

Daily Globe

Official Paper of the City & County of St. Paul, Minnesota. Printed and Published Every Day in the Year, by H. P. HALL, NO. 17 WABASH STREET, ST. PAUL.

Terms of Subscription for the Daily Globe, by carrier (7 papers per week) 70 cents per month, by mail (without Sunday edition) 70 cents per month, 50 cents per month, by mail (with Sunday edition) 70 cents per month, 50 cents per month.

THE SUNDAY GLOBE. By mail the SUNDAY GLOBE will be one dollar per year.

THE WEEKLY GLOBE. The WEEKLY GLOBE is a pamphlet sheet, exactly twice the size of the Daily. It is just the paper for the family, containing in addition to all the current news, choice miscellany, agricultural matter, market reports, etc. It is furnished to single subscribers at \$1.00 per year.

Daily Globe Advertising Rates. Fourth Page 5 cents per line every insertion. Third Page 6 cents per line for the first week. All subsequent insertions 3 cents per line.

Display Advertising (on Fourth Page only) double above rates. All advertising is computed as Non-panels, 10 lines to an inch.

Reading Matter Notices, First, Second and Fourth Pages, 25 cents per line.

Special Local Notices, Second Page, 15 cents per line. Reading Matter Notices, Third Page, 20 cents per line.

ST. PAUL, THURSDAY, MAY 22, 1879.

It is announced that President Wright, of the Northern Pacific railroad, will resign his position on account of ill health. The resignation will not affect St. Paul unfavorably.

The President is getting ready for some more votes. His many Democrats begged the pen with which he wrote the previous veto.

No; it has been reserved for the cabinet of criminal curiosities.

Sherman seems to have lost his "boom" in Ohio, while Thurman, who had the good sense to declare that he could not be the candidate of his party, has visibly risen in the estimation of his constituents.

Is Eliza B. Washburne "working up political sentiment" in Minnesota? That seems to be the principal occupation of Presidential possibilities and probabilities just now, and unless Eliza enters a disclaimer we shall be obliged to credit him with that purpose.

The New York Tribune offers a chronicle to the Northern Democrat who has ever cast his vote amid "bristling bayonets." We presume the chronicle will be a portrait of Little Johnny Davenport, who caused the arrest of six thousand Democrats on the day before the last general election on the general charges that they intended to cast their votes fraudulently.

It is said that Gov. Hendricks is "working up public sentiment" in view of the next Presidential nomination. His views are said to be prevailing all of the political conventions that are now being held, and laying the wires, setting up the pins, or whatever they may call it, for 1880. Mr. Hendricks, we have no doubt, would make a good President if elected, but we would warn him to be careful lest he tap his "bar!" too soon.

The English people are nothing if not aristocratic. Even the osamen of the country are high-toned, especially when they are overmatched in skill and muscle. The board of control of the Henley races has just excluded from those contests the Shoe-was-come-into that made such a brilliant record last year on the ground that they are mechanics. Of course it would be *infra dig* for gentlemen to enter into a contest with men who earn their living.

Vanderbilt, before starting for Europe, acknowledged that he was the possessor of half a million dollars worth of personal property, and paid a little over twelve thousand dollars into the New York city treasury. Repentance is to be commended always, but how can he account for the accumulation of so much property in a year. It is but a few months since he swore he hadn't a dollar's worth of personal property liable to taxation. He has evidently been very industrious since that time.

It spoiled all the Democratic thunder when Mr. Hayes declared, in the first paragraph of his veto message, that he was opposed to the use of troops at the polls, and in the last, that he would be glad to cooperate with Congress in any measure to make such use still more impossible than it is at present.—*Madison Journal*.

It spoiled Mr. Hayes' imitation of thunder when Congress, taking him at his word, passed a separate bill interdicting the presence of troops at the polls, which the standards of his party compelled him to veto. Tell the whole story when you attempt to tell it all.

THE REASON OF THE DISCUSSION.

