The Pittsburgh Gazette.

PUBLISHED DAILY BY

PENNIMAN, REED & CO., Proprietors,

F. B. PENNIMAN, JOSIAH KING,
T. P. HOUSTON, N. P. REED,
Editors and Proprietors.

OFFICE:
GAZETTE BUILDING, NOS. 84 AND 86 FIFTH ST.

OFFICIAL PAPER
Of Pittsburgh, Allegheny and Allegheny County.

Terms—Daily.	Semi-Weekly.	Weekly.
One year...$5.00	One year..$2.50	Single copy..$1.50
One month 75	Six mos.. 1.50	5 copies, each 1.25
By the week 15 (from carrier.)	Three mos 75	" " 1.15
		10 and one to Agent.

FRIDAY, JUNE 11, 1869.

UNION REPUBLICAN TICKET.

ASSOCIATE JUDGE DISTRICT COURT,
JOHN M. KIRKPATRICK.
ASSISTANT LAW JUDGE, COMMON PLEAS,
FRED'K. H. COLLIER.
STATE SENATE.
THOMAS HOWARD.
ASSEMBLY,
MILES S. HUMPHREYS,
ALEXANDER MILLAR,
JOSEPH WALTON,
JAMES TAYLOR,
D. N. WHITE,
JOHN H. KEER.
SHERIFF,
HUGH S. FLEMING
TREASURER,
JOS. F. DENNISTON.
CLERK OF COURTS,
JOSEPH BROWNE.
RECORDER,
THOMAS H. HUNTER.
COMMISSIONER,
CHAUNCEY B. BOSTWICK.
REGISTER,
JOSEPH H. GRAY.
CLERK OF ORPHANS' COURT,
ALEXANDER HILANDS.
DIRECTOR OF POOR,
ABDIEL McCLURE.

WE PRINT *on the inside pages of this morning's* GAZETTE—*Second page: Poetry, "Spring and Summer," Pennsylvania and Ohio State Items, Clippings. Third and Sixth pages: Financial, Commercial, Markets, Imports and River News. Seventh page: How to Prevent Moths in Furniture, Entertaining Reading Matter, Amusement Directory.*

U. S. BONDS at Frankfort, 86½@86⅝.

PETROLEUM at Antwerp, 47¾f.

GOLD closed in New York yesterday at 139¼.

WE hear better accounts from the political field in Virginia. Republicanism is drawing together more and more in harmony, while the opposition are relaxing their efforts under a most discouraging prospect for an inevitable failure.

CHILI has followed the example of Peru, and recognized the Cuban Government as belligerents. Both Governments have joined in a request, through their representatives at Washington, on our authorities to permit a withdrawal of the promise made by Peru to keep her monitors out of a conflict with the Spaniards during their transit to Peru.

WE REGRET to perceive that the Philadelphia *Press* supports the proposition to drag the Alabama controversy with England into our State politics. It is to be hoped that our cotemporary will stand alone in advocating this renewal of the "54-40 or fight" absurdity. One such fiasco as that is blemish enough upon the national repute for common-sense, and we object to its repetition at the Republican expense.

THE New York *Times* has been misled, by the balderdash of a disreputable print in the interior of our State, which maintains a precarious existence upon the fruits of past plunder of the State and National Treasuries, and upon the expectation for more, into some invidious reflections upon the management of our Republican politics. The *Times* will dismiss its fears when it comes to understand the motives of our domestic traducers.

HIS ADMIRING friends at Baltimore propose to give a terrapin lunch to Hon. REVERDY JOHNSON, who feels neglected if he is not well dined. The affair is to be called a banquet, and its design is to afford the ex-Minister an occasion for the public vindication, by himself, of his official conduct in England. It is intimated that he will show that he obeyed his instructions strictly, and these were approved by Senator SUMNER before his departure from America. After which, the Senator will have the floor.

AN IMPORTANT RUMOR obtains some little credence in Philadelphia to the effect that Gov. JOHN W. GEARY is to be called to succeed Mr. BORIE as Secretary of the Navy. We do not place any faith in the report. It may have been started to choke him off as a candidate for renomination to the Governorship, as, if the impression be made that he is to occupy a place in the Cabinet, the Republicans will have to cast about for a new candidate to unite upon for a leader in the approaching campaign.

THE INDIANA SNAP-JUDGMENT.

