be issued over the Columbia and Reading and the Philadelphia and Reading Railroad. I told him that they would be issued and remain good from the day before Christmas until the day after New Year's. Righter said that he thought Mr. Hoffman a very smart lawyer. I told him he was so. Mr. Righter then said "I admire him very much." He then asked me how long I thought it would take to try this case, and I replied it would be finished before Christmas. I told him that I hoped it would.

Mr. Ellmaker again asked that the jury be discharged.

The Court could not see that there had been the slightest impropriety in the conversation held between the juror and Mr. Nichols; and certainly no sufficient cause had been given for the discharge of the jury. A number of cases were cited in which jurors had held similar conversations, and applications to discharge the juries on such grounds had been refused, and the trials continued to the end. The case now before the Court there is not the slightest imputation against either the witness or juror; and this jury stands before the Court to day as pure as any other that has ever been in the box. The Court has thought it best on the trial of this cause to give the largest liberty in receiving evidence, so as to have the fullest information on all points involved.

Mr. Ellmaker asked that the affidavit might be filed and that plaintiff's counsel might retire and consult. After a brief consultation Mr. Hoffman stated that after consultation among themselves and with their clients, they could not consistently with their professional duty, proceed further in the trial before this jury, and with plaintiff's consent would take a non-suit, especially as we have been informed from Philadelphia & Reading Railroad Company was now pending in the Courts of Schuylkill county.

Mr. Gowan said, though there is nothing in the conversation between Mr. Righter and Mr. Nichols to warrant a non-suit, and although we are all convinced that the non-suit is not taken in consequence of anything that had occurred between Mr. Righter and Mr. Nichols, yet that the conversation is made use of as an excuse for doing what was inevitable. Yet before the non-suit is entered, we desire to offer to go on with the case with eleven jurors and to allow Mr. Righter to retire, or to allow any number of the jurors who may be objectionable to the plaintiff to leave the box, and to go on with those who remain.

Mr. Ellmaker said he was acting sincerely and conscientiously. The affidavit contained only stated what we saw in the case of one juror, and we don't know what may have occurred in the others. We want a full jury to try this case, and cannot consent to go on without one.

Mr. Kunkel regretted counsel for plaintiff, considered it necessary to put the non-suit on the facts alleged in the affidavit. Every one in the Court House knew that the non suit was inevitable to avoid the verdict. The motive was well known. The case, from the impetration of the writ to this present moment, was unparalleled for its unbushing audacity.

Mr. Hoffman said such unblushing imputations required no reply. The general railroad act passed by the Legislature prohibited the Company from changing venue to a county through which a road passes; and yet through their influence this case has been removed from Schuylkill county to Lancaster county, where the Reading and Columbia Railroad is located.

Mr. Kunkel reminded the gentleman that he had as much to do as any one else in removing the case to Lancaster county, and had never before objected to it.

Mr. Hoffman said that when the removal from Schuylkill county became inevitable, and the Legislature had given us Hobson's choice, between Dauphin and Lancaster we of course took the lesser of two evils.

The court ordered a non suit to be entered.

Mr. North said, now that the case was disposed of, he deemedit but justice to Mr. Righter to say that he knew him well; he was a man of wealth, station and honor; that there was not in the country a more upright and conscientious citizen.—The imputation that he was or could be tampered with was, as entirely groundless as it was unjust.

Afternoon Session.—At the re-convening of the Court at half-past two, P. M., a motion was made by counsel for the plaintiff, in the case off James M. Pettit vs. Charles E. Smith, to take of the non suit entered in the case this morning, on the ground that after the jury was discharged, it was ascertained that James Davis, one of the jurors in the case, was an employee of the Reading & Columbia Railroad, which is man., aged and operated by the Philadelphia & Reading Railroad, and which company, it is alleged, is defraying the expenses of the controversy on the part of defendant. The motion was denied by Court.

Mr. Ellmaker said there was one fact that should be stated; the record shows that the arbitrators in Schuylkill county gave plaintiff damages for the full amount claimed.

BIG PIGS.—These are trying times for porkers. One by one they are surely falling victims to the sausage-loving appetites of their owners. The latest victims were three Chester White Pigs, 16 months old, slaughtered at the Compass Tavern, near Cains P. O., this county, on last Thursday. The pigs weighed, when dressed, 543, 459, and 404 pounds. They were raised by John Cox, proprietor of the Compass Tavern.