There is an evident disposition on the part of the Senate to adjourn as early a day as possible. On Tuesday, after passing the legislative, executive and judicial appropriation bills, there was little opposition to an adjournment till to-day, the evident purpose being to afford time for the engrossment and transmission to Mr. Hayes of the bill, that he might prepare his veto with the least possible delay. That Mr. Hayes will veto the bill there is no question. His action relative to the army and military interference bills has fortunately left little room for doubt. The veto will probably be received by the House, which originated the bill, to-morrow or Saturday, when the future course of action of the Democratic majority will be determined upon.

The question has often been asked, during the progress of the debates on the measures in controversy, why discussion was maintained by the Democrats when they were convinced that their purpose would be defeated by a veto from Mr. Hayes. They have had a very good reason, as after results will demonstrate. It has been to place the two parties on record before the people on questions that will figure conspicuously, if they do not form the main issues, in the next Presidential campaign. The Democratic party was anxious to place its position before the public, and was at the same time determined to make the Republican party show its purposes. For this reason the political amendments were proposed to the appropriation bills at the last session, and insisted upon at the present one. The result has disappointed no one who has possessed any insight into the way events were being shaped, and therefore had little disappointment felt except among those who were compelled, unwillingly, to place themselves

on record as pledged to monarchism in America.

The debates in both houses of Congress resulted in placing the parties on trial. Only this and nothing more. But that is enough. It has established certain facts that it is not too early to impress upon the minds of citizens. These facts are pregnant with great results. They comprise no less issues than those of republicanism and monarchy. The Democratic party has taken a decided stand on the questions at issue. It has declared that all the vestiges of monarchism that creep in during and succeeding the war should be obliterated. Deming the law authorizing the use of troops at elections un-republican, the Democratic party sought to repeal that law. It was defeated by a veto from a man who occupies his position by virtue of the exercise of that un-republican and unconstitutional prerogative. It seeks, in the bill now before Mr. Hayes, to repeat laws that were designed to defeat the will of the people in preventing the freedom of elections, and to give to the people of the South the constitutional right of trial by a jury of their peers. The Democratic position needs no defense. It is thoroughly and radically the policy of republicanism upon which the government was founded.

But what shall be said of the attitude of the Republican party? Its leading members have stood up in the House and the Senate and defended the laws which the majority of those, coming directly from the people, have asked to be repealed. They have demanded that the military arm of the government should be felt at the polls, insisting that rebellion was still rampant throughout the country, though the last vestige of the rebellion was obliterated fourteen years ago. They have sought to array the North against the South politically, though in a business point of view the North and the South have been united for many years. They have insisted that elections require federal supervision, though it has been shown repeatedly that the purest elections for the past decade have been held under State supervision. They have declared that supervisors of elections and deputy marshals should have arbitrary powers of arrest—powers only delegated to such officials in monarchies in cases of extreme emergency. They have declared that the intelligent portion of one-third of the States of the union shall not sit in the jury box for the adjudication of a dispute, no matter how trivial. They have, in essence, placed themselves on record as favoring a strong central government at Washington that shall have the power to override the authority of the several States, and make of every citizen a pliant tool of the party that happens to be in power or else a prisoner in duress. They declare that the exercise of the privilege of the franchise is contingent upon a vote for the party that controls the army and the marshals—that a vote on the opposite side will subject the citizen to prosecution and proscription. Every monarchial idea that has been advanced has found a solid phalanx of supporters in the Republican representation in Congress.

The issue is made up. It is simply whether the republic shall remain such in fact as well as in name or whether it shall be converted into a monarchy. The transition, when it takes place, if it ever does, will be gradual, but it will nevertheless be certain. It is not too early to present the issues bluntly before the people.

BLAINE'S BOMBAST.

