

After Dinner

To assist digestion, relieve distress after eating or drinking too heartily, to prevent constipation, take

Hood's Pills

Sold everywhere, 25 cents.

AROUND THE CITY.

From Yesterday's Last Edition.

—Reeve Cameron, of Lobo, is in the city.

—Mr. C. E. Bernard, of the Bernard House, has returned from a week's visit in Detroit.

—Rev. Elmore Harris, president of the Bible Training School, Toronto, will address Sunday's meeting at the Auditorium.

—The Rev. Mr. Salton, of the Centenary Church, Hamilton, has been invited to the Dominion Methodist Church, Ottawa.

—Toronto Globe: Mr. C. B. Keenleyside, who has managed the Ontario News so successfully for some years, has been forced to quit work owing to ill-health.

—John Luney, of Tecumseh avenue, has taken out a permit for a story and a half brick residence on the south side of St. James street, between Maitland and William.

DEATH OF MRS. McMAN.

The death occurred this morning at the residence of her husband, at 374 Ridout street, of Mrs. Margaret McMan. Death was due to general debility. Mrs. McMan was aged 76 years. She leaves, besides her husband, one daughter, living at home. The funeral takes place tomorrow at 2:30 to Woodland Cemetery.

POLICE COURT.

This morning's session of the police court was short, only two cases being set down for the police magistrate's consideration. The long-pending charge against James Taylor of assaulting his wife was settled between the parties, Taylor paying costs of \$1.85. Frank McCready, charged with assaulting an old man named James Johnston, pleaded not guilty, and asked and received a week's adjournment to produce witnesses.

ADJOURNED TILL MONDAY.

This morning the charge of assault laid against Edward Grant, of the Hamilton road, by James W. Scott, the young man arrested on a charge of attempted indecent assault, came up before Squires Lacey and Smyth. The case was adjourned till Monday next, when it will be heard, together with the charge against Scott.

WOMAN'S AUXILIARY, Y. M. C. A.

The first meeting of the new year of the Women's Auxiliary to the Y. M. C. A. was held in the parlors on Monday afternoon, the attendance being comparatively small owing to the storm. The meeting opened with a Bible reading by Mrs. G. G. G. who made touching reference to the death of the Queen. The different committees presented their various reports, those of the finance and social being especially encouraging. Delegates were then appointed to attend the annual convention to be held from Feb. 7 to 11 in Kingston, which promises to be of a very interesting character. After routine business, Mrs. G. G. G. closed the meeting with the benediction.

PRESENTATION TO TROOPER JANES.

Last evening the members of the Woodbine Club, South London, gathered in large numbers at their rooms and tendered a reception to one of their members, Trooper Martin Janes, who lately returned from South Africa. After varied forms of amusements were carried out, Mr. John A. A. Orme, on behalf of the club, presented Mr. Janes with a handsome gold chain, suitable engraved, Mr. Janes replied with a short speech and told the story of his capture and imprisonment by the Boers, which was well received. After refreshments were served and a pleasant time was spent, the meeting dispersed with the singing of "God Save the King."

PRESENTATIONS TO LONDON BOY.

The Ottawa Journal of Saturday contains the following reference to Mr. Fred Chittick, of the department of agriculture, and son of Mr. W. H. Chittick, of this city: "A very pleasant event took place in connection with Mr. Chittick's official duties, as referee. Mr. Chittick has always acted in a very obliging manner towards the Merchants' League, and as a mark of appreciation of his services the Bryson-Graham hockey club presented him with a solid leather dress suit case. Mr. Chittick appropriately expressed his appreciation of the club's kindness. Yesterday Mr. Chittick received a number of other remembrances on the occasion of his approaching marriage. Mr. D. Daniels presented him with a beautiful engraved gold watch bearing the donor's name on the inner case. He also received an elegant cabinet of silverware from the employees of the department of agriculture, and a handsome clock from Mr. Arthur Powell. Mr. Chittick left today for Walden, Mass., via Montreal. His marriage takes place Jan. 30."

HOCKEY.

PUCKERINGS.

A Western Ontario Hockey Association will likely be one of the things the O. H. A. will have to run up against next season. The newly-elected officers would do well to get George Black on their string again. He is certainly one of the best trainers in the business. Macbeth and Shippi—that's a strong team, and a pretty safe guarantee that London hockey enthusiasts will see some good sport yet this season. The majority of the members of the London team claim that they were not aware that the individual who played in the Stratford game here was not Lindsay. Percy Aspinall will make an affidavit to this effect and forward it to the O. H. A. executive at once. There is every reason to believe that his statement is correct, as he never saw nor played with Lindsay previous to the game, and was not at the time anyone to hear that it was not Lindsay.

The two city hockey games at Jubilee rink tonight will be decidedly interesting, as the opposing teams are evenly matched and these four teams contain some of the most promising young colts who will yet lead the seniors.

