

THE BLAME FIXED. A Coroner's Jury Finds It Was Not Providence Did It.

THAT BUILDING COLLAPSE

Attributed Officially to Neglect on the Part of Three Men.

OWNER, BUILDER AND INSPECTOR.

What Contractor Hickenstein Says of the Notable Surprise.

MAJOR W. C. MORELAND ON DAMAGES

The horror of the Diamond and Wood streets disaster has not yet died away, and it is now augmented by a report that officially places the blame, not upon "an inscrutable Providence," but upon human brains and human hands that, as it is indicated, might have averted the rain and death.

The coroner resumed the inquest on the case yesterday morning. Contractor M. F. Malone testified that he thought the interior of the building was weak, and that the joists had not been perfectly secured.

Testimony was given by several other contractors and bricklayers. They all expressed the opinion that the building was strong, and the material of construction good.

At 3 o'clock Coroner McDowell in summing up the case said it was the duty of the jury to inquire into the cause of the death of each of the victims. He said the case had been carefully gone over, and he asked the jury to consider if the specifications for the Willey building were right.

THE LAW CITED

in which it was said that no alterations should be made without a permit, and the Coroner said that it was not the duty of the contractor to see that the walls were made thicker to bear the additional story. No permit for the additional story was obtained, however.

The jury returned a verdict on the death of Dr. James Logan Read, Charles McKee, William Gottman, James Frick, J. M. Hill, Richard Carroll, James McGough, Thomas Jones, John L. Rogerson, Samuel Stringer, Joseph W. Gearing, George L. Mason, Samuel Brown, Leonard Schillinger and George Biedinger, as follows:

Dr. James L. Read came to his death on Wednesday, January 9, 1888, about 1 o'clock P. M. while seated in his office, and he was killed by the falling of a wall of the Willey building.

The jury returned a verdict on the death of Dr. James L. Read, Charles McKee, William Gottman, James Frick, J. M. Hill, Richard Carroll, James McGough, Thomas Jones, John L. Rogerson, Samuel Stringer, Joseph W. Gearing, George L. Mason, Samuel Brown, Leonard Schillinger and George Biedinger, as follows:

Dr. James L. Read came to his death on Wednesday, January 9, 1888, about 1 o'clock P. M. while seated in his office, and he was killed by the falling of a wall of the Willey building.

The jury returned a verdict on the death of Dr. James L. Read, Charles McKee, William Gottman, James Frick, J. M. Hill, Richard Carroll, James McGough, Thomas Jones, John L. Rogerson, Samuel Stringer, Joseph W. Gearing, George L. Mason, Samuel Brown, Leonard Schillinger and George Biedinger, as follows:

Dr. James L. Read came to his death on Wednesday, January 9, 1888, about 1 o'clock P. M. while seated in his office, and he was killed by the falling of a wall of the Willey building.

The jury returned a verdict on the death of Dr. James L. Read, Charles McKee, William Gottman, James Frick, J. M. Hill, Richard Carroll, James McGough, Thomas Jones, John L. Rogerson, Samuel Stringer, Joseph W. Gearing, George L. Mason, Samuel Brown, Leonard Schillinger and George Biedinger, as follows:

Dr. James L. Read came to his death on Wednesday, January 9, 1888, about 1 o'clock P. M. while seated in his office, and he was killed by the falling of a wall of the Willey building.

The jury returned a verdict on the death of Dr. James L. Read, Charles McKee, William Gottman, James Frick, J. M. Hill, Richard Carroll, James McGough, Thomas Jones, John L. Rogerson, Samuel Stringer, Joseph W. Gearing, George L. Mason, Samuel Brown, Leonard Schillinger and George Biedinger, as follows:

Dr. James L. Read came to his death on Wednesday, January 9, 1888, about 1 o'clock P. M. while seated in his office, and he was killed by the falling of a wall of the Willey building.