Mr. Blaine can be both forcible and satirical by turns. His forte, if we can believe his admirers, is irony, and in this he shines brilliantly. He tried his hand at irony in the Senate the other day in the course of the debate on the legislative appropriation bill, and achieved distinction as the most brilliant ass of the century. He did not speak to the issue pending before the Senate at all, but went back nearly twenty years to find matter out of which to frame ammunition to fire at the Democratic party and the individual members of that organization who happen to be members of the Senate at the present time.

To laud a man for what he was two decades ago may constitute argument, but we cannot think so, especially in a country that has seen so many changes in that time. The man who has not changed his opinions on political subjects in the course of the past twenty years is not worth denouncing a man of intelligence. He may have adhered to certain well defined landmarks, but distinguished parties in the long ago, but on questions of minor importance he must inevitably have changed, no matter what party he may give his adhesion to. If he has not changed, it is an evidence that he is either incapable of learning or is too obstinate to merit public confidence. How would the utterances of Mr. Blaine twenty years ago sound when placed side by side with his utterances of to-day? It is true he has been consistent in one thing—his hatred of the South, and has never so far forgotten himself as to pay even a passing tribute of respect to the qualities which adorn the Southern character, but on all other subjects his views have materially changed. The case is different with those he assailed on Monday. They have not harbored a sectional animosity, nursing their wrath to keep it warm, for these long years. They may have entered into the rebellion and at that time have cherished feelings of animosity towards the people of the North, but when they had been conquered they dropped all such sentiments and again professed to be loyal to the union and the constitution. As far as outward appearances are concerned, we can find nothing to warrant the charge that the change in their sentiments was not thorough. They have acknowledged their fault and have atoned for it, and having received every possible legal forgiveness it would seem that they are entitled to the benefit of a moral forgiveness. Mr. Blaine's course is as reprehensible as would be that of a church member who should tattle a person recently admitted with the sins he had previously committed, for which he had received absolution, and was entitled to have been buried in forgetfulness. But the sins that the Southern people have committed, it seems, are never to be forgiven or forgotten, at least as long as they can be utilized to serve a political purpose—that of firing the Northern heart. In the opinion of Mr. Blaine and his fellow alarmists the man who, twenty years ago, was rebel against the government, is a rebel to-day. They do not believe in the possibility of conversion or repentance. They can condone sins of far greater magnitude. They can take a convicted

thief to their bosom provided he sustains their party, even though the prison doors may be yawning to receive him, but they cannot accept a man as loyal who, through zeal for the interests of his State, or from any other sense was drawn into the rebellion, though for fourteen years he has professed repentance and has long enjoyed legal absolution for his error, if he adheres to the Democratic party. If, however, he joins the Republican fold, he is instantly transformed from a red-handed traitor to a high-toned gentleman and distinguished patriot. No man can be a patriot in the opinion of this clique unless he is loyal to the Republican party. It is the first time in the history of this or any other country that party has been esteemed to be synonymous with country. But if the cabal of stalwarts that seem to govern at Washington is content to raise such an issue, the Democratic party can stand it.

COURT CAZECENES.

The Criminal Mill Grinding in Earliest in the District Court—The Assault Case of Allen and Fox's Larceny Disposed of.

Criminal business was begun in earnest yesterday in the district court, Judge Wilkin presiding. At the opening of court the case of John Allen, charged with a murderous assault, was taken up.

ALLEN'S ASSAULT. County Attorney Rogers appeared for the State and Allen's attorneys were committed to the care of Mr. L. V. D. Heard. A jury was impaneled without difficulty, Thomas Manning of the panel being excused and J. K. Hilliard, colored, being challenged for bias. The case then went to trial. George Morton, his wife, Ed Brady, Easton Burgett and Capt. John Clark were examined as witnesses for the prosecution. Those witnesses related in detail an account of the murderous row which occurred on the 13th inst., and which was duly summarized in the GLOBE at that time.

The defense introduced Ed Wright and defendant. Their testimony went to show that Burgett began the row, first assaulted Wright and that Allen acted promptly to protect Wright from murderous violence.