The Attorney General of Indiana has given an official opinion, affirming the validity of an appropriation act passed by the State Legislature, after the resignation of enough of the Democratic members of the House to break the Constitutional quorum, but before the House had been officially advised of the resignations. Hence, argue some of the Republican journals, the opinion equally establishes the validity of Indiana's ratification of the XV th Article.

The Attorney General's opinion may be an entirely sound exposition of the law, upon the precise state of facts attending the passage of that appropriation bill. But it does not apply to other legislative action—for example, the ratification referred to—under a state of facts altogether different. The House was officially advised of the resignation of those members *before voting upon the Article*. That marks the essential difference in the two cases. The quorum of the Senate had also been broken by a similar resignation in that body, but no official notice thereof had yet been brought to it, when its doors were locked, the would-be retiring Democrats kept in, the quorum preserved and the ratification carried. *Why were those doors locked?* If the new doctrine, now affirmed by some of our over zealous cotemporaries—that there can be no constitutional warrant for the claim of the minority to paralyze the action of the law-making power by breaking the quorum of three-fifths which the Indiana Constitution prescribes—be a sound doctrine, it is unfortunate that it should not have been discovered a little earlier.

We protest again, in behalf of Republican principle and of our partizan good name, against the whole of that Indiana business, in ratifying the XVth Article, as "an unprofitable snap-judgment" which will not bear an impartial revision. The sooner it is abandoned the better! Otherwise, we admonish Senators and Representatives in Congress to heed well their decision before they shall recognize this action of Indiana as legal. No party can afford to trample upon the plain forms of laws and Constitutions which have never heretofore been challenged—and, least of all, can that party afford to do it, which would be guilty of such a criminal blunder now, for the first time in its history. Nor can the people afford to have the validity of the final adoption of the XVth Article subjected to any such questions as this, business would be sure to entail upon our National politics.

A SIGN OF OUR ADVANCED CIVILIZATION.

The beneficent effects of advanced civilization cannot be more clearly seen than in the various plans through which Society extends a helping hand to each of its members. The theory of savage life was "Each for himself." All the efforts of each individual tended to benefit his own standing at the expense of his fellows. Actuated by the same spirit which leads two savages in Africa who may accidentally meet, to fall to work and see which can kill the other, the whole society of the barbarous age was warring upon itself. But with the advance of civilization, or more properly with the extension of the Christian religion, came the reverse of this social policy of mutual enmity. *All* commenced to see how *each* could be aided, and every system of co-operation was devised. The very foundation of government itself rests on this basis. The implied contract is, that every man shall hasten to help his brother, when his brother is in need. Carrying down the same idea from nations to communities, we find the system of co-operation and of societies formed. It underlies the Masonic Brotherhood, and is the moving spirit in unions of every class. But its perfection is reached in the adoption of the system of insurance. That is the practical triumph of all the doctrines of mutual aid. The first application of the plan of the many helping each one of its members, was the origination of the system of fire and marine insurance. There the society guarantees protection and recompense to each of its individual supporters and under its operation the loss of each is divided among all. By this means none can be crushed by disaster. But a higher form of mutual protection was destined to be reached in the organization of Life Insurance. It was possible that many of those who contributed to a fire insurance company, would never be exposed to the danger which they paid their money to avoid, and thus, after years of expense, they might find that they would have been as safe had they not paid premiums. Not so with Life Insurance. The dread certainty of death is not a possible danger to be averted; it will come to all, and is the only certain event in all the future. In preparing against its ravages, no man need fear that he is losing his money, or foolishly investing it. He is but taking a wise precaution against an approaching event. There is something positively startling in the idea of an insurance against the loss which must follow death. If an intelligent Chinaman was to be told the theory of Life Insurance, he would be amazed at its ingenuity and justice, and would be astonished that all did not avail themselves of its advantages. To have a society which will guarantee to the family of the deceased a certain large sum, on condition of a small annual payment, and that sum to be paid whether he die to-morrow or fifty years hence, is certainly a novel plan, and one which robs death of some of its keenest terrors. It is the dread of the destitution of the dear ones, which will follow death, which makes so many fathers of families tremble at its approach; and now a means is invented to deprive it of this great terror. Surely the discoverer of such a remedy can demand the credit for ingenuity given to WATT, WHITNEY, or FULTON. The only possible fear that can restrain a wise man from having an insurance effected on his life, is the thought that the company insuring may, after all, be insolvent or treacherous, and that when he is gone and none are present to protect his orphans, they may be deceived and imposed upon. This thought is justified with small local companies, but it is a foolish doubt when applied to a national enterprise. In such an institution as the National Life Insurance Company there is no more danger of a failure than is there of the eternal hills becoming unstable. It is an institution chartered by the Congress of the Nation; its revenues are so large, the character of its controllers so high, and its business so extended, that policy as well as honesty makes such a failure to keep its engagements impossible. We see in the National Life, the perfection of the theory of fraternal co-operation, which has been gradually developing for so many centuries—for it not only embraces all the ideas of the past, but is based on so broad a foundation that we have assurance that honesty as well as ingenuity will mark its successful workings.

