

Weather Indications: Cloudy, Showers.

THIS IS A DEMAND FOR GOOD FEMALE HELP. TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THE SPECIAL RATE IN THE WORLD. 20 WORDS, 10 CENTS.

Weather Indications: Cloudy, Showers.

CIRCULATION OF THE WORLD OVER 3,000,000 A WEEK.

PRICE ONE CENT. NEW YORK, FRIDAY, MAY 11, 1894. PRICE ONE CENT.

Nellie Bly and John Jacob Astor. First Interview for Publication Ever Given by the Young Man of Millions. See Next Sunday's World.

LAST EDITION. SAT DOWN TO DIE.

Heidrick Hanged Himself in a Cellar Where He Couldn't Stand.

Had Left His Family and Gone to Live with a Friend.

Several Days Passed Before the Body Was Found.

Adolph Heidrick was found dead in the cellar of the tenement-house in the rear of 407 East Ninth street, at 3:30 o'clock this morning. He had committed suicide by hanging himself with a rope. The body was found in a sitting position by Mrs. Catherine Walzel, who occupies the apartments overhead. The cellar was so low that he had to stoop to effect his purpose. Death resulted from slow strangulation.

Heidrick was forty-three years old and a carpenter by trade. Up to a week ago he lived with his wife and family of grown-up children at 18 East Second street. There, it is said, he had a quarrel and left home.

Heidrick was not seen again until his body was found this morning. He had evidently been dead for several days. Policeman Charles Smith, of the Union Market station, cut down the body and notified the coroner and the dead man's family.

SPELMAN OR SPELLMAN?

Mystery as to the Identity of a Hotel Suicide.

A man who was at first believed to be William C. Spellman, of the firm of Spellman Bros., of 261 Broadway, was found dead this morning in a room in the Hotel Albert, corner of University place and Eleventh street.

He was registered as William C. Spellman, spelling the name with one "l". He was found dead in bed, with a rubber tube running from the gas jet to his mouth. The gas was turned on.

A woman who said she was the dead man's widow called at the hotel and identified the body early this morning. She was understood to say that the deceased had been a special partner in the firm of Spellman Bros.

A nephew of the W. C. Spellman of that firm, however, accompanied an "Evening World" reporter to the hotel and after looking at the body declared positively that it was not that of his uncle.

FOUND DEAD IN BED.

Gottlieb Fritsch Asphyxiated in a Fort Hamilton Hotel.

A man believed from papers found on his person to be Gottlieb Fritsch, forty years old, of 44 Avenue C, New York, was found dead in bed late yesterday afternoon, at the Brooklyn Hotel, Fort Hamilton. He had been asphyxiated by gas, which was turned on in his room. The man was found fully dressed and lying on the bed.

Four years ago he was a cook at the Inebriates' Home, Fort Hamilton. He had been out of work for some time, and it is thought he grew despondent and turned on the gas with suicidal intent. The coroner was notified.

FOR SHOOTING HIMSELF.

Ward Accused of Attempted Suicide and Petty Larceny.

Abraham L. Ward, of Wyona and Atlantic avenues, Brooklyn, was this morning arraigned in the Gates Avenue Police Court, charged with attempting suicide and also with petty larceny.

On April 15 Ward was arrested for larceny on the complaint of G. A. Somers, a neighbor. He was locked up in the Liberty avenue station. That night he shot himself in the head. He was taken to St. Mary's Hospital, and was not able to be taken to court until this morning. In the act of bail, he was sent to jail to await trial.

SPRANG FROM A WINDOW.

Mrs. Butler Escaped from Her Husband, Probably to Die.

YONKERS, N. Y., May 11.—Mrs. Margaret Butler, of Centre street, this city, is lying at the point of death in St. John's Hospital from injuries received early this morning caused from jumping from the street from a second-story window of her house.

Her husband returned home intoxicated at 3 o'clock, and threatened to shoot her. The woman, fearing that she would carry out his threat, ran to the window and sprang out from it. She sustained internal injuries from which she died.

Butler was arrested this morning and was remanded for further examination by City Judge Donoghue.

JUMPED OUT THE WINDOW.

Intoxicated Servant Girl Receives Fatal Injuries.

WHITE PLAINS, N. Y., May 11.—Ellen Morris, a middle-aged woman, employed as a servant at E. T. Hopkins, on Hamilton avenue, in dying from internal injuries received by jumping from a third-story window of the house last night.

Ellen returned home late in the evening, intoxicated. She became disorderly and Mrs. Hopkins locked her in her room. She missed her key and sprang out, landing on her head.

BELIEVE SHE IS A SUICIDE.

Williamsburg Police Looking for Mrs. Kyte C. Bradford.

Financial Troubles May Have Induced Her to End Life.

The police of the Clymer street station, Williamsburg, are searching for Mrs. Kate C. Bradford, of 683 Bedford avenue, Williamsburg, who disappeared from her home early yesterday. She left behind a letter addressed to her husband, Charles Bradford, stating that she intended to commit suicide.

Lawyer Peter B. Mahoney, who went to the Clymer street station and reported the disappearance of the woman, described her as thirty-five years old, and as wearing a black dress, black waist, with blue spots, and a black hat trimmed with pink.

