

Bradford Reporter.

Towanda, Pa., Dec. 1, 1881.

The Cabinet maker will be long mourning a lost occupation.

The Lebanon Courier wants the Hon. JACOB C. HENRY, of that county, nominated as the Republican candidate for Secretary of Internal Affairs.

The enemies of President ARTHUR are really nonplussed; they can find nothing in his administration, so far, to find fault with. Even their inventive genius seems to be at fault.

Among the valuable statistics of the tenth census as far as area of Pennsylvania given as 4,985 square miles. Center county is the largest in the State, with 1,230 square miles.

The health of ALEXANDER H. STEVENSON is said to be better than it has been for three years. He now weighs ninety-four pounds, while at one time he barely tipped the beam at seventy-three.

SECRETARY KIRKWOOD, on Saturday, in the name of the President, accepted the resignation of Commissioner MARBLE, of the Patent Office, to take effect as soon as his successor shall be qualified.

The chairman of the Republican Congressional Committee has issued a call for a caucus in the House of Representatives on December 3d, at noon, to nominate a candidate for Speaker and candidates for the other elective offices.

Ex-Senator WALLACE is being mentioned as the probable candidate of the Democracy next year for Governor. Should he be nominated there would be occasion for the Republican candidate not permitting grass to grow under his feet.

ESTIMATES made from information gathered by the Medical Academy of Paris fix the number of doctors in various parts of the world at 189,000. Of these there are 15,000 in the United States, 30,000 in France, 23,000 in Germany and Austria, 35,000 in Great Britain and its colonies, 10,000 in Italy and 5,000 in Spain.

PRESIDENT ARTHUR has set down heavily on a certain class of journals by not doing anything that they possibly find fault with. They are almost dying of heart failure. He has made it a rule, but so far have not been gratified. The Lancaster Inquirer thinks the President should take pity on them and commit some indiscretion.

WILLIAM H. ENGLISH, proprietor of the Indianapolis opera house, has caused the arrest of four colored performers, known to the profession as the "Big Four," for breach of an engagement, which, according to his statement, caused a loss to him of \$300. ENGLISH will be remembered as the man who ran for Vice President on the Democratic ticket in 1880.

GRAPE culture has made so much progress already in our New England, middle and western States, and the increase from year to year is so extraordinary, that some enthusiastic agriculturists may be excused for seeing nothing in the future but the possibility of America becoming as great in this branch of cultivation as she already is in so many others. In the Atlantic States grape culture seems to offer many sources of profit, sufficient to compensate for the transfer of grain culture from those States to the far west.

THE New York Brewers are again in the pillory for the use of poisonous ingredients in the production of beer, and Commissioner RAY, who is agitating the matter, declares that the so-called beverage of Gambinus is an adulterated compound entirely unfit to drink. It is but a short time since the brewers professed to give a statement of what they were doing, but in recent reports that there are some things they either forgot to mention or kept back from the public on purpose.

THE total Greenback vote in this State is about 17,000. The Philadelphia Record charges that the Chairman of the State Committee attempted to sell the organization on the State ticket. It points to the fact that the Greenback vote did not appear in Luzerne and other counties in that section, where NORTON's majority was larger than given Democratic candidates for some years, as evidence that NORTON's bar was tapped to some purpose, and wonders how long the decent members of the Greenback party will consent to be bought and sold by the leaders.

THE geographer of the tenth census reports the water area of the United States at 11,500 square miles of rivers and smaller streams, 23,000 of lakes and ponds and 15,000 of coast waters, bays, gulfs and sounds, making an aggregate surface of 50,000 square miles. He fails to give an estimate of the average depth and doesn't attempt to relate the tide to gales, hurricanes or high tides, but even without this valuable aid at computation, and in view of the growing tendency to economize in water as a beverage, sufficient quantity is disclosed to justify the hope that the price of milk need not necessarily advance hereafter, even in dry seasons.