THE PITH OF THE GEORGIAN QUESTION.

The act of Congress of June 25, '68, to admit certain States, including Georgia, to representation in Congress, required, among other conditions precedent, her ratification of the XIVth Article. She did apparently ratify that Article, but subsequently declared that the act of ratification was usurpatory, in that it was done by an illegal body, to-wit, a Legislature in which the majorities were made up of intruders not having a shadow of constitutional title to seats therein. And then, consistently with that doctrine, the State proceeded to purge these intruders out. Of course their quasi-legislative record is expunged when they were expelled.

In this matter, we take Georgia at her own word, and hold her to its consequences, the most prominent of which must be her utter failure to ratify the Article, and her own resulting exclusion from the sisterhood of recognized States. Simply because the reactionary rebel sentiment obtained the control of that State's affairs, would be of no legal consequence to us, so long as their recovery of that position was in accordance with their Constitution and laws. We might regret it, but should be powerless to prevent or repair the political mischief. On no such ground do her Senators and Representatives stand now excluded from Congress. They remain in the lobby for a better reason—that an indispensible condition for their admittance, the legal ratification of that Article, remains unfulfilled, according to their own showing. It is true, as we stated yesterday, that the last House received her Representatives, but the Senate made no such blunder, and the present Congress concurs in the wiser caution, which is clearly defensible upon the position as we have here stated it—and upon no other ground whatever. Hence, whether in view of the law or of the facts, the New York *Times* is in error when it says:

Her Legislature ratified the Fourteenth Amendment, and we have never heard the validity of its action in so doing questioned. Its Representatives were admitted to the House and held their seats to the close of the Fortieth Congress. The State has, then, been represented in Congress since its reconstruction under the law or Congress, and all the acts essential to restore the State to its "practical relations to the Union" seem to have been performed to the entire satisfaction of all departments of the Government.

Every statement in this paragraph is a mistake, as we have repeatedly shown, and the XLIst Congress with the Executive are clearly justifiable in treating Georgia as under a provisional government, *unless we are all to be required to concede that this quasi legislative action, of persons who are held palpably intruders, without warrant for any legislative privilege whatever, is competent to bind both the State and the Union.* That is the question to be considered by Congress, by the President and by the people. For ourselves, it is plain enough where we stand upon it.

THE LAST FREE-TRADE DODGE.

If it be true, as stated in some quarters, that Republican politicians incline to engraft the Alabama question among party issues, they will reckon without their host in counting upon the Republicans of Pennsylvania. But we doubt the truth of the statement to which we refer. It bears the ear-marks of an opposition scheme to embarrass the Republicans of this State, in their advocacy of other political issues. The story is industriously disseminated from Washington, for the evident purpose of damaging a favorite principle in this Commonwealth—that of protection for American industry. For it is at once followed up with the flagrantly erroneous insinuation, in the New York *Post*, the leading free-trade organ of the foreign importers, that the scheme is wholly "a protectionist plot" to secure popular majorities by the help of a side-issue.