The jury returned a verdict on the death of Dr. James L. Read, Charles McKee, William Gottman, James Frick, J. M. Hill, Richard Carroll, James McGough, Thomas Jones, John L. Rogerson, Samuel Stringer, Joseph W. Gearing, George L. Mason, Samuel Brown, Leonard Schillinger and George Biedinger, as follows:

Dr. James L. Read came to his death on Wednesday, January 9, 1888, about 1 o'clock P. M. while seated in his office, and he was killed by the falling of a wall of the Willey building.

The jury returned a verdict on the death of Dr. James L. Read, Charles McKee, William Gottman, James Frick, J. M. Hill, Richard Carroll, James McGough, Thomas Jones, John L. Rogerson, Samuel Stringer, Joseph W. Gearing, George L. Mason, Samuel Brown, Leonard Schillinger and George Biedinger, as follows:

Dr. James L. Read came to his death on Wednesday, January 9, 1888, about 1 o'clock P. M. while seated in his office, and he was killed by the falling of a wall of the Willey building.

The jury returned a verdict on the death of Dr. James L. Read, Charles McKee, William Gottman, James Frick, J. M. Hill, Richard Carroll, James McGough, Thomas Jones, John L. Rogerson, Samuel Stringer, Joseph W. Gearing, George L. Mason, Samuel Brown, Leonard Schillinger and George Biedinger, as follows:

Dr. James L. Read came to his death on Wednesday, January 9, 1888, about 1 o'clock P. M. while seated in his office, and he was killed by the falling of a wall of the Willey building.

The jury returned a verdict on the death of Dr. James L. Read, Charles McKee, William Gottman, James Frick, J. M. Hill, Richard Carroll, James McGough, Thomas Jones, John L. Rogerson, Samuel Stringer, Joseph W. Gearing, George L. Mason, Samuel Brown, Leonard Schillinger and George Biedinger, as follows:

Dr. James L. Read came to his death on Wednesday, January 9, 1888, about 1 o'clock P. M. while seated in his office, and he was killed by the falling of a wall of the Willey building.

ALDRICH A SLICK ONE. The Man Arrested in Canada. Believed to be the One That Banked Murdoch.

THAT BUILDING COLLAPSE

Attributed Officially to Neglect on the Part of Three Men.

OWNER, BUILDER AND INSPECTOR.

What Contractor Hickenstein Says of the Notable Surprise.

MAJOR W. C. MORELAND ON DAMAGES

The horror of the Diamond and Wood streets disaster has not yet died away, and it is now augmented by a report that officially places the blame, not upon "an inscrutable Providence," but upon human brains and human hands that, as it is indicated, might have averted the rain and death.

The coroner resumed the inquest on the case yesterday morning. Contractor M. F. Malone testified that he thought the interior of the building was weak, and that the joists had not been perfectly secured.

Testimony was given by several other contractors and bricklayers. They all expressed the opinion that the building was strong, and the material of construction good.

At 3 o'clock Coroner McDowell in summing up the case said it was the duty of the jury to inquire into the cause of the death of each of the victims. He said the case had been carefully gone over, and he asked the jury to consider if the specifications for the Willey building were right.

THE LAW CITED

in which it was said that no alterations should be made without a permit, and the Coroner said that it was not the duty of the contractor to see that the walls were made thicker to bear the additional story. No permit for the additional story was obtained, however.

The jury returned a verdict on the death of Dr. James Logan Read, Charles McKee, William Gottman, James Frick, J. M. Hill, Richard Carroll, James McGough, Thomas Jones, John L. Rogerson, Samuel Stringer, Joseph W. Gearing, George L. Mason, Samuel Brown, Leonard Schillinger and George Biedinger, as follows:

Dr. James L. Read came to his death on Wednesday, January 9, 1888, about 1 o'clock P. M. while seated in his office, and he was killed by the falling of a wall of the Willey building.

