

CITY AND SUBURBAN.

Daily Prayer Meeting—From 12 M. to 12:30 o'clock at the Methodist Church, Fifth street, next door to GAZETTE office.

The dogs are hot to be poisoned this year. They will be impounded.

The supply of lager beer for the coming summer is said to be quite small.

The work on the new steeple of St. Paul's Cathedral is rapidly progressing.

The Police have adopted a peculiar whistle as a signal, almost entirely ignoring the usual one.

The Fruit in this neighborhood promises unusually well. Peaches will be very plenty.

Sheffield street, in the Fifth ward, Allegheny, is one of the finest thoroughfares in either city.

The same returns are refused for publication by the assessor of this district. It is hinted that they show a woful decrease from last year.

An inebriated fellow called "watch" on Fifth street at an early hour this morning, and disappeared before the "charities" could get to him.

It is seriously urged that to properly accommodate the voters who congregate on Fifth street the pavements should be made much wider.

Street Improvement—A large force of workmen are engaged in grading Fayette street, in the Fifth ward, Allegheny, preparatory to its being paved.

Improving—The woman Ann McFarland who was out on the head with a hatchet by her husband in Virginia, which was published was slightly better yesterday.

Strawberries—The price of strawberries is declining rapidly. They sold in market yesterday at sixteen cents per quart. They are very fine this season, and in great abundance.

Fight—A fight occurred last night about eleven o'clock, in Virginia Alley, which resulted in calling a squad of police to the spot, the fight however being over before any of them arrived.

The boat race between Coultter and Hamill will take place to-day. Considerable interest is manifested in the affair here. The boats are about even. In tomorrow's issue we will be able to give the result.

Larceny—John Gillespie charged James Cain before Alderman Taylor yesterday with the larceny of a lot of lumber from the bank of the Allegheny river. He failed to testify, however, and the accused was discharged.

A young and promising business man has been detected in a series of forgeries, using the name of a rich relative by marriage to secure funds from accommodation bankers. We will hereafter publish the full particulars.

Will Meet This Evening—The Allegheny City Republican Executive Committee meets this evening, at City Hall, at 8 o'clock. As this is the first meeting the present campaign, all persons interested should attend.

James Dougherty, who was struck with a two pound weight by Thomas Hart, the circumstances of which were noticed in yesterday's GAZETTE, is reported to be sinking rapidly and it is feared that his injuries will prove fatal.

New Sewer—Workmen are engaged in constructing a private sewer on West Common, Allegheny, from the residences of Henry Irwin and James Patton, Esq., to connect with the main sewer of the city, which crosses the Commons.

Alteration—The Columbia Hook and Ladder Company of Allegheny have altered their ladder truck so as to have their apparatus rest upon rollers above the axles, instead of below as before, and it can now be handled much easier and quicker.

Disorderly—Thomas Divino alleges that Sarah Mitchell called him all sorts of names and acted otherwise very disorderly in the neighborhood in which he lives, for which he makes information to do to the order of Alderman Thomas. A warrant was issued by Alderman Thomas.

Light Weights—H. B. Lyon, sealer of weights and measures, made information before Alderman Humbert yesterday, against John McKee, for selling measures which he had condemned. The measures were confiscated and defendant released upon payment of costs.

Inquest—Alderman G. M. Irwin, in the absence of Coroner Clawson, held an inquest yesterday evening on the body of William Peters, who was killed by a fall from a cherry tree, an account of which was given in yesterday's issue. The jury rendered a verdict of accidental death.

Grand Vocal Concert—We would again remind our readers of the grand vocal concert to be given this evening in the Second U. P. Church of this city, for the benefit of the English Ward Mission School. We hope there will be such a large attendance as is justly due to such a benevolent institution.

Attack on a Boy—E. R. Newland, made information before Alderman Thomas, against C. C. Craft, for assault and battery. Newland states that Craft attacked him on the sidewalk, near the Hill, striking him on the side of the head with a club, and abusing him. Warrant issued.

Violating City Ordinance—John Okenhart and W. A. Armstrong were taken before Alderman Humbert yesterday for violation of a city ordinance, in allowing their wagons to stand on Market street during market hours. After paying their costs they were discharged, this being their first offense.

Accident—On Tuesday last, James Singer, a lad about twelve years of age, met with a serious accident. It appears that he was practicing on a turning pole, when he fell striking his head violently against the bars of an iron fence, inflicting a very severe wound on the temple. He was carried to his home on Frank street, Allegheny, and his injuries attended to.

Fugitive Arrested—William Bea, a fugitive from justice, was arrested yesterday by officers Fowler and Lieutenant Wilmut and taken before the Mayor, who committed him to jail. It is alleged that he broke jail at Portsmouth, Sciota county, Ohio, May 25th, where he was confined on a charge of larceny. The authorities at Portsmouth have been notified of his arrest.

High School Commencement—The Commencement exercises of the Pittsburgh High School will take place at their hall, on Wood street, on Friday evening, the 19th inst., at 7 o'clock. The program consists of a vocal and instrumental concert, comprising orations and essays, interspersed with musical selections, and closing with the celebratory address by Miss Anna M. Cooper.

Ordinance Violated—Peter Tomaler, market commissioner, made information yesterday against Robert Barbour for violation of city ordinance and interference with him in the discharge of his duties by letting down the chains stretched across the Diamond during market hours. Barbour denied the charges and was discharged. His fine was set at \$100.

MURDER BY POISON.

Trial of Louis Lane for the Murder of His Wife.

Wednesday morning, in the Court of Oyer and Terminer, before Judges Sterrett and Stowe, the case of the Commonwealth vs. Louis Lane, a colored man, resident in the city, indicted for the murder of his wife by administering to her arsenic, was taken up. Wm. T. Haines and John C. McCarthy, Esq., appearing as counsel for the prisoner, and Col. L. B. Duff, District Attorney, assisted by W. A. Leggett, Esq., for the Commonwealth.

