

THE DOGS OF WAR LOOSE.

ENGAGEMENT BETWEEN FRENCH AND CHINESE TROOPS.

The victor beats the black flag—the allied and wounded—peace negotiations in progress—other particulars.

Hono Kono, Sept. 14.—It is reported that a battle has taken place between the French and black flags, lasting eight hours, between Hanoi and Sontay, near Red River. The French lost two officers and fifty men, while the loss of the black flag is estimated at between 500 and 600. Hanoi is where the French have been holding a garrison awaiting reinforcements. It is probable the black flags will en route from Bai Minh, across Delta, to recapture Sontay, were met by the French sent from Hanoi to intercept them.

During the latter part of the riot at Canton, the merchants armed themselves to defend their property. The party consisted of nine Germans and three Englishmen. They fired into the mob, killing five Chinese and wounding many. Two British, one French and five Chinese gunboats are moored in the river above the city.

The Chinese have posted a placard calling upon the populace to kill the Europeans on the next opportunity. The different consuls admit the situation to be very serious, and the future of the European colony gloomy. There is almost open war between the native and foreign elements, and the harbor for a long time. The American barred inland ten English, one American and one Chinese.

The Canton riot originated in a quarrel between a Portuguese mail steamer, captured on the dock as a watchman, and a Chinese man, during which the latter was wounded. A British boat picked up the wounded man, and took him to the hospital. The Chinese and the British consuls would not accept the message.

The Chinese captured the black flag and are reported to have the Chinese arsenal. The Chinese are reported to have the arsenal. The Chinese are reported to have the arsenal.

Paris, Sept. 14.—Solei gives the following as the result of the meeting of the French and Chinese ambassadors. That France shall cease sending reinforcements to Tonkin; that the Chinese will retain the right of investigation of the Annamese provinces; that the Chinese will retain the right of military administration; that China shall be reinforced with 100,000 men.

The Republic France takes the ground that France cannot accept the proposal. The Republic France takes the ground that France cannot accept the proposal.

London, Sept. 14.—The French accounts of the battle with the black flag from Hanoi, advanced to the French from Hanoi, advanced to the French from Hanoi.

London, Sept. 14.—The French accounts of the battle with the black flag from Hanoi, advanced to the French from Hanoi, advanced to the French from Hanoi.

London, Sept. 14.—The French accounts of the battle with the black flag from Hanoi, advanced to the French from Hanoi, advanced to the French from Hanoi.

London, Sept. 14.—The French accounts of the battle with the black flag from Hanoi, advanced to the French from Hanoi, advanced to the French from Hanoi.

London, Sept. 14.—The French accounts of the battle with the black flag from Hanoi, advanced to the French from Hanoi, advanced to the French from Hanoi.

London, Sept. 14.—The French accounts of the battle with the black flag from Hanoi, advanced to the French from Hanoi, advanced to the French from Hanoi.

London, Sept. 14.—The French accounts of the battle with the black flag from Hanoi, advanced to the French from Hanoi, advanced to the French from Hanoi.

London, Sept. 14.—The French accounts of the battle with the black flag from Hanoi, advanced to the French from Hanoi, advanced to the French from Hanoi.

A VERY QUEER CASE.

A Woman Accused of Aiding Her Husband to Commit Suicide.

Brampton, Sept. 14.—A case of an unusual nature has just been tried at the Police Court. One Thomas Ryan, of Chingunoy, many years ago married Bridget Keogh. After four children had been born to them the wife became insane and was sent to the Toronto asylum, where she has been for the last twelve years and where she is still living. For the past few years Elizabeth Ryan has been living in Ryan's house, acting as his housekeeper and taking care of his children. On Sept. 20, 1881, Ryan and his wife were married at Gravelly, Ryan having first made affidavit in the usual way as to his wife's insanity. They lived together for some months as man and wife after this in the spring Ryan left this country and, and is believed to be now in the States. Elizabeth Ireland remained here. A few weeks ago young Joseph Ryan, a son of Thomas Ryan, set on foot a scheme against her for aiding, abetting and assisting the aforesaid felony, namely, the bigamy. The prisoner was 42 years, and had a little boy with her in the house. She had had knowledge of this, whether she was aware of all the circumstances at the time she married Ryan. The jury acquitted her after a very short absence.