The jury returned a verdict on the death of Dr. James L. Read, Charles McKee, William Gottman, James Frick, J. M. Hill, Richard Carroll, James McGough, Thomas Jones, John L. Rogerson, Samuel Stringer, Joseph W. Gearing, George L. Mason, Samuel Brown, Leonard Schillinger and George Biedinger, as follows:

Dr. James L. Read came to his death on Wednesday, January 9, 1888, about 1 o'clock P. M. while seated in his office, and he was killed by the falling of a wall of the Willey building.

The jury returned a verdict on the death of Dr. James L. Read, Charles McKee, William Gottman, James Frick, J. M. Hill, Richard Carroll, James McGough, Thomas Jones, John L. Rogerson, Samuel Stringer, Joseph W. Gearing, George L. Mason, Samuel Brown, Leonard Schillinger and George Biedinger, as follows:

Dr. James L. Read came to his death on Wednesday, January 9, 1888, about 1 o'clock P. M. while seated in his office, and he was killed by the falling of a wall of the Willey building.

The jury returned a verdict on the death of Dr. James L. Read, Charles McKee, William Gottman, James Frick, J. M. Hill, Richard Carroll, James McGough, Thomas Jones, John L. Rogerson, Samuel Stringer, Joseph W. Gearing, George L. Mason, Samuel Brown, Leonard Schillinger and George Biedinger, as follows:

Dr. James L. Read came to his death on Wednesday, January 9, 1888, about 1 o'clock P. M. while seated in his office, and he was killed by the falling of a wall of the Willey building.

The jury returned a verdict on the death of Dr. James L. Read, Charles McKee, William Gottman, James Frick, J. M. Hill, Richard Carroll, James McGough, Thomas Jones, John L. Rogerson, Samuel Stringer, Joseph W. Gearing, George L. Mason, Samuel Brown, Leonard Schillinger and George Biedinger, as follows:

Dr. James L. Read came to his death on Wednesday, January 9, 1888, about 1 o'clock P. M. while seated in his office, and he was killed by the falling of a wall of the Willey building.

The jury returned a verdict on the death of Dr. James L. Read, Charles McKee, William Gottman, James Frick, J. M. Hill, Richard Carroll, James McGough, Thomas Jones, John L. Rogerson, Samuel Stringer, Joseph W. Gearing, George L. Mason, Samuel Brown, Leonard Schillinger and George Biedinger, as follows:

Dr. James L. Read came to his death on Wednesday, January 9, 1888, about 1 o'clock P. M. while seated in his office, and he was killed by the falling of a wall of the Willey building.

The jury returned a verdict on the death of Dr. James L. Read, Charles McKee, William Gottman, James Frick, J. M. Hill, Richard Carroll, James McGough, Thomas Jones, John L. Rogerson, Samuel Stringer, Joseph W. Gearing, George L. Mason, Samuel Brown, Leonard Schillinger and George Biedinger, as follows:

Dr. James L. Read came to his death on Wednesday, January 9, 1888, about 1 o'clock P. M. while seated in his office, and he was killed by the falling of a wall of the Willey building.

The jury returned a verdict on the death of Dr. James L. Read, Charles McKee, William Gottman, James Frick, J. M. Hill, Richard Carroll, James McGough, Thomas Jones, John L. Rogerson, Samuel Stringer, Joseph W. Gearing, George L. Mason, Samuel Brown, Leonard Schillinger and George Biedinger, as follows:

Dr. James L. Read came to his death on Wednesday, January 9, 1888, about 1 o'clock P. M. while seated in his office, and he was killed by the falling of a wall of the Willey building.

The jury returned a verdict on the death of Dr. James L. Read, Charles McKee, William Gottman, James Frick, J. M. Hill, Richard Carroll, James McGough, Thomas Jones, John L. Rogerson, Samuel Stringer, Joseph W. Gearing, George L. Mason, Samuel Brown, Leonard Schillinger and George Biedinger, as follows:

Dr. James L. Read came to his death on Wednesday, January 9, 1888, about 1 o'clock P. M. while seated in his office, and he was killed by the falling of a wall of the Willey building.

