

The Pittsburgh Gazette.

PUBLISHED BY PENNIMAN, REED & CO., Proprietors. P. B. PENNIMAN, JOSIAH KING, R. E. ROBERTSON, H. P. REED, Editors and Proprietors.

GAZETTE BUILDING, 34 AND 36 FIFTH ST.

OFFICIAL PAPER OF PITTSBURGH, ALLEGHENY AND WESTMORELAND COUNTIES.

Published Daily, except Sundays, Holidays, and Election Days, at 10 cents per copy. Single Copies 5 cents.

SATURDAY, SEPT. 11, 1890.

UNION REPUBLICAN PARTY STATE.

JOHN W. GLENN, Chairman of the Executive Committee.

HENRY W. WILLIAMS, Chairman of the Nominating Committee.

W. B. GRIFFIN, Chairman of the Finance Committee.

JOHN A. BISHOP, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

EDWARD B. SMITH, Chairman of the Committee on Credentials.

WILLIAM W. BROWN, Chairman of the Committee on Procedure.

JOHN R. HART, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

HENRY W. WILLIAMS, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

JOHN A. BISHOP, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

WILLIAM W. BROWN, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

JOHN R. HART, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

HENRY W. WILLIAMS, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

JOHN A. BISHOP, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

WILLIAM W. BROWN, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

JOHN R. HART, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

HENRY W. WILLIAMS, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

JOHN A. BISHOP, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

WILLIAM W. BROWN, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

JOHN R. HART, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

HENRY W. WILLIAMS, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

JOHN A. BISHOP, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

WILLIAM W. BROWN, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

JOHN R. HART, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

HENRY W. WILLIAMS, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

JOHN A. BISHOP, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

WILLIAM W. BROWN, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

JOHN R. HART, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

HENRY W. WILLIAMS, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

JOHN A. BISHOP, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

WILLIAM W. BROWN, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

JOHN R. HART, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

HENRY W. WILLIAMS, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

JOHN A. BISHOP, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

WILLIAM W. BROWN, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

JOHN R. HART, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

HENRY W. WILLIAMS, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

JOHN A. BISHOP, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

WILLIAM W. BROWN, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

JOHN R. HART, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

HENRY W. WILLIAMS, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

JOHN A. BISHOP, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

WILLIAM W. BROWN, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

JOHN R. HART, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

HENRY W. WILLIAMS, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

JOHN A. BISHOP, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

WILLIAM W. BROWN, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

JOHN R. HART, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

HENRY W. WILLIAMS, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

JOHN A. BISHOP, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

WILLIAM W. BROWN, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

WHERE THE FAULT LIES.

It is said that they are disputing, at Scranton, upon the proper responsibility for the present imperfections in the ventilation and management of coal mines.

Frank is found with the miners for their readiness to work. Little know these carping critics of the necessities which too often drive husbands and parents into the jaws of death, seeking bread for their families dependent upon the avails of their daily labor!

DEMOCRACY UNDER GROUND.

The spirit of a genuine democracy faithfully seeks the greatest good of the greatest number, and avoids needless injury to the interests of those few who usually experience some degree of individual loss from the application of that democratic principle.

MINOR TOPICS.

When all the traveling that was done was over the high roads, by means of public or private horse power, the frequency and boldness of highway robberies were notorious.

THE RIGHTS OF NAVIGATION.

The public-spirited gentlemen attending the Commercial Convention, at Keokuk, have done wisely to confine their deliberations to topics upon which they could rely on the hearty accord of their constituents, the business men of the great valley and its tributaries.

ORIENTATION AND MEANNESS.

We hear from March Chink, that the fact is generally conceded there that Mr. Ase Packer did endow Lehigh University with a large pecuniary gift.

THE PETER AND AGUE SEASON.

When the leaves begin to change, fumblers and intercalaters seem to be everywhere. From the surface of the earth, bathed in heavy dew, from marshes and swamps surge the mists from fettering pools and sluggish streams, the san of September evolves clouds of miasma vapor perilous to health and life.

HENRY W. WILLIAMS.

Two years have elapsed since the annotated declaration was made, by leading business men of this city, of their confidence in the personal and professional qualifications of the Republican candidate for that year for the Supreme Bench.

THE CHINESE SEEM TO HAVE.

A sorry prospect before them if they come to this country. At the best, they will receive but a cold welcome from our white and the colored races, in many portions of the country, have deteriorated, before-hand, war to the tooth and toe-nails with the yellow, oblique-eyed strangers.

THE NEW DEMOCRATIC CATHEDRAL.

Tennessee makes very interesting reading. Here is an extract from the Memphis Argonaut, for which its editor, in Pennsylvania, would be read out of the party.

MISCELLANEOUS.

COWPER, the Cleveland bigamist, has been found to be in Erie, in the sum of \$5,000, and has also been sued for \$10,000 damages.