THE OSBOOD STABBING CASE.

The Victim Dies Refusing to Give the Name of His Assailant—Two Men Arrested.

Concord, Sept. 14.—McDowall, who was stabbed last night, did not say the name of his assailant. The victim died refusing to give the name of his assailant. The victim died refusing to give the name of his assailant.

A Woman's Fate.

London, Sept. 14.—The late relief in London, Hughes, for a number of years had charge of a dwarf girl and received from the city a stipulated sum for her board and lodging. One gentleman's death this morning and the girl went to board with Mrs. Green, a woman named Mrs. Green, who had been living with her in an interesting condition, and she was in the city hospital. The girl was in an interesting condition, and she was in the city hospital.

Provincial News.

Montreal, Sept. 14.—The provincial synod of the church of England in Canada resumed its sittings this morning. Rev. Earl Duffell, minister of the church, presided. The synod resumed its sittings this morning.

Disastrous Fire at Lebridge.

Exbridge, Sept. 14.—At a late hour broke out in an unusual manner, merely an accident, as it is supposed. The fire broke out in an unusual manner.

Funerals at St. Thomas.

St. Thomas, Sept. 14.—While William White and others were moving a frame building this afternoon the Jack screw upon which the building stood gave way, and the building fell, crushing a young man named Alexander Dixon, supposed to be a native of either Toronto or Chicago, and another man named John White, who was killed. The building fell, crushing a young man named Alexander Dixon.

Two Children Buried to Death.

Ottawa, Sept. 14.—Mrs. Giron, living at Templeton station, left her two children, aged 4 and 5, in her burning in the stove, and a small fire was kindled, both the children being burned to death.

The New Parliamentary Buildings.

Ottawa, Sept. 14.—The contract for the construction of the new departmental buildings at Ottawa has been awarded to a cost of some \$350,000. A. Charbonnet of Quebec.

His Grace at Breakfast.

Brooklyn, N. Y., Sept. 14.—The Brooklyn fat hat works of W. A. Biglin & Co. and the novelty straw hat factory of C. E. Everett, were burned today. The loss is \$25,000. Novelty loss about \$75,000.

Woman and Her Disobedience.

It is the title of a large illustrated treatise, by Dr. R. V. Pierce, Buffalo, N. Y. It teaches any address for three stamps. It is a very long and interesting work.

On Saturday next the Montrealers will play the Shamrocks for the championship, and of course promise to give them a hard one.

Exchange ventilated the fact that Comte de Chambrun had \$12,000,000 in his pocket when he died, although he was not a millionaire.

Full of a Bridge.

Utica, N. Y., Sept. 14.—The Hotel street bridge over the Erie canal was struck by a boat this afternoon, and fell with a crash into the canal. The bridge cost \$200,000.

A Missing Steamer Found.

Wilmington, N. C., Sept. 14.—The missing steamer City of Atlanta, from Charleston, was towed into Smithville by a revenue cutter yesterday. She was leaking.

GREENEY IN GREENLAND.

THE STORY OF THE LOSS OF THE STEAMER PORTER.

Adventures in an Ice-Floe—Blame Attached to Lieut. Greeney—Anxiety for the safety of Greely and his party.

New York, Sept. 14.—The Herald's special, giving details of the loss of the Proteus, says: On July 16 it entered a false lead in the ice and continued until stopped by ice on July 19. The retreat was begun by way of favorable leads in the ice, and an effort was made for a passage.

This was abandoned on July 21 and another lead entered, which promised to reach open water. Before an opening was reached the lead closed, and the Proteus was unable to force her passage. The ice continued to close, and at 2 a.m. on July 23 the vessel was stopped. The ice was spongy, and after about two hours' pressure was applied, the Proteus started forward, only to find that the open water had disappeared. It headed back for Cape Sabine and nearly reached open water when the heavy ice-packs began to close. Every effort was made, but it was unsuccessful. At 4 p.m. the vessel was again stopped, and the ice was broken up and necessary articles were thrown upon the ice and transferred to a safe place. The ice was breaking through the starboard bulwarks, and crushing in the side, and the engine boiler was exposed to the action of the ice.