Both counsel presented arguments according to their views, and the case was given to the jury. After being out for an hour the jury returned a verdict finding Allen guilty of "a simple assault" only.

Mr. Heard made a motion for a new trial, after which the prisoner was returned to jail.

DAMON AND PYTHIAS.

In determining the question of Lawrence Fox's guilt or innocence, the court and jury had a case of friendship to contemplate equalling the self-sacrificing condition of mind related of those old mythical persons, Damon and Pythias.

Lawrence Fox was brought to trial for stealing three or four pairs of boots from Thomas Nolan's shop, on Wabasha street. Fox and one Charles A. Squires were jointly indicted for the commission of the crime. Squires pleaded guilty and Fox not guilty to the charge as made in the indictment.

The prosecution introduced evidence to show that Fox and Squires were together all the date on which the crime was committed. They were arrested in company, and that Squires showed up the stolen property and implicated Fox in the transaction.

The defense introduced Squires as a witness. And as a witness, Squires did some very strong swearing for Fox. He declared he'd done the business alone. He'd taken Fox to his room, and he'd paid for the boots he'd engaged before, paying for the same; left Fox sitting on the steps drunk. That he had then skipped off alone and done the little job all by himself. He then hid the boots in a barn, one pair on one side and three pairs on the other side of the barn, and had then gone back to Fox. All this business was done expeditiously in fifteen minutes.

The cross-examination mixed Squires in his friendly determination to sacrifice himself.

Fox followed in evidence for himself, which became confused on cross-examination.

Then the prosecution introduced John Peters to show that both Fox and Squires lied when they claimed that they had been in his boarding house to get a night's lodging, or that either one had ever boarded there, as Fox claimed he had.

Thomas Nolan made both of 'em out liars in their claim that they had had boots mended by him, or had bartered with him for a new pair during the morning of the day of the theft.

Capt. Clark clinched the business of proving both unmitigated liars by relating all of Squires' admissions to him, when he, Squires, squealed on Fox. Squires had further confessed that Fox was "so mad" with him for "squealing," that he (Squires) was going to take all the blame on himself and clear Fox.

With this testimony for a starter, Mr. Rogers presented the case for the State, and Mr. J. J. Egan tried to clear it up for the defense. The jury got out of the matter about 6 o'clock, and five minutes thereafter returned a verdict finding Mr. Lawrence Fox just as guilty as his friend Squires had declared himself guilty.

The twin went back to jail to await the pleasure of the court in fixing up the period for each over in Stillwater or the county jail.

THE COURTS.

District Court. [Before Judge Wilkin.] CRIMINAL CASES.

The State of Minnesota vs. John Allen; assault with a murderous weapon with intent to do great bodily harm. Jury impaneled and verdict was rendered of not guilty of the indictment charged but guilty of a simple assault. Motion for new trial made by defendant's counsel.

The State of Minnesota vs. Lawrence Fox; larceny from a shop. Jury impaneled and a verdict of guilty returned. Defendant remanded to await sentence.

Municipal Court. [Before Judge Flint.] CRIMINAL CASES.

The City vs. Honora Fishery and Eugene Carrigan; nuisance. Continued until the 24th inst.

The City vs. L. E. Moody; disorderly conduct. Sentence suspended during good behavior.

The City vs. W. T. Bassett; disorderly conduct. Acquitted and discharged.

The City vs. John Brady; disorderly conduct. Committed for seven days.

The City vs. Peter Anthony; disorderly conduct. Committed for fourteen days.

The City vs. John Sullivan; disorderly conduct. Fine of \$6 paid and defendant discharged.

The City vs. Nellie Gilbert; drunkenness. Fine of \$8 paid and defendant discharged.

The City vs. Adolph Steinar, L. Tool, James Green, Mart Kelly, F. Mountain, George Hayes, Thomas McCue, John Morgan, John Hayes, John Utz and John Lester; vagrancy. Sentence suspended to allow defendants to leave the city.

