


For Careful Study.



The composition of prescriptions is an exact science. Competence only comes after careful study. To give best results from the medicine, the filling of prescriptions must be absolutely accurate. Our constant study keeps us up to date and careful work.

SHENANDOAH DRUG STORE,
South Main Street, Shenandoah, Pa.
Telephone Connection.

See the excellent quality and the large quantity of meat you can buy at our market.

For 25c.

One trial will cause you to give us more.

Our market is not exactly located centrally but that little extra walk will benefit your...

DALUS' MEAT MARKET,
203 E. Centre St.

Eye Treatment For Children.

DISTANT NEAR

Many children are allowed to blink and blink through the day's study, and at home, with a book six or eight inches from the eyes.

During childhood, the ocular nerves and muscles are very sensitive and may be exposed to severe inflammation and strain by overwork. Where a child was formerly operated with drugs for nervous and muscular trouble he is now cured with glasses.

Thos. Buchanan,
Jeweler and Optician.
18 South Main Street.

SPRING SHOES

A big line of Men's, Ladies', Misses' and Children's shoes await your approval. We call special attention to our exquisite line of **Russet Shoes.**

Men's \$5.00 Shoes at \$3.50.	3.50	2.25
" 3.00 " " 1.25.	2.00	1.25
Ladies' 3.00 " " 2.00.	2.25	1.50
" 1.50 " " 1.00.	1.50	1.00

These prices range in comparison with the Misses' and Children's stock.

Another lot of shoes going at 35 cents that are really worth \$1.25 and \$1.50.

BOSTON FACTORY SHOE STORE,
27 South Main Street, Shenandoah, Pa.
1. SPONT, PROP.
FOUR DOORS ABOVE POST OFFICE.

Miss Mary E. Jones,
Dealer in and maker of WAX - AND - NATURAL - DESIGNS

For use on formal occasions.

All kinds of designs always on hand and special designs made on short notice. Best materials and all work guaranteed.

White and black satin slipper with patent extension device.

Cor. Main and Lloyd Streets.

CHEAP GROCERIES.
Hay, Flour and Feed.
NEW STORE, NEW STOCK.

Our goods are staple and sell retail at wholesale prices.

FOR SATURDAY.—Furner roll butter, 16c and 18c; best creamery butter, 22c; shoulders, 10c; 20 bars of soap for 25c.

Ellis Guziksky,
16 West Centre St., Shenandoah.
Three doors below brick school.

WITH PLEASURE!



You have a pleasure in the groceries you buy and the way we handle your order. Everything in our place is fresh, except the measure of our employees. Our delivery system is perfect, as you'll find it when you try it.

E. B. FOLEY, 27 West Centre St.

Paine's Celery Compound Gives Strength.

Rest spring medicine. It makes the weak strong. We sell and recommend it.

SHENANDOAH DRUG STORE,
3 South Main Street.

THE WEATHER.

The temperature has risen in the Middle and North Atlantic states, the lower Missouri valley and middle Rocky mountain regions, has fallen in the middle and northern plateau, and has remained nearly stationary elsewhere. From Arizona through the middle Rocky mountains to Manitoba there extends a trough of low pressure. Forecast for this section until 8 p. m. today: Fair; continued high temperature; light southerly winds. Probably thunder storms tomorrow afternoon.

Sunrise, 4:41; sunset, 7:29; length of day, 14h. 48m.; moon rises, 3:30 a. m.; moon sets, 8:01 p. m.

THE SLATE PREVAILED.
(Continued from First Page.)

Board was re-organized as follows: P. J. Ferguson, president; John Durkin, secretary; John McAndrew, treasurer. The first two named are Democrats, while the latter is a member of the Citizens' party. M. M. Burke, Esq., of Shenandoah, was re-elected Solicitor. James F. Gallagher was elected principal of the schools for a term of one year. The examination of teachers, in number, was conducted to-day by County Superintendent G. W. Weiss.

MAHANOV CITY.

The School Board of Mahanov City organized last night as follows: President, George Weiss; Secretary, Jacob G. Sunday; Treasurer, Charles Reusser; Solicitor, R. P. Swank. The last two named officers were elected without opposition.

MADDOX SCHOOL BOARD.

The Maddox School Board re-organized for the year last evening by electing John M. Williams, President; Edward McGehee, Secretary; and John B. Currey, Treasurer. John W. Hansberger was chosen Solicitor.

MADISON TOWNSHIP.