The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel. The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel.

The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel. The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel.

The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel. The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel.

The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel. The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel.

The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel. The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel.

The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel. The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel.

The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel. The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel.

The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel. The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel.

The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel. The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel.

The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel. The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel.

The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel. The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel.

The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel. The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel.

The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel. The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel.

The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel. The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel.

The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel. The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel.

The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel. The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel.

The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel. The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel.

The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel. The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel.

The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel. The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel.

The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel. The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel.

The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel. The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel.

The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel. The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel.

The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel. The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel.

The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel. The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel.

The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel. The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel.

The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel. The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel.

The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel. The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel.

The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel. The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel.

The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel. The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel.

The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel. The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel.

The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel. The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel.

The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel. The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel.

The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel. The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel.

The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel. The hold was full of water, and the crew were ordered to get out of the vessel.

DOINGS AT THE COURT HOUSE.

True Bills Against Several Prisoners.

The court of general sessions met yesterday morning, but as there were no cases ready to go on with it adjourned till 10 o'clock today. True bills have been brought in by the grand jury in the following cases: Henry Dill, felonious wounding; John Pankron, indecent assault; Thomas Guayot and Thomas Scandant, obstructing a county constable in the discharge of his duty; Thomas Linn, larceny; John McKenna and John Freer, robbery; Amos Harrington, larceny.

The court opened by Judge Boyd disposing of the case of Barker & Stoffer against the sum of \$300 from the defendants. The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff for the full amount claimed. The next case was that of James W. Bell. This action was brought to recover the amount of \$141.85, which was claimed by the plaintiff from the proceeds of the sale of a farm placed under the control of a receiver appointed by the court. A verdict was returned by the jury for the defendant. The case of the plaintiff was dismissed.

The court opened by Judge Boyd disposing of the case of Barker & Stoffer against the sum of \$300 from the defendants. The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff for the full amount claimed. The next case was that of James W. Bell. This action was brought to recover the amount of \$141.85, which was claimed by the plaintiff from the proceeds of the sale of a farm placed under the control of a receiver appointed by the court. A verdict was returned by the jury for the defendant. The case of the plaintiff was dismissed.

The court opened by Judge Boyd disposing of the case of Barker & Stoffer against the sum of \$300 from the defendants. The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff for the full amount claimed. The next case was that of James W. Bell. This action was brought to recover the amount of \$141.85, which was claimed by the plaintiff from the proceeds of the sale of a farm placed under the control of a receiver appointed by the court. A verdict was returned by the jury for the defendant. The case of the plaintiff was dismissed.

The court opened by Judge Boyd disposing of the case of Barker & Stoffer against the sum of \$300 from the defendants. The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff for the full amount claimed. The next case was that of James W. Bell. This action was brought to recover the amount of \$141.85, which was claimed by the plaintiff from the proceeds of the sale of a farm placed under the control of a receiver appointed by the court. A verdict was returned by the jury for the defendant. The case of the plaintiff was dismissed.

The court opened by Judge Boyd disposing of the case of Barker & Stoffer against the sum of \$300 from the defendants. The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff for the full amount claimed. The next case was that of James W. Bell. This action was brought to recover the amount of \$141.85, which was claimed by the plaintiff from the proceeds of the sale of a farm placed under the control of a receiver appointed by the court. A verdict was returned by the jury for the defendant. The case of the plaintiff was dismissed.

The court opened by Judge Boyd disposing of the case of Barker & Stoffer against the sum of \$300 from the defendants. The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff for the full amount claimed. The next case was that of James W. Bell. This action was brought to recover the amount of \$141.85, which was claimed by the plaintiff from the proceeds of the sale of a farm placed under the control of a receiver appointed by the court. A verdict was returned by the jury for the defendant. The case of the plaintiff was dismissed.

The court opened by Judge Boyd disposing of the case of Barker & Stoffer against the sum of \$300 from the defendants. The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff for the full amount claimed. The next case was that of James W. Bell. This action was brought to recover the amount of \$141.85, which was claimed by the plaintiff from the proceeds of the sale of a farm placed under the control of a receiver appointed by the court. A verdict was returned by the jury for the defendant. The case of the plaintiff was dismissed.