The State vs. Charles H. Taylor; assault with intent to commit rape. Partially tried and examination postponed until 8 o'clock this morning.

Good Fire Department on Parade. [Special Telegram to the Globe.] MADISON, Wis., May 21.—The annual inspection and review of the Madison fire department took place to-day, the department making a very creditable appearance, the steamers throwing much better streams than they ever do at fairs.

Memorial day was observed at Richmond, Va., yesterday, with the usual decoration of graves of Confederate soldiers in Holly Wood cemetery.

VOICE OF THE PEOPLE.

[The GLOBE will be glad to receive and print short letters from the people on local or current topics. Make your communications brief and to the point and you will secure their publication.]

The Social Evil Now and Then. To the Editor of the Globe.

John W. 3. And the scribes and Pharisees brought unto him a woman taken in adultery; and when they had set her in the midst,

4. They say unto him, Master, this woman was taken in adultery, in the very act.

5. Now Moses in the law commanded us that such should be stoned, but what sayest thou?

6. This they said to tempt him, but he stooped down, and wrote on the ground as though he heard them not.

7. So when they continued asking him he lifted up himself and said unto them, He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at this woman, if he can.

8. When Jesus had lifted himself up and saw none but the woman, he said unto her, Woman, where are thine accusers? Hath no man condemned thee?

9. She said, No man, Lord; And Jesus said unto her, Neither do I condemn thee; go and sin no more.

Passing by many interesting features of this account, the particular feature to which I wish to allude is that the Scribes and Pharisees brought unto him a woman taken in adultery, in the very act.

The man was equally guilty, nor for want of evidence, for they reported she was "taken in adultery, in the very act." The peculiar nature of this sin makes it impossible for the woman to have been the only one involved in it. It takes two to make a bargain. There was a woman in the case, but there was also a man. Why was he not brought unto him. Was it that these valiant men were afraid to tackle the man for fear of losing popularity, or encountering the spurs of the rooster, while the hen was without spurs and unable to fight? Was it cowardice?

Jesus saw none but the woman.

And when our grand jury brought unto him the woman, we observe the same suggestion on our part, and the same result. The men who were in the act were not accused.

The parallel so far between the St. Paul way of dealing with the social evil and the way the Pharisees did it, is complete.

The accusers in that case had the gallantry to retire and throw no stones, while our grand jury, being all without sin, insist upon throwing the stones and carrying out the law to the bitter end.

Now is not this whole business just a trifle unmanly. Is it not a relic of barbarism, in that the more barbarous mankind are, the more cruel, unjust and unfair are they to the weaker sex. It is so with the Congo tribes in the interior of Africa. It is so with the Indian lords of creation, who impose the heavy burdens upon the women. It is so the world over that the woman is made the slave just in proportion to the number and brutality of the men, and the tribe she belongs to. St. Paul is simply re-enacting and executing the code of barbarism, in this inconsistent singling out of the weaker sex to punish, fine and imprison, while the stronger goes free and is well received in social and religious circles.

Do I justify the social evil then? Prejudice and surface thinkers will say I do. I do not any more than Christ did. He demanded equal rights. He demanded the man as well as the woman. I do the same; or I say let all go and sin no more.

Let us have sense for the goose as well as the trouble it is, the ganders have votes. They have business and patronage. They pay pew rents, and are nice young men at a tea party. It would raise a row to tackle these, and cost something.

They have no sense, and manhood, and sincerity, and pluck enough to do this? If not, for God's sake let us abandon this cowardly programme. It does not take the courage of a sheep to fight a woman.

Mack.

The Principality of the Wisconsin Normal School.

To the Editor of the Globe.

St. Paul, May 21, 1879.—Permit me to say through your paper that the normal school board did not secretly resolve at its late meeting to appoint no one now a resident of Minnesota to take the vacant chair of principal of the Wisconsin Normal School.