We have yet to see the first journal in this State, among those which have been ever known as consistent and sincere advocates for protection, which gives a shadow of countenance to the alleged movement for Republicanizing the Alabama issue. On the contrary, that proposition was denounced in our own columns, upon the first telegraphic intimation of it, and now, one after another, the best journals of the State are coming forward with the same expressions of disapproval. For example, the Philadelphia *North American*, a newspaper which was never untrue to the interests of native industry, remarks that the "leaders" who could propose this new article in our political creed, must be few in number "and composed rather of those who would be, than of such as are leaders." And it adds, upon the point of withdrawing the question from diplomacy, that:

This will be the almost certain result if a party is formed on the basis of demanding all of our claims from England without qualification. We have great hopes that justice will yet be tendered us by that country, and an absolute certainty that wise delay will win for us all we need to have without war. Of war we have had enough to satisfy the most belligerent and those who pay the piper, so that, unless those who propose to incorporate another "54 40 or fight" in the political platforms are favored with a special providence, their scheme is likely to fall through before it is matured. We want peace and business, and the country will accept another war only when its absolute necessity is proved.

The Wheeling *Intelligencer* says:

A war of any magnitude with anybody, in our present financial condition, would lay still heavier burdens on the now heavily taxed business interests of the country and could not fail to result in grave disasters. If the administration and the party in power cannot maintain themselves without resort to such an expedient, they are very certain to go down. The people of the United States are not ready to engage in any such folly. If leading Republicans cannot keep themselves in office except by such tricks as this, it is better they should be out of office. We hope the administration does not countenance any such mad scheme as an English war or such tricks as putting the Republican party on a war platform next fall.

Plainly, the allegation of the *Post* is a slander upon the protectionists of Pennsylvania, unless it be supported by the specific proofs which we have the right to ask for. Let the New York paper specify one representative man—not BUTLER, nor CHANDLER, but leaders whom Republicanism everywhere regards—whose adhesion to this new idea justifies its allegation of a "protectionist plot." Otherwise, the *Post* will be held responsible for fabricating a story which has just about as much real substance as free-trade "arguments" and "facts" can generally boast of. In the meantime, let us say that neither the N. Y. *Post* nor its "Republican leaders" can find ten intelligent men in Western Pennsylvania, who would sustain the incorporation of that dodge into our political creed. The free-traders, and their European friends, may keep it all to themselves.

MATTER TO THINK UPON.

The New York *Tribune*, while paying a just tribute to the uprightness of Mr. BRYANT, the veteran editor of the *Evening Post*, of that city, incidentally expresses, in a decided manner, an opinion entitled to high consideration. We copy two paragraphs, as follows:

"Mr. William C. Bryant has been over forty years an editor in this city, and always a pronounced and unequivocal Free Trader. Nay: it is considerably *more* than forty years since in his "Meditation on Rhode Island Coal," he tilted at Secretary Richard Rush's first Protectionist Report as Secretary of the Treasury, thus:

"Moore's Lalla Rookh, the Treasury Report,
And other brilliant matters of the sort."

In these forty-odd years, we have seen nothing to incite a doubt that Mr. Bryant's understanding and heart were on the same side with his pen; and the fact that his services to the Free Trade cause have been generously requited, casts no shadow on his integrity. We say it to the honor of our importers that they have, by their advertising patronage, wisely, generously, sagaciously made *The Evening Post* the most profitable newspaper of like circulation in America, as they ought to have done. Had those interested in the prosperity and progress of American Manufactures evinced equal good sense, instead of barely one journal openly, actively, defiantly Protectionist in New York, there would have been at least half a dozen. *And now, if they shall be juggled out of the present tariff, as they were out of that of 1828, and again out of that of 1842, we shall for the country's sake deeply regret the calamity, but for theirs not a bit.* THEY WILL HAVE RICHLY DESERVED THEIR BACKSET."

This censure upon the men prominently connected with the manufacturing interest, is not simply applicable in New York, but everywhere else throughout the whole country; and, in a special degree, in those centres of population where manufacturing is the main employment both of labor and capital.

THE COURTS.

United States District Court—Judge McCandless.

THURSDAY, June 10.—The case of the United States vs. McKim & Co., reported yesterday, was resumed. Maj. A. M. Brown closed the argument for the defendants, and was followed by District Attorney Carnahan on behalf of the Government.

Judge McCandless charged the jury as follows: I cannot agree with the learned counsel for the defendants, in the points submitted by them. This is not a case parallel to those before my brothers Drummond and Leavitt, at Chicago and Cincinnati. It is not a case of forfeiture, dependent upon an intent to defraud the Government, or of fraud actually perpetrated. The Government does not claim that the Revenue has been defrauded, or that even such was the design of the parties in failing to comply with the requisitions of the law. The minute details enumerated in the statute, necessary for the construction of a distillery, almost equal to those required for the erection of King Solomon's Temple, where each cubit was particularized, were for the purpose of preventing fraud which former laws seemed inadequate to meet.