LOCAL MISCELLANY.—The venerable Godfried Zahm gave the inmates of the Children's Home a liberal dinner, on the occasion of his birthday.

Recently Jacob Habecker, son of Adam Habecker, in Elizabeth twp., whilst sawing wood with a circular saw, lost his left hand by being caught in the saw.

On Sunday, the 12th, a son of Mr. Henry Huber, in Warwick twp., was severely injured by being kicked in the head by a colt. The lad is now doing well.

A shooting match took place in Washington bor., on Saturday the 11th inst., under the management of Daniel Shultz. Ten geese were disposed of in that manner. The distance was forty yards. Isaac Shultz was conceded to have made the best shots.

On the night of the 14th inst., the school house on Prospect Hill, in Manor twp., J. C. Shuman, teacher, was entered by burglars, and his clock, a pair of slippers and a lot of new books (Sanders' series) were taken. The entrance was effected by breaking the shutter bolts. An attempt was made at the door and a hinge broken.

The *Marietlian* states that the water was let out of the Pennsylvania canal on the 11th inst., and the boatmen are now 'lying on their oars."

The following gentlemen are the newly elected officers of "Asbara Lodge, A. Y. M., of Marietta borough: W. M., Dr. Henry Landis; S. W., John W. Rich; J. W., Henry C. Eagle; Secretary, Geo. H. Ettis, Treasurer, W. H. Eagle.

The young man, Vincent Augustus Vandever, who recently committed suicide at the Rising Sun, Md., was, says the *Marietta Union*, a son of Benjamin F. Vandever, who a few years since kept the Linden House in Marietta. When in Marietta young Vandever appeared like a precocious youth.

The annual meeting of the Pennsylvania Fruit Growers' Society, will convene in the Orphans' Court room at Lancaster, Jan. 12, 1870, at 2 o'clock P. M.

A DREADFUL AFFAIR—*A Young Man Shoots Himself.*—The Oxford *Press* says:

A most distressing and shocking affair occurred in our neighboring borough of Rising Sun, Md., the 10th inst., which called a thrill of horror to pierce the breast of every citizen of that quiet community. A young man named Vincent Augustus Q. Vandever, son of B. F. Vandever, aged about 22 years, deliberately shot and killed himself instantly. The weapon used was a pistol, and the lever, killing him self instantly. The circumstances attending this affair are as follows:

Young Vandever some weeks since went to Philadelphia where he obtained employment as conductor on one of the Chestnut street railway cars, and having associated with bad company, was finally arrested on the charge of having stolen about $300 from a drover named Miller. At a hearing before an alderman he was released, and returned to his home, and was to report himself for another hearing next week; but his surety fearing that he would not appear, sent a city constable after him on Friday. When the officer arrived at his residence on the 30 ult., to take him, he attempted to arrest young Vandever at a hotel, and on producing a pair of handcuffs the young man's father, who was present, interfered and told the officer that he (young Vandever) was to be handcuffed. After a promise on the part of the father that he would accompany the officer and son to the city on the afternoon train, the latter was allowed his liberty.

Shortly after this affair it appears that young Vandever contemplated suicide, as he procured a bottle and obtained an ounce of muriatic acid at Dr. Kirk's drug store; the doctor supposing it was for his father, who is a sufferer under spells of dizziness, when he remarked, "If a fellow would put this under his vest it would put his light out." The doctor remarking that it would be a slow poison, proceeded to some other store and procured a stronger dose of acid, but presently returned with another bottle and obtained an ounce of creosote, remarking "He's a poison, too." On being informed that all caustic poisons would cause a slow and horrible death, he replied, "Oh, I've been bought at another store a sheet of paper, remarking that he intended to write his will. He then went home and deliberately sat down at the dining room table in the presence of his mother, the address to his friends which will be found below, and which he placed in his pocket. After partaking of his dinner and supper he retired for a few minutes and on descending took a short walk and then went into the stable, where he shot himself.

He was subsequently found by his father, who had prepared to go to the city, in the hay mow of the stable, lying upon his back, dead. It was discovered that he had deliberately unbuttoned his vest, turned it back and fastened it behind him, and then placed the muzzle of a large 32 calibre revolver to his left side and fired. The ball had entered between the fifth and sixth ribs passed through the heart, and emerged about two inches below the shoulder blade. The bed was saturated with clothing, and the blood had run through the floor. The deceased came to his death by a gunshot wound by his own hand. He evidently died instantly, as there were no signs of struggle and the weapon was still clenched with a pistol at his feet. The following is the letter written by the suicide about half an hour before he took his life; it was written in a bold hand and fair penmanship:

RISING SUN, Dec. 10th, 1869.