A committee consisting of Mitchell, of St. Cloud; Pitcher, of Mankato; and Simpson, of Winona, were appointed to find a man for the position, but they were placed under no instructions, either secret or open.

If the opinion has been expressed that this committee will inquire who can be found abroad for the place, it only implies that the committee will secure the best man they can find, and make no point with less promote a public good by communicating to Mr. E. W. Chase, relief secretary, at his rooms on Robert street, or to the city of St. Paul, that it will be put in some other part of the city.

W. L. WILSON, Pres. Soc. for P. C. to Animals.

Card from Dr. Minter.

To the Editor of the Globe.

A statement was made a day or two ago in your paper, that I had rented a house to a disreputable woman. This is not true. I have not owned the house in question for a year, and had nothing to do with the renting of it. You can find the owner by reference to the record. I had occupied the house, and had bought a place in the Sixth ward, I moved out, and it was rented to other parties by the owner.

In regard to the horse you allege I bought of Mr. Babcock, I wish to say that I bought of John Cody, who had bought of the brother-in-law of John Patterson, and paid him \$100 for it. It was Cody, and not Babcock, who was arrested. I had not the slightest idea that the horse was stolen, and the animal had been offered to me for \$15; I should have had suspicion and refused to do anything in the matter. I refer you to the court records to show the arrest of Cody.

W. L. MINTZER.

Market House Letting.

To the Editor of the Globe.

As the committee on market house building have failed to bring the price below \$65,500, notwithstanding their out-of-town

competition, would it not be well to have a little competition among architects out of town for the building that would not cost over \$40,000, the architect submitting his plan being required to give bonds that his building will not cost over that amount? Where's Col. Allen's \$40,000 man? Bring him on, colonel, the public is anxious to make his acquaintance. A CITIZEN.

A Deadfall.

Will you please give Dr. Day or the landlord of Uppan's Hotel arrested for leaving a man trap on the new sidewalk that has been built there. It is causing more profanity than a little. I have just jarred myself out of joint there and indulged in a little ejaculatory soliloquy more emphatic than complimentary to the authors of this deadfall. A deadfall of 539 lbs. who sympathize, I am yours, M. A. D.

Teachers' Salaries.

To the Editor of the Globe.

While reading the GLOBE yesterday morning my attention was called to a communication from Minneapolis on the position of the school board toward the primary teachers. The writer said that the lowest grade teachers only get \$380 per year; deducting tax of \$20 only leaves \$360. He also stated that the next higher grade only received \$425 minus \$25. Will you inform me if the above communication is reliable? Yours truly, NEW ENGLANDER.

THE PUBLIC PRINTING.

Defrees and Hutchinson.