Mr. Haines prayed that the prisoner be arraigned, for the reason that at the time of his arraignment on Saturday last he was without counsel. He stated that to proceed with the trial under the present arrangement would be prejudicial to the prisoner.

The District Attorney, not objecting, and the Court seeing no legal obstacle in the way, allowed the prisoner to withdraw his plea of guilty, and ordered a rearrangement.

Mr. Haines interposed and moved to quash the indictment. On the ground that the indictment upon which the commitment, and all subsequent proceedings are founded, is invalid, and for the following reasons, viz: 1. Because the indictment is not in conformity with the act of May 7, 1841, sec. 15, can be construed so as to include Alderman Lane, the designation of "Justices of the Peace," yet the indictment upon which such jurisdiction is alone founded, viz: the inability of the Coroner to attend, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

2. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

3. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

4. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

5. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

6. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

7. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

8. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

9. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

10. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

11. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

12. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

13. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

14. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

15. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

16. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

17. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

18. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

19. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

20. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

21. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

22. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

23. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

24. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

25. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

26. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

27. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

28. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

29. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

30. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

31. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

32. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

33. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

34. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

35. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

36. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

37. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

38. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

39. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

40. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

41. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

42. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

43. Because the act of May 27, 1841, section 10, requires the indictment to be returned by a Justice of the Peace, under the authority conferred by it, to be certified to the Court by a Justice of the Peace, and that the Court shall adjudge the case justified by the evidence, or as stated more forcibly, in a subsequent act, the impracticability of his attendance, did not arise.

Black, saw no unusual appearances about the body of his wife. He stated that he had taken the stomach, and gave it to Alderman Butler.

Alderman Butler, sworn—Received from Dr. Black a stone jar, which he stated contained the stomach of Mrs. Henrietta Lane; I delivered the jar to Professor Wulff.

Cross-examined—Dr. Black pointed to the stone jar in a cupboard in my office, and told me to take charge of it.

Dr. Black recalled—Placed the jar in a cupboard in Alderman Butler's office, and waited till the Alderman came; then went with him to the cupboard; pointed out the jar containing the stomach, and told him to take charge of it.

Otto Wulff, sworn—Am a practical chemist, in the city of Pittsburgh, since 1851, in Germany. (Witness proposed to read from manuscript what he had to testify, stating he could not speak English directly, and preferred this mode as being more satisfactory to himself. Defense objected, but would consent to witness reciting the manuscript, if the same was being read from a manuscript. Defense objected to the manuscript being read from a manuscript, and stated that he would not consent to it being read from a manuscript.)

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

Witness testified that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic. He stated that he had analyzed the stomach, and found it contained arsenic.

First-class Livery and Sale Stables. Prominent amongst our first-class and well conducted livery and sale stables that of Messrs. McKelvey & Sampson, No. 117 and 119 Third street, directly opposite the St. Charles Hotel. They have, during their comparatively brief term in business succeeded in building up a patronage that has grown so large as to demand larger facilities for its accommodation, and no firm in this line of business are more worthy of an endorsement of the public. Mr. McKelvey is thoroughly acquainted with every detail of the business, having had long experience in the management of the stables of W. B. Jackson, remaining with him up to the time he retired from the business, when he (Mr. McKelvey) entered the proprietorship and management of the Third street stables. He is always on hand, carefully looks after all horses entrusted to his care for boarding, and having none but the most capable, prompt and sober hostlers and drivers in his employ, sustains high reputation with all who have bestowed their patronage. At the stables will be found all the latest styles of carriages, buggies and other vehicles are kept for hire to travel in, and no where else in the city can a double or single team be got ready in good style at quicker notice. Our readers are earnestly recommended to favor Messrs. McKelvey & Sampson by calling for anything in their line, as we can guarantee in advance that they will be satisfactorily answered. We have no objection to our bestowing their patronage on such worthy, careful and enterprising gentlemen. Particular attention is paid to the buying and selling of horses, and any person having any business of that character cannot entrust it to more careful hands.

The Best Family Sewing Machine. In the world is Singer's New Nolessee Machine. Those of our readers who have not examined this marvel of perfection should call at the salesroom and do so at once, and be convinced that it is the best. It is very remarkable for its quietness, speed, lightness in running, ease of management, simplicity of position of parts. It is entirely different from Singer's old machine. The tension is really self-adjusting, running from various thicknesses of goods without change; and the feed motion is so perfect that the operator does not have to hold the goods stretched to prevent puckering even when sewing the finest Serges or Nainsook. The hemmer is so perfect that it will make any width of hem, and fall in the most beautiful manner with less skill than is required to sew a straight seam on any other machine. The machine works equally well on the finest or coarsest materials, and is so simple in its construction that the finest needle of cotton or heavy patent or linen thread. Do not be influenced by the claims of rival machines, who, by misrepresentation, try to prevent customers from examining this machine, knowing that their own will not stand comparison. Prices and terms to suit all. Straw & Morton, corner of St. Clair and Penn streets.

Home Sites at Hoboken at Auction. Perhaps the most important sale of building lots in this neighborhood for a long time past, will be that advertised to take place next Saturday at Hoboken, that delightfully situated site for building purposes on the Western Pennsylvania Railroad seven miles up the river to Allegheny. The auctioneers Messrs. Smith, Yanhook & McClelland, announce this sale as positive, and in an advertisement on our Fifth page fully describe the property, 125 lots of which will be knocked down perpetually under the terms of the highest bidder. Excursion trains will leave the Federal street depot at 11:20 o'clock a. m., and at 2:30 o'clock p. m., so that the highest bidder will