AVOTE IS THE LAW. Will a Constitutional Amendment Find Its Own Enforcement?

GOOD LAWYERS BELIEVE IT WILL.

Because It Will be Law Just as Soon as It is Adopted.

LICENSE NO CONTRACT WITH A STATE

THE STATE IS SOVEREIGN.

OF SMALL FORCE.

The proposed constitutional amendment to prohibit the manufacture and sale of ardent spirits and malt liquors in Pennsylvania is the subject of a discussion in the columns of this paper. It is a matter of special interest to saloon keepers, who must soon go through the license Court, if they wish to continue business.

An attempt was made yesterday to get legal opinions on the case, but it was a difficult matter, as many of the lawyers seemed to consider the day an off day, and had gone home, others were up to their eyebrows in business and not talkative, and others said they didn't care to talk at all, as they had not given the subject any thought whatever.

The question that agitates the liquor dealers, next to what disposition they shall make of their stock, in case it becomes unobtainable in this State, is what encouragement is there for them to take out license if the verdict of the 18th of June is that therefor the State shall do so.

The State is sovereign. C. F. McKenna, Esq., was not disposed to talk much about the matter, merely remarking that with a change of the license law the State is sovereign, and that a license could not be held to a contract; but he supposed that something equitable would be proposed.

Mr. Raymond, Esq., stated that if the amendment prevailed, the business would become illegal at once, and that sellers would be prosecuted as maintaining a nuisance. There would be nothing whatever elastic in the result, should the amendment prevail, and it would not be a contract, and it is reversible whenever the people see fit to consider such action necessary for the public welfare. This is the language of the law, and it is the law.

The principle that the State is sovereign and can do as it pleases in the matter of the kind, has been asserted in one judicial decision after another for many years. When the States supreme Court, in the case of the State of Texas vs. White, said that a State is a States rights man, but that explanation does not apply to later decisions; and the States are not up to this State, the vested interest argument becomes of small force.

According to Representative Marland, the States are not up to this State, the vested interest argument becomes of small force. The principle that the State is sovereign and can do as it pleases in the matter of the kind, has been asserted in one judicial decision after another for many years.

When the States supreme Court, in the case of the State of Texas vs. White, said that a State is a States rights man, but that explanation does not apply to later decisions; and the States are not up to this State, the vested interest argument becomes of small force.

The principle that the State is sovereign and can do as it pleases in the matter of the kind, has been asserted in one judicial decision after another for many years. When the States supreme Court, in the case of the State of Texas vs. White, said that a State is a States rights man, but that explanation does not apply to later decisions; and the States are not up to this State, the vested interest argument becomes of small force.

When the States supreme Court, in the case of the State of Texas vs. White, said that a State is a States rights man, but that explanation does not apply to later decisions; and the States are not up to this State, the vested interest argument becomes of small force.

The principle that the State is sovereign and can do as it pleases in the matter of the kind, has been asserted in one judicial decision after another for many years. When the States supreme Court, in the case of the State of Texas vs. White, said that a State is a States rights man, but that explanation does not apply to later decisions; and the States are not up to this State, the vested interest argument becomes of small force.

When the States supreme Court, in the case of the State of Texas vs. White, said that a State is a States rights man, but that explanation does not apply to later decisions; and the States are not up to this State, the vested interest argument becomes of small force.

The principle that the State is sovereign and can do as it pleases in the matter of the kind, has been asserted in one judicial decision after another for many years. When the States supreme Court, in the case of the State of Texas vs. White, said that a State is a States rights man, but that explanation does not apply to later decisions; and the States are not up to this State, the vested interest argument becomes of small force.

When the States supreme Court, in the case of the State of Texas vs. White, said that a State is a States rights man, but that explanation does not apply to later decisions; and the States are not up to this State, the vested interest argument becomes of small force.