WE most heartily endorse the following from the Lebanon Courier: "A candidate for Congress has been found against an editor named CRAB, up in Lackawanna county, for a while on Mr. SCRANTON. We know little of this particular case, but that there is too loose a pen wielded by many connected with the sensation press of the country is a fact to be deplored. There is a certain class of papers whose specialty is the assailing of characters of public men, 'without rhyme or reason,' and a pity it is that a perverted taste among the people causes the slanders to be enjoyed, and incites to further indulgence in the wicked and unmanly work. A man's character can be well judged by the papers he is found reading."

THE committee appointed by the National Grange waited upon Commissioner LORINE last week and presented the resolutions embodying the idea that the Department of Agriculture should be elevated to a higher plane, with a Cabinet officer at its head, and that it could best promote the interests of agriculture by being kept clear of all other interests. Commissioner LORINE in reply said that he had advocated an enlargement of his department, so as to include those interests which were intimately and to a great extent inseparably allied to agriculture. He could not personally urge any action looking toward making his a Cabinet office. He left that to the country and to legislation which the agricultural interests may demand.

POSTMASTER-GENERAL JAMES' annual report has been made public. He recommends a reduction in the salaries of postmasters, a redistribution of the sums paid for railway mail service, and a change in the rates charged for second-class mail matter, and the sale of cheap newspapers printed matter. By the aid of these and other reforms, he announces that letter postage can be reduced from three to two cents in the next three years. The Postmaster-General also recommends post office savings banks, cheap money orders at the rate of three cents for sums of \$5 and less, and other important reforms. Through the exposure and stoppage of the Star Route frauds, \$1,147,757 has been saved to the Department.

MR. A. M. GIBSON, who claims to be a special attorney for the United States in the matter of the Star route investigation, has submitted a report to the Acting Attorney General, which was last week made public. Mr. Gibson says at the outset: "For manifest reasons it would not be prudent in my report to disclose the facts discovered by the investigation pursued by the representatives of the two departments, or to indicate a title of the evidence, which would be reserved for the courts of justice." The document is nevertheless of great length, and would fill about twenty ordinary newspaper columns, exclusive of its accompanying "exhibits." Among other charges which are alluded to is the matter of sixteen letters to Gen. B. B. Bateman, dated at New York, dated 1877, the contract price being \$184,544.24, and the extra allowances \$197,046.10. Cases are also cited where the increase was at the rate of 36 per cent, and the additional work about 25 per cent. The granting of retroactive allowances, in direct violation of law, is also charged.

PROSECUTIONS have been made in a number of counties throughout the State of physicians who neglected or peevishly refused to register under the act. Some of these physicians assumed to set themselves above the law, and to defy it, but in all these cases the law was too strong for them. The trouble in all such cases is the efforts of a man or a number of men to decide that a law is wrong. No man or set of men can do this. That is the business of the court of last resort. Lower courts are bound to enforce all statutes until they are pronounced unconstitutional, and this the physicians who attempted to ignore the registration act have discovered. It is also complained by some physicians that bogus diplomas are presented to the practitioners. This may be so, but as the matter now stands, practitioners are the only authority to judge of the genuineness of such instruments. Whether these officers do this intelligently or not, is no question for the courts to decide. They have the authority to make the judgment in the premises, and so the courts decide. All that all physicians have to do is to apply for and make a registry, and when they fail in this, they are liable to the fine.

THE PARTY TRIPLICATE. The uninstructed observer might conclude that the Republican party in Pennsylvania has a superabundance of material after reading the post election address of Mr. WOLFE and the resolutions adopted by the gentlemen who met at the Continental hotel the other day. Parties in duplicate are not so uncommon as to excite much remark. Parties in triplicate are not so often observed, however. We do not know of any political party so great numerically that it can afford to divide itself in even two parts, and in that condition expect to appear formidable to a well organized opposition. The returns of the November election conclusively show that had the Democracy been united and well led they would have been able to carry off the fruits of victory. The Republicans were, partly because they were well organized, and partly because the Democrats were divided in sentiment and in action.