The committee on printing of the House on Tuesday resumed consideration of the subject in relation to the management of the government printing office. The statement of Mr. Defrees, in reply to the charge made by Silton Hutchinson, that the office is conducted extravagantly, was submitted and read. Mr. Defrees, in answer to the charge that the public printer employs from 1,500 to 2,500 persons, and that the printer's office purchased during last year \$41,000 worth of nonpartisan type, for which he paid 60 cents per pound, Mr. Defrees says that only \$13,183 worth of nonpartisan type was purchased instead of \$41,000, as asserted, and that the type found in the printer's office was purchased during last year \$41,000 worth of nonpartisan type, for which he paid 60 cents per pound, Mr. Defrees says that only \$13,183 worth of nonpartisan type was purchased instead of \$41,000, as asserted, and that the type found in the printer's office was purchased during last year \$41,000 worth of nonpartisan type, for which he paid 60 cents per pound, Mr. Defrees says that only \$13,183 worth of nonpartisan type was purchased instead of \$41,000, as asserted, and that the type found in the printer's office was purchased during last year \$41,000 worth of nonpartisan type, for which he paid 60 cents per pound, Mr. Defrees says that only \$13,183 worth of nonpartisan type was purchased instead of \$41,000, as asserted, and that the type found in the printer's office was purchased during last year \$41,000 worth of nonpartisan type, for which he paid 60 cents per pound, Mr. Defrees says that only \$13,183 worth of nonpartisan type was purchased instead of \$41,000, as asserted, and that the type found in the printer's office was purchased during last year \$41,000 worth of nonpartisan type, for which he paid 60 cents per pound, Mr. Defrees says that only \$13,183 worth of nonpartisan type was purchased instead of \$41,000, as asserted, and that the type found in the printer's office was purchased during last year \$41,000 worth of nonpartisan type, for which he paid 60 cents per pound, Mr. Defrees says that only \$13,183 worth of nonpartisan type was purchased instead of \$41,000, as asserted, and that the type found in the printer's office was purchased during last year \$41,000 worth of nonpartisan type, for which he paid 60 cents per pound, Mr. Defrees says that only \$13,183 worth of nonpartisan type was purchased instead of \$41,000, as asserted, and that the type found in the printer's office was purchased during last year \$41,000 worth of nonpartisan type, for which he paid 60 cents per pound, Mr. Defrees says that only \$13,183 worth of nonpartisan type was purchased instead of \$41,000, as asserted, and that the type found in the printer's office was purchased during last year \$41,000 worth of nonpartisan type, for which he paid 60 cents per pound, Mr. Defrees says that only \$13,183 worth of nonpartisan type was purchased instead of \$41,000, as asserted, and that the type found in the printer's office was purchased during last year \$41,000 worth of nonpartisan type, for which he paid 60 cents per pound, Mr. Defrees says that only \$13,183 worth of nonpartisan type was purchased instead of \$41,000, as asserted, and that the type found in the printer's office was purchased during last year \$41,000 worth of nonpartisan type, for which he paid 60 cents per pound, Mr. Defrees says that only \$13,183 worth of nonpartisan type was purchased instead of \$41,000, as asserted, and that the type found in the printer's office was purchased during last year \$41,000 worth of nonpartisan type, for which he paid 60 cents per pound, Mr. Defrees says that only \$13,183 worth of nonpartisan type was purchased instead of \$41,000, as asserted, and that the type found in the printer's office was purchased during last year \$41,000 worth of nonpartisan type, for which he paid 60 cents per pound, Mr. Defrees says that only \$13,183 worth of nonpartisan type was purchased instead of \$41,000, as asserted, and that the type found in the printer's office was purchased during last year \$41,000 worth of nonpartisan type, for which he paid 60 cents per pound, Mr. Defrees says that only \$13,183 worth of nonpartisan type was purchased instead of \$41,000, as asserted, and that the type found in the printer's office was purchased during last year \$41,000 worth of nonpartisan type, for which he paid 60 cents per pound, Mr. Defrees says that only \$13,183 worth of nonpartisan type was purchased instead of \$41,000, as asserted, and that the type found in the printer's office was purchased during last year \$41,000 worth of nonpartisan type, for which he paid 60 cents per pound, Mr. Defrees says that only \$13,183 worth of nonpartisan type was purchased instead of \$41,000, as asserted, and that the type found in the printer's office was purchased during last year \$41,000 worth of nonpartisan type, for which he paid 60 cents per pound, Mr. Defrees says