The principle that the State is sovereign and can do as it pleases in the matter of the kind, has been asserted in one judicial decision after another for many years. When the States supreme Court, in the case of the State of Texas vs. White, said that a State is a States rights man, but that explanation does not apply to later decisions; and the States are not up to this State, the vested interest argument becomes of small force.

When the States supreme Court, in the case of the State of Texas vs. White, said that a State is a States rights man, but that explanation does not apply to later decisions; and the States are not up to this State, the vested interest argument becomes of small force.

The principle that the State is sovereign and can do as it pleases in the matter of the kind, has been asserted in one judicial decision after another for many years. When the States supreme Court, in the case of the State of Texas vs. White, said that a State is a States rights man, but that explanation does not apply to later decisions; and the States are not up to this State, the vested interest argument becomes of small force.

When the States supreme Court, in the case of the State of Texas vs. White, said that a State is a States rights man, but that explanation does not apply to later decisions; and the States are not up to this State, the vested interest argument becomes of small force.

The principle that the State is sovereign and can do as it pleases in the matter of the kind, has been asserted in one judicial decision after another for many years. When the States supreme Court, in the case of the State of Texas vs. White, said that a State is a States rights man, but that explanation does not apply to later decisions; and the States are not up to this State, the vested interest argument becomes of small force.

When the States supreme Court, in the case of the State of Texas vs. White, said that a State is a States rights man, but that explanation does not apply to later decisions; and the States are not up to this State, the vested interest argument becomes of small force.

The principle that the State is sovereign and can do as it pleases in the matter of the kind, has been asserted in one judicial decision after another for many years. When the States supreme Court, in the case of the State of Texas vs. White, said that a State is a States rights man, but that explanation does not apply to later decisions; and the States are not up to this State, the vested interest argument becomes of small force.

When the States supreme Court, in the case of the State of Texas vs. White, said that a State is a States rights man, but that explanation does not apply to later decisions; and the States are not up to this State, the vested interest argument becomes of small force.

The principle that the State is sovereign and can do as it pleases in the matter of the kind, has been asserted in one judicial decision after another for many years. When the States supreme Court, in the case of the State of Texas vs. White, said that a State is a States rights man, but that explanation does not apply to later decisions; and the States are not up to this State, the vested interest argument becomes of small force.

When the States supreme Court, in the case of the State of Texas vs. White, said that a State is a States rights man, but that explanation does not apply to later decisions; and the States are not up to this State, the vested interest argument becomes of small force.

MOOTED AND BOOTED. Mock Murderer Gilchrist Fares Hardly With the Budding Blackstones-Lively Tilt Between Lawyers and Witnesses.

TO SCARE SCALPERS. A New Railway Ticket Which May Drive Them Out of Business.

A PURCHASER MUST BE DESCRIBED.

REBATES TO BE PAID ON THE TICKETS.

MUST SIGN ON THE SPOT.

THE EXPOSITION SITE.

SELECTED FOR THE ERECTION OF THREE HUNDRED.

A VERY SUCCESSFUL AND PROFITABLE SESSION HELD AT BRADDOCK.

A KNOWN OFFICER TO THE CENTRAL STATION WITH HIS PRISONER.

LABOR NOTES.

LOCAL ITEMS, LIMITED.

INCIDENTS OF A DAY IN TWO CITIES CONDENSED FOR READING.

A DETECTIVE LOCKED UP.

LABOR NOTES.

LOCAL ITEMS, LIMITED.

INCIDENTS OF A DAY IN TWO CITIES CONDENSED FOR READING.

A DETECTIVE LOCKED UP.

LABOR NOTES.

LOCAL ITEMS, LIMITED.

INCIDENTS OF A DAY IN TWO CITIES CONDENSED FOR READING.

A DETECTIVE LOCKED UP.

LABOR NOTES.

LOCAL ITEMS, LIMITED.

INCIDENTS OF A DAY IN TWO CITIES CONDENSED FOR READING.

A DETECTIVE LOCKED UP.

LABOR NOTES.

LOCAL ITEMS, LIMITED.