The Republicans of Pennsylvania cannot afford to maintain a state of war within the party. The entire membership of the party is needed to give moral force to the victory. The old proverb touching a house divided against itself applies to political parties as forcibly as it does to nations. It does not follow that there can be no difference in opinion in a nation at peace with itself. We know better than that at the outset. What does follow is that our united purpose is absolutely required to preserve national integrity. Unity of purpose and differences of opinion are strictly compatible. There was a very wide divergence of opinion among the founders of the republic, but with it all there was a singleness of purpose made entirely evident to any one who reads history for instruction. There was very little in common, so far as opinion was concerned, between the Federalists, led by HAMILTON, WASHINGTON and ADAMS, and the early Republicans led by JEFFERSON and BURR. But so far as the Republic was concerned all of these men were practically united, each professing, and no doubt sincerely, save as to BURR, to desire nothing so much as the success of the newly born nation. They differed respecting policy, and time has shown that there was room for differences of opinion in that respect.

There is the same reason for differences of opinion within a party. Such differences prevailed in the Republican party from the beginning. Even during the war the Republicans differed widely as to the policy of emancipation. They differed, yet their purpose being the same, the effect was not destruction to that party in action which alone can render a party formidable to its opponents. At this time the quarrel between Republicans does not relate to the general policy of the party. Republicans differ in opinion somewhat as respects the policy of the party in the nation. But the quarrel is not over such divergences in opinion. The quarrel relates to leadership, to management, to dynasties. It is not a new quarrel, but it is not any one as old as the history of organized society. It is a war within.

SOME newspaper articles have been published in Boston relative to JAY GOULD's alleged selfishness and other unamiable qualities, the widow of JAMES FISK, Jr., writes from that city to the New York Herald to make public her opinion about Mr. GOULD. Whatever he may be to other people to her he has been a just and generous man, she calls him her great friend, and she implies that since her husband's death she has needed a friend. He is entitled to the benefit of her testimony and she seems to give it gladly and gratefully.

ACTING Assistant Surgeon LAMB, who performed the autopsy upon the body of the late President GARFIELD, has published a statement refuting the rumors that there was any evidence of poison of method in conducting the examination. He details the processes by which the discovery of the bullet was reached, and explains that to medical experts there could be no possible difficulty in assigning it the proper position, although it had been removed with the internal organs. He thoroughly vindicates the conduct of the autopsy.

Gov. QUAY is said to be in doubt as to whether he will support the bill for the removal of the National Bank of the United States, or the bill for the removal of the National Bank of the United States, or the bill for the removal of the National Bank of the United States.

out armistice and sometimes without trace. It is not peculiar in any civilized land but is common in all such lands. It is not peculiar to the Republican party but common to all parties in all times. We hear a great deal of the quarrel in the Republican party of Pennsylvania because it is the majority party. But in fact there is a much more formidable quarrel going on in the Democratic party of this State, and the quarrel is between the dynasty of WALLACE and that of RANDALL. But as the Democratic party is a minority party the fullness of the conflict is never comprehended by the general public. Were the Democrats to get the lead in Pennsylvania the public would witness a party quarrel that would quite put the present unpleasantness in the Republican party out of mind.

The kind of conflict prefigured by the resolutions of the Continental Hotel meeting is certainly legitimate. It is announced as a struggle for the mastery within the lines of the party. It is not a new departure, however, but an old conflict, to be conducted with system. It is an organized struggle for the mastery. How it may be determined we cannot foretell. But if carried on as announced it cannot be destructive of party life. It may impair the power of individuals in the party. It may affect the leadership. But it cannot weaken the party as an aggressive force. It is one of the movements within party lines which are bound to develop themselves after a long term of rule. To deprecate it is to deprecate the inevitable. It is one of the conflicts which determines the survival of the fittest in party management, and it will be just as well to take it for what it is.

An important question has just been decided by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the appeal of Mr. J. B. STARK from the decision of the District Court at Williamsport. The suit involved a matter of some eighteen thousand dollars, the plaintiff being the Second National Bank of Wilkes-Barre. Mr. STARK had induced certain notes, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser, who in defense alleged usury on the part of the plaintiff. The judgment of the District Court was against Mr. STARK, and he appealed. The Supreme Court has now decided in favor of Mr. STARK, and the drawee having failed, proceedings were instituted against the indorser,