MR. ROBERT SELLERS, aged eighty-five years, residing in Franklin, Venango county, died suddenly from apoplexy on the 6th inst.

THE MASSACHUSETTS SUPREME COURT has decided that no non-resident stockholder is liable to taxation.

THE WEDDING SHOES OF Cotton Mather's grandmother, with the original published program, are in the possession of the descendants of the Winslow family in Duxbury, Mass.

PERPETUAL INJUNCTIONS have been granted against forty-eight dentists and others in the U. S. Court at Cleveland, for infringement on the Goodyear patent, and a commissioner appointed to take account of damages.

AT LIERE, in Belgium, thirty thousand Belgian sharpshooters will compete for prizes sometime during the present month.

IN SPITE of the spread of Liberty and Laborism, there are still great countries which know almost nothing at all of either one or the other.

AT THE Union Depot, Cleveland, O., a day or two ago in the handling of baggage, a revolver fell from a sack to the floor and was discharged thereby, the charge taking effect in the ankle of John Higgins, a brakeman, inflicting a serious wound.

AT Newerry, Westmoreland county, on the 10th, Timothy Conner cowhided Elias Hunterberger, who retaliated by shooting his assailant in the leg, inflicting a severe wound.

A LITTLE boy, six years of age, son of David Hines, of East Boston, was run over by a horse car Saturday afternoon.

THE STOCK on hand, as compared with August 1st, shows an increase of 250,000 barrels.

THE COURTS.

Quarter Sessions—Judge Keiser. FRIDAY Sept. 10.—The case of the Commonwealth vs. D. O'Neill and J. W. Rook, indicted for libel, prevailed.

A. Brown, Esq., then opened the case for the defense, after which he proposed to offer in evidence the entire article in the Dispatch, which contained the alleged libelous matter.

Mr. Swartzwelder objected, holding that the remainder of the article was not relevant testimony.

The court overruled the objection and the article was read in evidence.

Mr. Hamilton, for the defendants, then proposed to read the report of the proceedings in the O'Neill-Pitcock trial, published in the Dispatch on the day preceding the publication of the article, which was admitted, although objected to by Mr. Swartzwelder.

Mr. Brown, for the defendants, offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Swartzwelder then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Hamilton then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Brown then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Swartzwelder then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Hamilton then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Brown then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Swartzwelder then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Hamilton then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Brown then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Swartzwelder then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Hamilton then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Brown then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Swartzwelder then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Hamilton then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Brown then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Swartzwelder then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Hamilton then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Brown then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Swartzwelder then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Hamilton then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Brown then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Swartzwelder then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Hamilton then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Brown then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Swartzwelder then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Hamilton then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Brown then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Swartzwelder then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Hamilton then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Brown then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Swartzwelder then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Hamilton then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Brown then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Swartzwelder then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Hamilton then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Brown then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Swartzwelder then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Hamilton then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Brown then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Swartzwelder then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Hamilton then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Brown then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Swartzwelder then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Hamilton then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Brown then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Swartzwelder then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Hamilton then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Brown then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Swartzwelder then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Hamilton then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Brown then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Swartzwelder then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Hamilton then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

THE COURTS.

Quarter Sessions—Judge Keiser. FRIDAY Sept. 10.—The case of the Commonwealth vs. D. O'Neill and J. W. Rook, indicted for libel, prevailed.

A. Brown, Esq., then opened the case for the defense, after which he proposed to offer in evidence the entire article in the Dispatch, which contained the alleged libelous matter.

Mr. Swartzwelder objected, holding that the remainder of the article was not relevant testimony.

The court overruled the objection and the article was read in evidence.

Mr. Hamilton, for the defendants, then proposed to read the report of the proceedings in the O'Neill-Pitcock trial, published in the Dispatch on the day preceding the publication of the article, which was admitted, although objected to by Mr. Swartzwelder.

Mr. Brown, for the defendants, offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Swartzwelder then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Hamilton then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Brown then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Swartzwelder then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Hamilton then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Brown then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Swartzwelder then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Hamilton then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Brown then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Swartzwelder then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Hamilton then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Brown then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Swartzwelder then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Hamilton then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Brown then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Swartzwelder then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Hamilton then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Brown then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Swartzwelder then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Hamilton then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Brown then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Swartzwelder then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Hamilton then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Brown then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Swartzwelder then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Hamilton then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Brown then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Swartzwelder then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Hamilton then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Brown then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Swartzwelder then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Hamilton then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Brown then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Swartzwelder then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Hamilton then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Brown then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Swartzwelder then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Hamilton then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Brown then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Swartzwelder then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Hamilton then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Brown then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Swartzwelder then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Hamilton then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Brown then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Swartzwelder then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Hamilton then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Brown then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Swartzwelder then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Hamilton then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Brown then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Swartzwelder then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

Mr. Hamilton then offered in evidence the judgment of the District Judge, who had found the article libelous and awarded damages to the plaintiff.

</