INCIDENTS OF A DAY IN TWO CITIES CONDENSED FOR READING.

A DETECTIVE LOCKED UP.

LABOR NOTES.

LOCAL ITEMS, LIMITED.

INCIDENTS OF A DAY IN TWO CITIES CONDENSED FOR READING.

A DETECTIVE LOCKED UP.

LABOR NOTES.

LOCAL ITEMS, LIMITED.

INCIDENTS OF A DAY IN TWO CITIES CONDENSED FOR READING.

A DETECTIVE LOCKED UP.

LABOR NOTES.

LOCAL ITEMS, LIMITED.

INCIDENTS OF A DAY IN TWO CITIES CONDENSED FOR READING.

A DETECTIVE LOCKED UP.

LABOR NOTES.

LOCAL ITEMS, LIMITED.

INCIDENTS OF A DAY IN TWO CITIES CONDENSED FOR READING.

A DETECTIVE LOCKED UP.

LABOR NOTES.

LOCAL ITEMS, LIMITED.

INCIDENTS OF A DAY IN TWO CITIES CONDENSED FOR READING.

A DETECTIVE LOCKED UP.

LABOR NOTES.

LOCAL ITEMS, LIMITED.

INCIDENTS OF A DAY IN TWO CITIES CONDENSED FOR READING.

TO SCARE SCALPERS. A New Railway Ticket Which May Drive Them Out of Business.

A PURCHASER MUST BE DESCRIBED.

REBATES TO BE PAID ON THE TICKETS.

MUST SIGN ON THE SPOT.

THE EXPOSITION SITE.

SELECTED FOR THE ERECTION OF THREE HUNDRED.

A VERY SUCCESSFUL AND PROFITABLE SESSION HELD AT BRADDOCK.

A KNOWN OFFICER TO THE CENTRAL STATION WITH HIS PRISONER.

LABOR NOTES.

LOCAL ITEMS, LIMITED.

INCIDENTS OF A DAY IN TWO CITIES CONDENSED FOR READING.

A DETECTIVE LOCKED UP.

LABOR NOTES.

LOCAL ITEMS, LIMITED.

INCIDENTS OF A DAY IN TWO CITIES CONDENSED FOR READING.

A DETECTIVE LOCKED UP.

LABOR NOTES.

LOCAL ITEMS, LIMITED.

INCIDENTS OF A DAY IN TWO CITIES CONDENSED FOR READING.

A DETECTIVE LOCKED UP.

LABOR NOTES.

LOCAL ITEMS, LIMITED.

INCIDENTS OF A DAY IN TWO CITIES CONDENSED FOR READING.

A DETECTIVE LOCKED UP.

LABOR NOTES.

LOCAL ITEMS, LIMITED.

INCIDENTS OF A DAY IN TWO CITIES CONDENSED FOR READING.

A DETECTIVE LOCKED UP.

LABOR NOTES.

LOCAL ITEMS, LIMITED.

INCIDENTS OF A DAY IN TWO CITIES CONDENSED FOR READING.

A DETECTIVE LOCKED UP.

LABOR NOTES.

LOCAL ITEMS, LIMITED.

INCIDENTS OF A DAY IN TWO CITIES CONDENSED FOR READING.

A DETECTIVE LOCKED UP.

LABOR NOTES.

LOCAL ITEMS, LIMITED.

INCIDENTS OF A DAY IN TWO CITIES CONDENSED FOR READING.

A DETECTIVE LOCKED UP.

LABOR NOTES.

LOCAL ITEMS, LIMITED.

INCIDENTS OF A DAY IN TWO CITIES CONDENSED FOR READING.

A DETECTIVE LOCKED UP.

LABOR NOTES.

LOCAL ITEMS, LIMITED.

INCIDENTS OF A DAY IN TWO CITIES CONDENSED FOR READING.

A DETECTIVE LOCKED UP.

LABOR NOTES.

LOCAL ITEMS, LIMITED.