The court opened by Judge Boyd disposing of the case of Barker & Stoffer against the sum of \$300 from the defendants. The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff for the full amount claimed. The next case was that of James W. Bell. This action was brought to recover the amount of \$141.85, which was claimed by the plaintiff from the proceeds of the sale of a farm placed under the control of a receiver appointed by the court. A verdict was returned by the jury for the defendant. The case of the plaintiff was dismissed.

The court opened by Judge Boyd disposing of the case of Barker & Stoffer against the sum of \$300 from the defendants. The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff for the full amount claimed. The next case was that of James W. Bell. This action was brought to recover the amount of \$141.85, which was claimed by the plaintiff from the proceeds of the sale of a farm placed under the control of a receiver appointed by the court. A verdict was returned by the jury for the defendant. The case of the plaintiff was dismissed.

The court opened by Judge Boyd disposing of the case of Barker & Stoffer against the sum of \$300 from the defendants. The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff for the full amount claimed. The next case was that of James W. Bell. This action was brought to recover the amount of \$141.85, which was claimed by the plaintiff from the proceeds of the sale of a farm placed under the control of a receiver appointed by the court. A verdict was returned by the jury for the defendant. The case of the plaintiff was dismissed.

The court opened by Judge Boyd disposing of the case of Barker & Stoffer against the sum of \$300 from the defendants. The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff for the full amount claimed. The next case was that of James W. Bell. This action was brought to recover the amount of \$141.85, which was claimed by the plaintiff from the proceeds of the sale of a farm placed under the control of a receiver appointed by the court. A verdict was returned by the jury for the defendant. The case of the plaintiff was dismissed.

The court opened by Judge Boyd disposing of the case of Barker & Stoffer against the sum of \$300 from the defendants. The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff for the full amount claimed. The next case was that of James W. Bell. This action was brought to recover the amount of \$141.85, which was claimed by the plaintiff from the proceeds of the sale of a farm placed under the control of a receiver appointed by the court. A verdict was returned by the jury for the defendant. The case of the plaintiff was dismissed.

The court opened by Judge Boyd disposing of the case of Barker & Stoffer against the sum of \$300 from the defendants. The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff for the full amount claimed. The next case was that of James W. Bell. This action was brought to recover the amount of \$141.85, which was claimed by the plaintiff from the proceeds of the sale of a farm placed under the control of a receiver appointed by the court. A verdict was returned by the jury for the defendant. The case of the plaintiff was dismissed.

The court opened by Judge Boyd disposing of the case of Barker & Stoffer against the sum of \$300 from the defendants. The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff for the full amount claimed. The next case was that of James W. Bell. This action was brought to recover the amount of \$141.85, which was claimed by the plaintiff from the proceeds of the sale of a farm placed under the control of a receiver appointed by the court. A verdict was returned by the jury for the defendant. The case of the plaintiff was dismissed.

The court opened by Judge Boyd disposing of the case of Barker & Stoffer against the sum of \$300 from the defendants. The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff for the full amount claimed. The next case was that of James W. Bell. This action was brought to recover the amount of \$141.85, which was claimed by the plaintiff from the proceeds of the sale of a farm placed under the control of a receiver appointed by the court. A verdict was returned by the jury for the defendant. The case of the plaintiff was dismissed.

The court opened by Judge Boyd disposing of the case of Barker & Stoffer against the sum of \$300 from the defendants. The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff for the full amount claimed. The next case was that of James W. Bell. This action was brought to recover the amount of \$141.85, which was claimed by the plaintiff from the proceeds of the sale of a farm placed under the control of a receiver appointed by the court. A verdict was returned by the jury for the defendant. The case of the plaintiff was dismissed.

The court opened by Judge Boyd disposing of the case of Barker & Stoffer against the sum of \$300 from the defendants. The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff for the full amount claimed. The next case was that of James W. Bell. This action was brought to recover the amount of \$141.85, which was claimed by the plaintiff from the proceeds of the sale of a farm placed under the control of a receiver appointed by the court. A verdict was returned by the jury for the defendant. The case of the plaintiff was dismissed.