Friends and whom it may concern.

I have suffered for crimes unjust—it has brought me to my tomb at last. I wish to be laid under the large chestnut tree in the rear. Friends do not weep for me, but henceforth and forever try to mend your ways.

Mother and Father dear, do not weep for me; I am satisfied that I will have rest hereafter. Give my sincere love to my dear Annie. I know it will almost break your hearts, but do not weep for me—the one third wronged shall be forever happy.

Good by, friends! I have no enemies. One whom trouble has laid in his grave. Young men beware of bad company and shun it. Take your dear mother's advice—you'll be well off in the end. Please take advice from me.

Have this last published in all the public columns. Put my name to it as follows:

J. V. A. Q. V., THE VICTIM.

His body was brought to Oxford on the train on Monday morning and interred in our cemetery.

ARRESTED.—Charles Hambright and John Frankhouser, who some time ago escaped from the Lancaster County Prison, were arrested by detectives on Saturday, while in the cars, at Harrisburg on a charge of larceny of goods belonging to the Pennsylvania Railroad Company. They were committed in default of bail, to the Dauphin County Prison.

David Beard of this city was arrested on Monday on a charge of being implicated in the above robbery. He had a hearing before Alderman Fisher, and was held in the sum of $3,000 to answer the charge at the Allegheny County Court on the 2nd Monday in January. There was no evidence offered implicating Beard, except a letter addressed to "John Rine, (Hamilford *alias*,) care of David Beard," which letter was in Beard's possession, opened. It purported to have been written by a banking house in Chicago, and referred to various remittances of large sums of money, and the disposition of certain property.—Beard stated that he knew that John Rice was one of Frankford's *aliases* and he thought there was something else opening the letter, as Frankford was his brother in-law. He denied knowing anything about the business transactions mentioned in the letter. Beard is a young man who has borne a good character, heretofore. Martin H. Fry, went bis bail.

PARKESBURG.—Our correspondent "Dave" sends us the following facts respecting "Parkesburg:"

Parkesburg, on the line of the Penna. R. R., contains 500 inhabitants; there are 4 dry good stores, 2 grocery and provision stores, and 1 clothing store in the village; there is also a large and commodious hotel. The village also contains an Academy for ladies and young men, with Prof. J. M. Rawlins, formerly of Lancaster county, as Principal; the institution is in a flourishing condition. The Octoraro Church (Presbyterian) is situated 1 mile from the village, and is well attended; the church is a fine edifice and is well furnished; Rev. Pomeroy is the pastor. The land surrounding Parkesburg is of good quality, and produces good crops; it would however, produce a greater yield of grain &c., if it was more carefully farmed. The people in Parkesburg and its vicinity are mostly of English and Irish descent.

LOCAL ITEMS.—We are indebted to a correspondent for the following items:

A little girl about four years old, a daughter of Mr. John Bryson, residing near May Post Office, this county, met with a painful accident on Tuesday, the 14th inst. It seems that she was playing alone, when her clothing caught fire; fortunately she was discovered shortly after her clothes had caught, and the fire was put out. She was badly burned, but is now expected to recover.

The present comparatively mild spell has put to flight the theory of the *Savans* who have predicted a *long, cold* winter, and farmers here about are improving it by killing their hogs and beeves for home use.

JUNCTION AND BREAKWATER RAILROAD.—From the *Sussex Journal*, (Georgetown, Delaware,) of the 26th ult., we clip the following. It will be remembered that Messrs. Sheaff & Barry, of our city, were the contractors for the building of the road referred to:

"It will be gratifying to our readers, and the public generally, to learn, that the last link of the Junction and Breakwater Railroad, is now nearly completed and will be opened for freight and travel, about the beginning of the next month. The first carload of the best anthracite coal, direct from the mines of Thomas Baumgardner Esq., in Pennsylvania, will be sent over the road, by the first train, as a complimentary present from that gentleman, to the Hon. J. W. Houston, the efficient and public spirited President of the Rail Road, through whose exertions, aided by the energetic Directors of the present Board, this important public work has been brought to a successful termination. * *"

REAL ESTATE MARKET.—The Reading *Times* states that Samuel L. Rhoads, of that city, has purchased a fine meadow farm of 113 acres, belonging to the estate of Frederick Koch, dec'd, situate near Reinholdsville, Lancaster county. Mr. R. is an extensive stock dealer, and it his intention to use this farm for pasturing purposes.