This is an action for the recovery of a penalty imposed for not doing that which the law commands, or doing that which the law forbids. It is averred that the cisterns were not so constructed as to prevent the abstractions of spirits while passing from the outlet of the worm and forward to the receiving cistern. And that the apparatus was so arranged that free access was had to the spirits between the outlet of the worm and the cistern room, and that while the spirits were so passing, they might be abstracted, to the prejudice of the public revenue.

If you believe the witnesses on the part of the Government, such was the case in this distillery.

But it is contended that under the ninety-sixth section this must be "wilfully and maliciously done." So it must. And Mr. M'Kim, with the candor which becomes his character, admits it was done by him for the reason that if the opening in the receiving tub had not been made, he could not see whether what was passing from the worm was high or low wines, that the pressure from the stills forced up the undistilled mash, and that he could not manufacture whisky without it. No man is compelled to manufacture whisky, and no person is authorized to make it unless he complies with all the requirements of the act of Congress. These are enjoined to prevent the possibility of frauds, and courts and juries will be derelict in duty when these salutary provisions are permitted to be frittered away by judicial legislation.

The interpretation given to the words "knowing and wilfully" is constrained, and does not fit the argument for the defense, without an interpolation of the statute, by adding "with intent to defraud the revenue." Under the act no such intent is necessary. The penalty is incurred, the offence complete, when the defendants "have left undone those things which they ought to have done, and done things which they ought not to have done," and this without any fraudulent or criminal intent.

The jury then retired, and after a brief absence returned a verdict for the United States in the sum of $1,000, the amount of the penalty imposed by the law.

United States vs. John Ward, indicted for illicit distilling. It is alleged that defendant set up a tin still at a woolen manufactory in the Fourth ward, Allegheny, in March, 1868, and distilled whiskey from molasses, on a small scale, without complying with the requirements of acts of Congress. The case is on trial.

Information *in rem* in a case of forfeiture, filed by the District Attorney against the distillery and other property of John R. Lowther, of Mifflin county. Attachment issued and monition awarded returnable at Williamsport, June 21, 1869.

District Court—Judge Kirkpatrick.

Friday, June 10.—Beck, Phillips & Co. vs. Hespenheid. Action on a book account. Jury discharged and plaintiff took a nonsuit.

TRIAL LIST FOR FRIDAY.

121. Rabenstein vs. P. F. & M. Turnpike Company.
124. Waring, King & Co. vs. Miller & Co.
127. Potts vs. Frazier Bros.
141. McCreery & Co. vs. Ward & Beaumont.

Quarter Sessions—Judge Stowe.

THURSDAY, June 10.—John Lehman was convicted on a charge of assault and battery, preferred by Mrs. Slacker, and was sentenced to pay a fine of ten dollars and costs.

John Fisher, charged with rape, upon oath of Josephine Linker, was tried and found guilty.

A hearing was had in the case of William McKee, charged with surety on oath of J. McFadden. The defendant was discharged and the prosecutor ordered to pay the costs.

The next case taken up was the city of Allegheny vs. John A. Strain, charged with disorderly conduct. This was an appeal from the decision of the Mayor of Allegheny in a case of summary conviction.

The defendant, in company with a number of other persons, it appears, had been out serenading a friend, and were returning home between twelve and one o'clock on the morning of the 5th inst., where, it is alleged by the prosecution, they were acting in a disorderly manner, singing songs and hallooing on the streets of said city, and they were arrested and taken before the Mayor, who fined Mr. Stain and others of the party, and an appeal was taken and the case brought for a hearing before Judge Stowe.

The following testimony was elicited:

Lieutenant McChesney, sworn.—Friday morning, June 4, a little after twelve o'clock, I was passing along Jackson street, heard a party coming along some distance above, making considerable noise; hurried down to meet them at Montgomery street, to request them to keep quiet. At North avenue one of the teams halted a little to let the other pass. I got close enough to be seen by them. They saluted us by saying "come on you sons of b—s." They then drove on. I followed them to the Diamond, in front of the Market House, where some of the officers had stopped them. They were singing and shouting all the way down. Some of them were arrested then, and some got away. I was fully three squares from them when I first heard the noise. I cannot say whether there was anything particular in the conduct of Strain from the rest of the party. Strain was arrested and locked up.