School Directors Bradley, Galvin, Dalton, McKerns and Keating, of Mahanov township, met last evening in the school house at Cole's patch at 7:30 o'clock for the purpose of re-organization. Hon. William A. Anderson was unavoidably absent from the meeting. The organization resulted as follows: President, James Dalton; Secretary, Secretary William Bradley; Mahanov City, P. O.; Treasurer, Michael Burke, of St. Nicholas. The treasurer's bond was fixed at \$35,000.

"Tisn't safe to be a day without Dr. Thomas' Electric Oil in the house. Never can tell what moment an accident is going to happen.

Pennsylvania's Grand Army.

Wilkesbarre, Pa., June 6.—The state encampment of the G. A. R. meets here this week. The city is gaily decorated in honor of the occasion. Today will be taken up in the registering of delegates and assigning them to their hotels. This evening there will be a public entertainment at the Newbitt theater. Tomorrow the parade will take place and on Thursday the election of officers.

Miners Demand Another Advance.

Dubois, Pa., June 6.—Notwithstanding the miners of the entire region were granted an advance of five cents last week, a strike was inaugurated yesterday at Reynoldsville and Elsenora which promises to extend to all other mines in this section before the end of the week. Demands are made for another advance.

Urging Colonel Hawkins For Treasurer.

Washington, Pa., June 6.—The Republicans of Washington county met in annual convention yesterday and nominated a county ticket to be voted on next Tuesday. Resolutions were adopted strongly urging Colonel A. L. Hawkins, of the Tenth Pennsylvania regiment, for state treasurer.

NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION.

REDUCED RATES TO LOS ANGELES, CAL., VIA PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD.

For the National Educational Association Convention to be held at Los Angeles, Cal., July 11 to 14, the Pennsylvania Railroad Company will sell excursion tickets via direct routes from points on its line, to Los Angeles, Cal., and return, at rate of single fare for the round trip, plus \$2.00 membership fee. These tickets will be sold, good going June 24 to July 7, and when stamped by Joint Agent at Los Angeles, good to return, arriving at final destination, until September 5.

For further information apply to ticket agents.

California and Return.

One fare plus two dollars advance to return via Portland, Tacoma and Seattle. Choice of time east from Portland, via Northern Pacific Ry., or Great Northern Ry., or Canadian Pacific Ry., to St. Paul. Tickets will be sold June 25 to July 7, good to return until September 4th. For map-time table and full particulars address John R. Pott, District Passenger Agent, Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway, 456 William street, Williamsport, Pa.

A Blessing For the Ladies.

Thousands of ladies are using Brazilian Balm. For soreness, pain, bearing down and many kinds of trouble, it acts like a charm. A 50 cent or dollar bottle often does more good in one week than any other remedy does in months. It goes right to the spot, removing all inflammation. Mrs. Geo. W. Roberts, of Wilmington, Del., says, "A strong solution of Brazilian Balm and warm water used as an injection has done me more good than all the remedies and prescriptions I ever tried."

Shenandoah drug store, wholesale agents.

SCANLAN CASES ARGUED.
Judge Bechtel to Decide as to a Jury Trial.

Pottsville, June 5.—Judge Bechtel at 2 o'clock began hearing the arguments on the rules to re-open the judgments obtained by the borough and School Board of Shenandoah against M. J. Scanlan, tax collector during the years 1894, '95 and '96, and allow trial by jury. Former Congressman Reilly represented the petition upon which the proceeding is based, and a number of bondsmen for the year 1896: Mr. Wadlinger, a number of the 1895 bondsmen, and Messrs. A. W. Schickel, S. G. M. Hoppeter and Nicholas Hechtel varied the arguments of the different years. John F. Whalen and M. M. Burke appeared for the borough and School Board.

Mr. Reilly several Mondays ago said in court that the case might involve a far-reaching decision that would, perhaps, form a state-wide precedent in the matter of the collector's bonds; and, judging from the powerful arguments made by the various lawyers great importance is attached to the coming ruling of the court.

George J. Wadlinger made the opening argument which, briefly stated, claimed that the books of the borough and School Board officials have applied ten thousand dollars more to the 1895 duplicate than the duplicate amounts to.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond, \$100,000. He charged the borough authorities with negligence and claimed that unless it could be shown the duplicate was legally made out and that other details had been properly attended to by the borough officials there could be no liability on the part of the bondsmen.

He also eloquently argued that the act of the borough in applying the 1895 and 1896 taxes toward the settlement of the 1894 duplicate is a plain case of misappropriation of the public funds and a violation of the law. Mr. Wadlinger cited authorities in support of his position, notably 6th county reports, page 413, and was complimented on his address.

James B. Reilly, in behalf of Mr. Scanlan, said, among other things, that the sureties shall be responsible and responsible only for the amount of the duplicate and not for the amount of the bond,