LIFE INSURANCE.—John C. Adams, of this city who died a few days ago, had at the time of his death, an insurance policy in the Mutual Insurance Company, of New York, for $2,000.

YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION.—Some thirty gentlemen favorable to the formation in this city of a Young Men's Christian Association, met in the Hall in Kramph's Building, East Orange street, last evening, to hear and consider the report of a committee, previously appointed to draft a constitution for the government of the Association. Brother John H. Pearsol, of St. Paul's German Reformed Church, was chosen President, and Brother Wm. L. Bear, of the Moravian Church, Secretary. The proposed constitution was read by articles and sections, which were discussed, amended, and adopted. The constitution provides that the society shall consist of four classes of members—active, sustaining, honorary, and life members—all of whom are to be of good moral character, the active members to be elected by a two-thirds vote; the sustaining members to pay an annual fee of $5; the honorary members a single fee of $20, and the life members a single fee of $50. The Constitution further provides that none of the offices shall be filled by others than members in good standing of some of our Evangelical churches, no one denomination to have more officers than the President and one other.

There was but little discussion in the adoption of the Constitution until Brother "Sh Schwelbrenner," of *Father Abraham*, offered an amendment that none but total abstinents should be eligible either to hold office or be appointed on any Committee. "Pit" urged the adoption of his amendment with the zeal and eloquence usual in new converts. His speech was brief and determined, and defiant as it was years ago when he used to make Native American speeches in Franke's Beer Saloon and Dittlow's Restaurant, after having indulged freely in "Old Rock" or "XX." His little eyes sparkled like coals as an occasional glimpse of them was caught as they peeped from under his shaggy brows. He was not satisfied by merely throwing cold water on the Association, but was determined to submerge it entirely in that aqueous element. President Pearsol, Brother Beardslee, and a few others of the hydropathic persuasion, listened to "Pit" with evident delight, but a majority of the brethren present looked as though they had been subjected to an involuntary douche bath and then wrapped up in wet blankets.

Brother Landis was the first to shake off the icicles formed by "Pit's" freezing discourse, and in a few well-timed remarks intimated that outside issues had perhaps be better left to outside organizations, and that any attempt to introduce them here would be more than good. He was ably seconded by Brother J. M. Willis Geist, who avowed himself a prohibitionist, although unconnected with any of the so-called temperance organizations. He reminded "Schwelbrenner" that the stream from the mountain would be purer and sweeter and get higher than its fountain. This Association was but a stream from the fountain of the Christian Church, and no evangelical denomination of Christians could be excluded from membership. He warned "Pit" that any attempt to introduce such a test here, would deprive the Association of the sympathy and support of a large and useful class of Christians.

Brother Wm. A. Baer spoke forcibly and at considerable length on the same side, as did one or two other brothers, and when the vote was taken it was like the bandle of the brown jug, not on one side—still "Schwelbrenner" demanded a division, which was wisely refused him by President Pearsol, who, notwithstanding his thirty-years abstinence, backed water for once, and choked off "Pit," much to the delight of several of his brethren present nervously watching, as, with pencil in hand we were ready to put them on record.

But little difficulty was experienced in adopting the remaining clause of the Constitution, and the Association then adjourned subject to the call of the President.

There was a full meeting of the Board of Managers, and a large number of young men present, Dr. E. Franklin moved that a committee be appointed to draft resolutions expressive of the feelings of the bar on the decease of their distinguished brother lawyer. Eloquent and appropriate addresses respecting the deceased were then delivered by Judge Long and Judge Hayes, and by Messrs. T. E. Franklin, N. Ellmaker, A. H. Hood, I. E Hiester, Jesse Landis and Julius Kauffman.

Judge Long appointed the following gentlemen on the Committee to draft resolutions: Hon. T. E. Franklin, Hon. I. E Hiester, N. Ellmaker, Esq., A. H. Hood, Esq., and Hon. Jesse Landis, Esq. On motion the meeting then adjourned to meet at 9 o'clock, A. M., to hear the report of the above Committee.

Tribute to the Memory of Hon. Emanuel C. Reigart, by the Members of the Lancaster Bar.

Hon. Thomas E. Franklin, on rising to move the appointment of a