Cross-examined—When I first heard the noise they were on the track of the Pleasant Valley Railway. I do not know what they were singing. The party was arrested by Samuel Bowden and others. The first that I saw of Mr. Strain he was in the cell in the lock-up. Mr. Strain might have been the front man.

James Taylor, sworn—First saw the party on Jackson street; heard the noise two squares. They could see us plainly. They were making a loud noise, some singing and some hallooing. All appeared to be singing separate tunes. I did not see Strain until after some of the parties were arrested. The only thing I heard Strain say was that he "would make some of their heads sweat.

Chas. Buhwo, sworn.—The first place I saw their wagon was in the Diamond. I heard them first on Federal street. When I got to the Diamond an officer had stopped the wagon, and Strain got down off the wagon and demanded by what authority the arrest was made, and said he wanted some one to arrest him. I arrested him.

Officer Nathaniel Cease, sworn.—First heard the parties when I was standing at the corner of Montgomery avenue and Federal street. They were about two squares off. I went up and met them at the corner of Federal street and North avenue, and warned them to keep quiet. They called me a "d—d son of a b—h," and started on. I helped to stop the teams in the Diamond. Strain was one of the party, and when the wagon was stopped Strain jumped out and demanded by what authority the arrest was made.

Cross-examined—If they were singing, every man had his own tune. I do not know that they had said anything to any citizen. I was not requested by any one to stop the procession. Chief Bowden was not present that I know of. I saw Strain in the cell, but did not assist to take him in.

Jeremiah Smith, sworn—I was on duty the night the arrest was made. The wagons were stopped when I got to the Diamond. I was standing near the bank of the river when I first heard the noise. When I got there, there was a disturbance and the officer was about to arrest the party.

D. McFerron, sworn—I am Treasurer of Allegheny city. I heard a noise on the night in question. When I first heard it I thought it was an alarm of fire. Got up and listened and thought it a row. The noise then approached my house, and the party were singing and shouting. Still heard the noise as they passed down Federal street. Some of them were swearing, and when opposite my house one of the party shouted at the top of his voice, "you son of a b—h." I had been in bed.

Cross-examined—There was not much song about it, at least I could not recognize a song.

Lawrence Sproul, sworn—I heard the party coming down Federal street. They were making a great deal of noise.

The plaintiff's testimony here closed, and the following was offered for the defense:

James Stewart, sworn—I heard the noise on the night in question, and when I was passing down Ohio street. Heard a mace rap and returned to the Diamond; when I got there the party were under arrest. I heard Strain say "I am under arrest and I want you to follow me."

James McCallum, sworn—Keep a livery stable. I was with the party on the night in question. Strain was not in the wagon I was driving. Both wagons were together. In my wagon the party were singing "Sherman's March to the Sea."

Chief Bowden sworn—I made the information upon which this case was based, on information received. I was present at the difficulty.

Jno. Irwin sworn—I was with the party; was in the wagon with Alderman Strain. When we got to the Diamond I saw several policemen run out and catch the horses; Alderman Strain asked the cause of the arrest. The officer replied that we were under arrest and must go to the Mayor's office. Alderman Strain told the men to go to the office and see what was wanted.

The Court stated that the arguments would be heard Friday morning at nine o'clock.

TRIAL LIST FOR FRIDAY.

59. Com. vs. Joseph Samuels and Joseph Forker.
60. " Lenhart Hook.
61. " Gust Rholock.
62. " Wm. Howard, 2 cases.
64. " Samuel Carmer and Samuel Smith.
65. " Charles Bailey and Ross Smith.
66. " Stephen Blange.
26. " Wm. R. Jones.
30. " Hugh McLane.
31. " Geo. Gillespie.
35. " Mary Neno.
36. " Hugh Smith.
28. " Mich. Roedler.
27. " Elizabeth Roedler.

Common Plear—Judge Mellon.

THURSDAY, June 10.—In the case of Wendell et al. vs. Goehring, previously reported, verdict for plaintiff in the sum of $909.68.

Lynch vs. Haney. Action to recover for work and labor done. Jury out.

Graham vs. Moffitt's administrators. Motion for a new trial and reasons filed on part of defendants.