THE FLAGGING ENERGIES REVIVED.—Constant application to business is a tax upon the energies, and if there be not relaxation, lassitude and depression are sure to intervene. These come from staid troubles. The want of exercise brings on nervous irregularities, and the stomach ceases to assimilate food properly. In this condition, Parley's Vegetable Pills will be found a recuperative of rare power, restoring the system to health, dispelling depression, and reviving the flagging energies.

RESOLUTION OF CONDOLENCE

Passed by the County Council on the Death of the Queen.

Improvements To Be Made to Have Court House Properly Ventilated.—Communications Dealt With.

The county council met yesterday at 10 o'clock, and transacted business for two hours and a half. A resolution of condolence on the death of the Queen was passed, and will be sent direct to England. An inspection of the court house was made, and measures will be taken to remedy the defective ventilation. G. B. Campbell was the only absentee today, he having been called away on urgent business.

COMMUNICATIONS. Inspector Sanders, of the Children's Aid Society, reported that twelve county children had been placed in good homes during the year, and one boy sent to the Orillia Asylum. He asked for the customary grant of \$75.

Richard Ward, clerk of Metcalfe township, wrote asking \$2 each for deputy returning officers, for extra work at municipal elections on account of county council elections.

The Victoria Hospital trustees presented an account of \$2,106.54 for county patients.

Strathroy Collegiate Institute and Glenora High School presented reports of attendance and accounts, and asked for usual grants.

All these communications were referred to the finance committee.

QUEEN'S MEMORY HONORED.

The special committee to draft a resolution of condolence to the King and royal family on the death of Queen Victoria, presented for the council's approval the following memorial, with the recommendation that it be sent direct to the Secretary for the Colonies, London, England:

"This memorial of the Council of the County of Middlesex, in the Province of Ontario, Dominion of Canada, expresses the profound sorrow, which, in common with our fellow-subjects we feel, and which now fills the hearts and homes of our people, and our royal family, on the death of Her Majesty Queen Victoria, Queen and Empress, a sorrow which springs from love of one who has bestowed such incalculable benefits on her subjects, ourselves and our children, through her wisdom and devotion as a sovereign, her exalted example and her ever-flowing appreciation of and sympathy with the feelings of her people. Time has assimilated this love to that which blesses and binds the home, more than that due from subjects to sovereign, and today we mourn for a heart that has ever been open to our sympathy to those who are still more sadly bereft by this event, and we devoutly pray that the merciful God will give and take so much, may ever keep her example before us, 'Lest we forget.'"

The resolution was adopted.

COURT HOUSE VENTILATION.

On motion of Mr. Elson, the council proceeded to the consideration of a memorial from the engineer and the janitor, to inspect the same, with a view to making such alterations, and improvements as would provide proper ventilation.

On returning from the court house the council was addressed by the engineer on the matter of ventilation. He advocated a system similar to that in the county buildings, which has proved quite satisfactory. He pointed out that by agreement with the city council, that body had to be consulted re any proposed alterations in the court house.

Mr. Elson then moved that the matter be left in the hands of the engineer and the janitor, who has in the past been given power to make any alterations or improvements which would meet the desired end of affording good ventilation, after obtaining the city council's assent. The motion was carried.

The council then adjourned till 2 p.m.

Terse Telegrams.

Senator Power is to be appointed speaker of the Dominion Senate.

The annual meeting of the Dominion Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, opens in Toronto today (Wednesday).

The steamer Amur, at Victoria, B. C., brings news that on Jan. 22 quartz mining as high as \$400 a ton was found in the Klondike.

Wm. Senter, president of the St. Louis Cotton Exchange, at St. Louis, died yesterday of a complication of diseases, aged 70 years.

All the Filipino members of the Federal party continued their loyalty to the Catholic Church, excepting Buenafuente, Rosario and Ner.

John Nicholson, of Port Hastings, C. B., aged 103 years, died Sunday. He lived about the house as usual during the morning, but after dinner went to bed and passed peacefully away.

President McKinley has sent a message to congress recommending the appropriation of \$100,000 for the payment of the claim of Spain for Sibuta and Cogoyan Islands, in the Philippine group.

Charles Schmidt, whose true name is believed to have been De la Motte, a supposed descendant of a former reigning house of Sweden, committed suicide in Helena, Mont. He is said to have left Sweden because of a love affair.

Chairman W. H. Hunnewell, of the board of directors, of the Kansas City, Memphis and Birmingham Railway, has tendered his resignation. Mr. Hunnewell is nearly 81 years of age, and one of the best-known figures among the pioneers of the railroad world.

ILL-FITTING BOOTS and shoes cause corns. Holloway's Corn Cure is the article to use. Get a bottle at once and cure your corns.

Archibald Gauthier of Kingston is dangerously ill.