The court opened by Judge Boyd disposing of the case of Barker & Stoffer against the sum of \$300 from the defendants. The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff for the full amount claimed. The next case was that of James W. Bell. This action was brought to recover the amount of \$141.85, which was claimed by the plaintiff from the proceeds of the sale of a farm placed under the control of a receiver appointed by the court. A verdict was returned by the jury for the defendant. The case of the plaintiff was dismissed.

The court opened by Judge Boyd disposing of the case of Barker & Stoffer against the sum of \$300 from the defendants. The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff for the full amount claimed. The next case was that of James W. Bell. This action was brought to recover the amount of \$141.85, which was claimed by the plaintiff from the proceeds of the sale of a farm placed under the control of a receiver appointed by the court. A verdict was returned by the jury for the defendant. The case of the plaintiff was dismissed.

The court opened by Judge Boyd disposing of the case of Barker & Stoffer against the sum of \$300 from the defendants. The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff for the full amount claimed. The next case was that of James W. Bell. This action was brought to recover the amount of \$141.85, which was claimed by the plaintiff from the proceeds of the sale of a farm placed under the control of a receiver appointed by the court. A verdict was returned by the jury for the defendant. The case of the plaintiff was dismissed.

The court opened by Judge Boyd disposing of the case of Barker & Stoffer against the sum of \$300 from the defendants. The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff for the full amount claimed. The next case was that of James W. Bell. This action was brought to recover the amount of \$141.85, which was claimed by the plaintiff from the proceeds of the sale of a farm placed under the control of a receiver appointed by the court. A verdict was returned by the jury for the defendant. The case of the plaintiff was dismissed.

The court opened by Judge Boyd disposing of the case of Barker & Stoffer against the sum of \$300 from the defendants. The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff for the full amount claimed. The next case was that of James W. Bell. This action was brought to recover the amount of \$141.85, which was claimed by the plaintiff from the proceeds of the sale of a farm placed under the control of a receiver appointed by the court. A verdict was returned by the jury for the defendant. The case of the plaintiff was dismissed.

The court opened by Judge Boyd disposing of the case of Barker & Stoffer against the sum of \$300 from the defendants. The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff for the full amount claimed. The next case was that of James W. Bell. This action was brought to recover the amount of \$141.85, which was claimed by the plaintiff from the proceeds of the sale of a farm placed under the control of a receiver appointed by the court. A verdict was returned by the jury for the defendant. The case of the plaintiff was dismissed.

The court opened by Judge Boyd disposing of the case of Barker & Stoffer against the sum of \$300 from the defendants. The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff for the full amount claimed. The next case was that of James W. Bell. This action was brought to recover the amount of \$141.85, which was claimed by the plaintiff from the proceeds of the sale of a farm placed under the control of a receiver appointed by the court. A verdict was returned by the jury for the defendant. The case of the plaintiff was dismissed.

The court opened by Judge Boyd disposing of the case of Barker & Stoffer against the sum of \$300 from the defendants. The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff for the full amount claimed. The next case was that of James W. Bell. This action was brought to recover the amount of \$141.85, which was claimed by the plaintiff from the proceeds of the sale of a farm placed under the control of a receiver appointed by the court. A verdict was returned by the jury for the defendant. The case of the plaintiff was dismissed.

The court opened by Judge Boyd disposing of the case of Barker & Stoffer against the sum of \$300 from the defendants. The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff for the full amount claimed. The next case was that of James W. Bell. This action was brought to recover the amount of \$141.85, which was claimed by the plaintiff from the proceeds of the sale of a farm placed under the control of a receiver appointed by the court. A verdict was returned by the jury for the defendant. The case of the plaintiff was dismissed.

The court opened by Judge Boyd disposing of the case of Barker & Stoffer against the sum of \$300 from the defendants. The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff for the full amount claimed. The next case was that of James W. Bell. This action was brought to recover the amount of \$141.85, which was claimed by the plaintiff from the proceeds of the sale of a farm placed under the control of a receiver appointed by the court. A verdict was returned by the jury for the defendant. The case of the plaintiff was dismissed.

The court opened by Judge Boyd disposing of the case of Barker & Stoffer against the sum of \$300 from the defendants. The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff for the full amount claimed. The next case was that of James W. Bell. This action was brought to recover the amount of \$141.85, which was claimed by the plaintiff from the proceeds of the sale of a farm placed under the control of a receiver appointed by the court. A verdict was returned by the jury for the defendant. The case of the plaintiff was dismissed.