Graham et ux vs. Reiley et. al. Action in ejectment to regain possession of a piece of land in Allegheny county. Verdict for plaintiff for six cents damages and six cents costs.

TRIAL LIST FOR FRIDAY.

December List.

44. Grimes vs. Robb.

March List.

8a. Neish vs. McClarren.
85. Jenkins vs. Same.
87. Duffy vs. Sheriff.
92. Hugel vs. Mitchell.
93. Mellon Bros. vs. Moundfield.
94. Hershauser vs. Mansinger.
95. Kretzer vs. Schweitzer.
96. Anderson vs. Alpert, Hill & Co.
97. Hart et al. vs. Finch.
93. McElroy vs. Barker & Co.

THE TRUSS.

The truss is an instrument, or rather an appliance, employed to retain the bowels to their proper place, when they have been forced out of their natural position, and this forms a disease called a rupture or hernia. Hernia is reducable or not. When not reducable, it becomes strangulated or incarcerated, a condition of always more or less danger, and requiring, in most cases, a surgical operation before the intestines can be restored to their proper position. When not strangulated primarily, ruptures are liable to become so by accident or neglect, hence, the necessity of trusses to keep the intestines in their proper place, and if possible to cure the disease by closing the opening through which the bowels protruded. In times past trusses have been regarded as palliative remedies rather than the means of effecting a radical cure. Dr. Keyser, however, of this city, who has devoted a great deal of thought and reflection to the subject of hernia, and besides has had over twenty-five years of practical experience in the application of trusses, is of the opinion that a large portion of cases can be radically cured. He attributes the failure to cure, in most cases, to the inefficiency of the trusses used, or the want of proper adjustment. He maintains that there are few conditions of the human body requiring greater skill and capacity than those in which there is a protrusion of any part, and much more so when the part is so intimately connected with human health and life as are the intestines. Trusses of every kind and at prices suitable to all may be had in great variety at Dr. KEYSER'S GREAT MEDICINE STORE, 167 Liberty street, or at his private consulting rooms, No. 120 Penn street, from ten A. M. until four P. M. Every Monday, Wednesday and Saturday, at the store, for free consultation from our to six P. M., and eight to nine at night.

USEFUL INSTITUTION.—No more useful place can be found than the great medicine store of Dr. Keyser, at 167 Liberty street, where the Doctor gives three free days for consultation from 4 to 6 P. M. every Monday, Wednesday and Saturday. It is a matter of some moment to the afflicted that they should know this and avail themselves of an opportunity not often afforded.

CATARRH.—Dr. Keyser, at 120 Penn street, will undertake and cure the worst case of Catarrh, by an entirely new system, so as to completely eradicate it from the system. He does so by restoring the general health of the system. Let those interested inquire if this is true.

HOME QUESTIONS FOR THE SICKLY AND DEBILITATED.

Is it worth while to endure penal torture after every meal, when indigestion can be immediately relieved and permanently cured by so agreeable a remedy as HOSTETTER'S STOMACH BITTERS?

Does it pay to be compelled by debility and languor to abandon active business, when brain, nerve and muscle can be braced up, and the whole system restored to a healthy condition by a course of HOSTETTER'S BITTERS?

Why approach the dinner table daily with a positive disgust for all that is savory and delicious, when a vigorous appetite for even the plainest fare is created by the use of HOSTETTER'S BITTERS.

Is it wise to live in this bright world as if it were a dungeon, gloomy, discontented and miserable, when the worst case of hypochondria can be cured in a week by such a pleasant and wholesome exhilarant as HOSTETTER'S BITTERS?

Can it be possible that any person of bilious habit will run the risk of remittent fever, or billious colic, when he can tone and regulate the great secretive organ with HOSTETTER'S BITTERS?

Is it not a species of moral insanity for any merchant, farmer, mechanic or traveler to be without the best known antidote to the effects of poisoned air and impure water, HOSTETTER'S BITTERS?

Considering the harrassing and depressing nature of the functional derangements to which woman is subject, is it not astonishing that any invalid of the feebler sex should hesitate to seek the certain relief afforded in such cases, by the genial operation of HOSTETTER'S BITTERS.

These are questions of deeper interest than any of the political dogmas of the day, and those whom they concern are invited to give them something more than a passing thought.