FREE AND EASY expectation immediately relieves and frees the throat and lungs from viscid phlegm, and a medicine that promotes the best medicine to use for coughs, colds, inflammation of the lungs and all affections of the throat and chest. This is precisely what Bickie's Anti-Consumptive Syrup is a specific for, and wherever used it has given unbounded satisfaction. Children like it, because it is pleasant; adults like it because it relieves and cures the disease.

Chester Wyatt is under arrest at Ottawa on the charge of having cut his neighbor's throat with a razor in the course of a quarrel.

The automobile delivery wagon has worked its way as far west as Toledo, Kan.

TO CURE THE GRIP IN TWO DAYS

Laxative Bromo-Quinine removes the cause.

MUTINY AT ST. HELENA DEBARRED FROM THE FUNERAL

West Indian Troops Terrorize the Inhabitants.

Insubordination Suppressed Only by Force—Trouble Arose From a Quarrel With Blue Jackets.

London, Jan. 30.—The West Indian troops, stationed at the Island of St. Helena (where Gen. Cronje and a large number of Boers are held prisoners), mutinied early during the month, raided the town, terrorized the inhabitants, injured many of them, defied their officers and were subdued only when faced by the muzzles of rifles. The censor suppressed the news, but the Associated Press has received the story by mail.

The trouble started with a row on the night of Jan. 1 between some Blue jackets and a party of West Indians. On the following night the West Indians broke out of the barracks and raided the town with clubs, and razors tied to sticks.

THEY RAN AMUCK, cutting and beating women, children and men indiscriminately, and attacking the Sailors' Rest, tearing out the doors and windows.

All the efforts of the officers to suppress the mutineers were futile. When ordered to the barracks they refused to obey, and threatened to dynamite the town. A strong naval force then was landed, the available troops were collected, and the streets were paraded and guarded all night long.

At daybreak the troops were drawn up, with loaded rifles in front of the place where the West Indians were barricaded. The latter were ordered to surrender, and were notified if they did not do so they would be fired upon. The mutineers were cowed, and allowed themselves to be taken to the camp, where they will remain under guard until a troopship shall arrive to receive them.

UNITED STATES SAILORS MUTINY

Manila, Jan. 30.—Forty sailors from the United States cruiser Albatross, convicted of mutiny while the ship was in dock at Hong Kong, have been sentenced to various terms of imprisonment at Cavite. The only cause for their conduct is said to have been restlessness and dissatisfaction.

WAS THERE NEGLIGENCE

Case of Brown vs. London Street Railway Heard on Appeal—Judgment Reserved.

The following case was heard at Osbourne Hall, Toronto, Tuesday.

Brown vs. London Street Railway Company—Gibbons, K.C., for plaintiff, appeared from the judgment of Meredith, C.J., entered on the findings of the jury in action for damages for injury to plaintiff's car by defendant's car attempting to cross Dundas street at Colborne street, in the city of London, was knocked down by a car. Plaintiff complained that the car was being run at a speed in not sounding the bell, and in not having the car under proper control, and that the injury to plaintiff was caused by their negligence. They also introduced evidence to the effect that the plaintiff was not guilty of contributory negligence in not using more caution in crossing the railway tracks, and they then assessed the plaintiff's damages at \$800. The action has been tried three times.

On behalf of appellant the charge and questions were objected to in that it was not the duty of the plaintiff to be responsible until they became aware of plaintiff's danger, instead of, as the fact is, that the motorman was bound to look out, and that he ought to have been aware of the fact that there was no evidence of contributory negligence—that the proximate cause of the accident, as found by the jury, was the defendant's negligence. The defendant's counsel, in answer to the question, "Was the plaintiff guilty of contributory negligence?" taken with the other findings, brought the case within Rowan vs. Toronto R. W. Co., C. B., 25, and asked the jury to find in favor of the defendant, and inconsistent to hold that the accident was caused by the neglect of the defendants on three grounds, want of care and running at too high a speed, and to be found the statement caused by plaintiff's neglect. Either judgment should be entered for plaintiff or there should be a new trial and a further question put to the jury to answer, that the defendant was negligent and his negligence contributed to the accident, yet if the defendants could in any way be held liable of ordinary care and diligence have avoided the mischief, the plaintiff's negligence will not excuse them: See Radley vs. London and N. W. Railway Co., 1 App. Cas. 25, and ask the jury to find in favor of the plaintiff, and to find that the defendant's negligence was the proximate cause of the accident, and that the plaintiff's negligence (if any) is not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit, but admitting that not to be so, then the finding as to the contributory negligence by plaintiff is final and should not be set aside. The case is distinguishable from Rowan's case, because here the jury did not use the word "possibly," but the simple affirmative, and in the next question explained in what the negligence consisted, and that the plaintiff's negligence was not "contributory negligence," with the legal meaning of that term. Helmutz for defendants, opposed the appeal, and contended that upon the evidence for the plaintiff twelve reasonable men must find that he had been guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore there should have been a non-suit