that only \$13,183 worth of nonpartisan type was purchased instead of \$41,000, as asserted, and that the type found in the printer's office was purchased during last year \$41,000 worth of nonpartisan type, for which he paid 60 cents per pound, Mr. Defrees says that only \$13,183 worth of nonpartisan type was purchased instead of \$41,000, as asserted, and that the type found in the printer's office was purchased during last year \$41,000 worth of nonpartisan type, for which he paid 60 cents per pound, Mr. Defrees says that only \$13,183 worth of nonpartisan type was purchased instead of \$41,000, as asserted, and that the type found in the printer's office was purchased during last year \$41,000 worth of nonpartisan type, for which he paid 60 cents per pound, Mr. Defrees says that only \$13,183 worth of nonpartisan type was purchased instead of \$41,000, as asserted, and that the type found in the printer's office was purchased during last year \$41,000 worth of nonpartisan type, for which he paid 60 cents per pound, Mr. Defrees says that only \$13,183 worth of nonpartisan type was purchased instead of \$41,000, as asserted, and that the type found in the printer's office was purchased during last year \$41,000 worth of nonpartisan type, for which he paid 60 cents per pound, Mr. Defrees says that only \$13,183 worth of nonpartisan type was purchased instead of \$41,000, as asserted, and that the type found in the printer's office was purchased during last year \$41,000 worth of nonpartisan type, for which he paid 60 cents per pound, Mr. Defrees says that only \$13,183 worth of nonpartisan type was purchased instead of \$41,000, as asserted, and that the type found in the printer's office was purchased during last year \$41,000 worth of nonpartisan type, for which he paid 60 cents per pound, Mr. Defrees says that only \$13,183 worth of nonpartisan type was purchased instead of \$41,000, as asserted, and that the type found in the printer's office was purchased during last year \$41,000 worth of nonpartisan type, for which he paid 60 cents per pound, Mr. Defrees says that only \$13,183 worth of nonpartisan type was purchased instead of \$41,000, as asserted, and that the type found in the printer's office was purchased during last year \$41,000 worth of nonpartisan type, for which he paid 60 cents per pound, Mr. Defrees says that only \$13,183 worth of nonpartisan type was purchased instead of \$41,000, as asserted, and that the type found in the printer's office was purchased during last year \$41,000 worth of nonpartisan type, for which he paid 60 cents per pound, Mr. Defrees says that only \$13,183 worth of nonpartisan type was purchased instead of \$41,000, as asserted, and that the type found in the printer's office was purchased during last year \$41,000 worth of nonpartisan type, for which he paid 60 cents per pound, Mr. Defrees says that only \$13,183 worth of nonpartisan type was purchased instead of \$41,000, as asserted, and that the type found in the printer's office was purchased during last year \$41,000 worth of nonpartisan type, for which he paid 60 cents per pound, Mr. Defrees says that only \$13,183 worth of nonpartisan type was purchased instead of \$41,000, as asserted, and that the type found in the printer's office was purchased during last year \$41,000 worth of nonpartisan type, for which he paid 60 cents per pound, Mr. Defrees says that only \$13,183 worth of nonpartisan type was purchased instead of \$41,000, as asserted, and that the type found in the printer's office was purchased during last year \$41,000 worth of nonpartisan type, for which he paid 60 cents per pound, Mr. Defrees says that only \$13,183 worth of nonpartisan type was purchased instead of \$41,000, as asserted, and that the type found in the printer's office was purchased during last year \$41,000 worth of nonpartisan type, for which he paid 60 cents per pound, Mr. Defrees says that only \$13,183 worth of nonpartisan type was purchased instead of \$41,000, as asserted, and that the type found in the printer's office was purchased during last year \$41,000 worth of nonpartisan type, for which he paid 60 cents per pound, Mr. Defrees says that only \$13,183 worth of nonpartisan type was purchased instead of \$41,000, as asserted, and that the type found in the printer's office was purchased during last year \$41,000 worth of nonpartisan type, for which he paid 60 cents per pound, Mr. Defrees says that only \$13,183 worth of nonpartisan type was purchased instead of \$41,000, as asserted, and that the type found in the printer's office was purchased during last year \$41,000 worth of nonpartisan type, for which he paid 60 cents per pound, Mr. Defrees says that only \$13,183 worth of nonpartisan type was purchased instead of \$41,000, as asserted, and that the type found in the printer's office was purchased during last year \$41,000 worth of nonpartisan type, for which he paid 60 cents per pound, Mr. Defrees says that only \$13,183 worth