It is said that Mrs. Bradford, who is quite prominent in Williamsburg social circles, has been cashing certificates for school teachers at a discount, and in order to carry on this business has borrowed large sums of money from various people. It is said that the money received from the certificates was wasted in speculation, and as her creditors pressed her she decided to make away with herself.

On Tuesday night, her husband and lawyer Mahoney both received letters from her in which she announced her intention in drowning herself.

Lawyer Mahoney refused to discuss the case with an "Evening World" reporter to-day, on the ground that what he said would be learned professionally. He said, however, "I believe this woman has committed suicide."

Among the woman's creditors are John Prubst, wholesale baker at 99 Henry street, Alfred C. Squires, oil dealer, 114 Broadway street, New York; Corlies, William M. Maguire and a maiden sister of William C. Look. Mr. Squires admitted that he knew of the meeting and that Mrs. Bradford owed him money. He refused to say whether she had committed suicide.

Mr. Prubst said that he had cashed many checks for the woman and estimated her high. He said she had cashed the checks she had given him, and all been from \$1,000 to \$2,000 each, and all from the right side of the account, but that he did not consider that Mrs. Bradford owed him any money, and knowing that she had cashed the checks, he was sorry she had done so, as it was a pity such a happy family as the Bradfords should be broken up.

ASSAULTED A BARTENDER.

Peter Breen and William Doherty Held for Trial.

Peter Breen, twenty years old, of 322 East Twenty-second street, and William Doherty, aged twenty-three, of 143 East Twenty-ninth street, were held to members of the "Rock Gang," were arraigned in Yorkville court this morning on the charge of assaulting Patrick Brennan, bartender in Steedman's liquor store, Twenty-second street and Second avenue.

As Policeman Burns, of the East Twenty-second street, was patrolling Second avenue at 7:30 o'clock this morning he heard cries of "Police!" and he turned to see what was the matter. He saw Breen and Doherty in the front of Steedman's saloon surrounding the bartender, who was bleeding from an injury on the forehead. Breen and Doherty had attempted to use a knife on him. The trouble arose when Brennan tried to eject the prisoners from the saloon.

Breen and Doherty fled before the officer appeared on the scene. They were Ninety-eighth street, when a cab driver, Martin also took part in the assault, and was arrested. Justice Voorhis committed them for trial.

POLICEMAN GRENELL HELD.

To Be Tried for Clubbing Bootblacks, Who Say He Owed Them.

In Yorkville Police Court this morning Justice Voorhis held Patrolman Edward Grennell, of the East Sixty-seventh street station, for trial for alleged assault on Joseph Petro, of 242 East Seventy-seventh street, and Frank Martin, of 233 East Eleventh street, two bootblacks who have a stand at Sixty-seventh street and Third avenue.

The bootblacks claim that Grennell had been clubbing them for some time, and asked Grennell for the money and the bootblacks refused to pay him. Petro insisted Grennell pay him, but Petro clubbed him and then locked him up. Grennell was taken to the station and Frank Looney, who took charge of Justice Voorhis decided that Looney had nothing to do with the clubbing. In the morning he was paroled in the custody of Capt. Strauss.

TO SUE A CABLE ROAD.

Lewis Had a Leg Broken While Driving on Third Avenue.

Charles Lewis, of 107 Heister street, was to-day appointed guardian ad litem, of his son, Harry Lewis, eighteen years old, for the purpose of bringing a suit for \$20,000 damages against the Third Avenue Cable Railroad.

Young Lewis alleges that on May 1 last, he was driving a horse attached to a load of furniture, near the corner of Heister street and Third avenue, when he was struck by a cable car which killed both the horse and the wagon and injured over against one of the iron supports of the cable.

Young Lewis says his left leg was broken and his right foot badly crushed. His right ankle was also sprained by being caught between the wagon and the iron support. He charges carelessness on the part of the company's employees.

Authorizing the construction of a new bridge between Park Row Park and the new Central Avenue street, the cable car was driven on Main street, New Rochelle, and the cable car was driven on Main street, New Rochelle, and the cable car was driven on Main street, New Rochelle.

The bill finally went over, and the bill was passed by the Senate on the 10th inst.

"Does the Senator think," said Mr. Harris, "in the midst of the present depression, that it is profitable to the country to spend money on a bill which will be more profitable than the consideration of the tariff bill?"

"There was more sparring and Mr. Wellman said he would like to save time while Mr. Brooke had been wasting time all morning."

"Now, what is this? Is this a public censor of the acts of everybody else in the Senate?" said Mr. Harris.

"I will not say anything. The interruptions and interferences of this man are beneath even contemptuous notice."

It was finally agreed that a No. 3 capsule should be accepted as the size of a No. 3 is about as big as a thimble for a lady's little finger, might be the size of the defendant's what you pocket, handed it to a messenger and said, with disgust expressed in face and voice:

"Go out and buy a lot of sample capsules."

Mr. Brooke moved that the jury be instructed to acquit Dr. Meyer, because of the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" who was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him, and the report that he had been charged with the murder of a woman named "Lutwick Brandt" was the man who died; the indictment against Dr. Meyer was returned on the evidence showed that arsenic and antimony were used, if it is believed that the defendant is innocent, Dr. Meyer was entitled to know the whole nature of the charge against him,