The court opened by Judge Boyd disposing of the case of Barker & Stoffer against the sum of \$300 from the defendants. The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff for the full amount claimed. The next case was that of James W. Bell. This action was brought to recover the amount of \$141.85, which was claimed by the plaintiff from the proceeds of the sale of a farm placed under the control of a receiver appointed by the court. A verdict was returned by the jury for the defendant. The case of the plaintiff was dismissed.

The court opened by Judge Boyd disposing of the case of Barker & Stoffer against the sum of \$300 from the defendants. The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff for the full amount claimed. The next case was that of James W. Bell. This action was brought to recover the amount of \$141.85, which was claimed by the plaintiff from the proceeds of the sale of a farm placed under the control of a receiver appointed by the court. A verdict was returned by the jury for the defendant. The case of the plaintiff was dismissed.

The court opened by Judge Boyd disposing of the case of Barker & Stoffer against the sum of \$300 from the defendants. The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff for the full amount claimed. The next case was that of James W. Bell. This action was brought to recover the amount of \$141.85, which was claimed by the plaintiff from the proceeds of the sale of a farm placed under the control of a receiver appointed by the court. A verdict was returned by the jury for the defendant. The case of the plaintiff was dismissed.

The court opened by Judge Boyd disposing of the case of Barker & Stoffer against the sum of \$300 from the defendants. The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff for the full amount claimed. The next case was that of James W. Bell. This action was brought to recover the amount of \$141.85, which was claimed by the plaintiff from the proceeds of the sale of a farm placed under the control of a receiver appointed by the court. A verdict was returned by the jury for the defendant. The case of the plaintiff was dismissed.

The court opened by Judge Boyd disposing of the case of Barker & Stoffer against the sum of \$300 from the defendants. The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff for the full amount claimed. The next case was that of James W. Bell. This action was brought to recover the amount of \$141.85, which was claimed by the plaintiff from the proceeds of the sale of a farm placed under the control of a receiver appointed by the court. A verdict was returned by the jury for the defendant. The case of the plaintiff was dismissed.

The court opened by Judge Boyd disposing of the case of Barker & Stoffer against the sum of \$300 from the defendants. The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff for the full amount claimed. The next case was that of James W. Bell. This action was brought to recover the amount of \$141.85, which was claimed by the plaintiff from the proceeds of the sale of a farm placed under the control of a receiver appointed by the court. A verdict was returned by the jury for the defendant. The case of the plaintiff was dismissed.

The court opened by Judge Boyd disposing of the case of Barker & Stoffer against the sum of \$300 from the defendants. The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff for the full amount claimed. The next case was that of James W. Bell. This action was brought to recover the amount of \$141.85, which was claimed by the plaintiff from the proceeds of the sale of a farm placed under the control of a receiver appointed by the court. A verdict was returned by the jury for the defendant. The case of the plaintiff was dismissed.

The court opened by Judge Boyd disposing of the case of Barker & Stoffer against the sum of \$300 from the defendants. The jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff for the full amount claimed. The next case was that of James W. Bell. This action was brought to recover the amount of \$141.85, which was claimed by the plaintiff from the proceeds of the sale of a farm placed under the control of a receiver appointed by the court. A verdict was returned by the jury for the defendant. The case of the plaintiff was dismissed.

LATEST OLD WORLD NEWS.

WHAT THE CABLE BRINGS ACROSS THE OCEAN.

Repeated Congress of European Nations—The Congress of Silver-Paid Representatives of Labor in Parliament—Notes.

PARIS, Sept. 14.—It is said that the recent accession to the Austro-German alliance will shortly result in a general congress of all the European powers with a view of determining upon a general disarmament. It is reported that Austria, Prussia and Italy have signified their willingness to participate in the congress.

Congress of Trades Unions. BIRMINGHAM, Sept. 14.—At the trades unions congress held at the residence of Jos. Arch was adopted, but an amendment calling upon the government to do away with the government property was rejected. A resolution favoring paid labor representatives in parliament was passed.