The Sun.

VOL. XLVII.—NO. 51. NEW YORK, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 21, 1879. PRICE TWO CENTS.

THE JURY STILL DEBATING.

CALLING FOR INSTRUCTIONS FROM JUDGE DEPUE ON TWO POINTS.

The Judge Re-reads a Portion of his Charge—Ex-Judge Titsworth's Exception—A Sick Juryman—Blair's Friends Somewhat Depressed—Locked Up for Another Night.

Joseph A. Blair arose yesterday morning much refreshed after a long night's sleep in his cell in the Essex County Jail. It was understood that he was to remain there until the jury announced a desire to recinter court. His wife, who had stayed at the house of a Newark friend, was early at the court house, where she retired with some friends to a witness room to await the long-delayed verdict. When the doors of the court were opened at 9 o'clock there were persons gathered at the porch in readiness to occupy the seats in Judge Depue's court room, and be the first to hear the decision of the jury. Judge Depue, who arrived at 10 o'clock, remained in his private room until 12½ o'clock, and then went home, intending to stay during the remainder of the day. A monotony of hope deferred settled over the few hundred persons who retained their seats in the big court room. Some among the spectators were of the idle throng that always haunts court houses; others were workingmen out of employment who felt an interest in the case. On Saturday it had become a general belief in Montclair that a verdict of acquittal could not be delayed longer than Sunday, and on Sunday a number of the young men of the Montclair Riding Club, of which Mr. Blair is a member, rode down to Newark in the expectation of escorting him and his wife to their home.

At 2:35 o'clock there was a rush of persons from the hall into the court room, and soon the pale, worn, melancholy face of the prisoner appeared in the doorway. He was preceded by Sheriff Van Rensselaer and Deputy Sheriff Davis, who conducted him into the witness room where his wife was. The seats within and without the bar now rapidly began to be filled. At 2:40 o'clock a new impetus was added to the excitement on the arrival of Judge Depue. The Sheriff and his deputy approached the Judge's desk and whispered to him. The Judge nodded to the court crier, J. W. Wood, who cried the court open after the formula of the New Jersey court criers. Then ex-Judge Titsworth, who had entered the room abreast of the broad shouldered Public Prosecutor, disappeared into the witness room, whence he emerged in half a minute, followed by the prisoner, Mrs. Blair, Mr. William Blair, Miss Drayer and four other ladies. There was a buzz of excitement, and nearly every seat in the court was occupied, although the only public notice of what was to take place had been the appearance of the Judge and the prisoner as they approached the court house.

Soon the jury began to file in through the door and to take their seats. They looked haggard and as if they were oppressed with a sense of their responsibility. The prisoner and his wife scanned their faces narrowly, but no juryman was observed to look toward where Blair sat. Just as the jury had taken their seats, the band of a funeral procession passed, playing the "Dead March." The marching was so slow and the music so loud that several minutes elapsed before the dispiriting sounds ceased to be heard. When they were loudest, Judge Depue was obliged to pause in his remarks to the jury.

"I have received a communication from the jury, in which they ask for instructions," he said. "There are two questions, both of which involve nothing but questions of fact, concerning which the Court is not permitted to give instruction. The first question is as follows:

"Question—Was Mr. Blair acting on the defensive when he went to the house and got his pistol, and came back to the barn, under the circumstances as produced in the evidence?

MELVIN DOREMUS, Foreman.'

"That is a question of fact. If he did it to engage in an affray, or for purpose of forcing deceased into compliance with his demands, his act was illegal; but if he repaired to the barn expecting to induce the deceased to surrender the keys and leave the premises, and took the pistol with him for the purpose of defending himself in the event of his being assaulted, or was made to fear that he was in danger, he was not in fault. You, gentlemen, must determine that from the evidence.

"The second question is as follows:

"Question—Was he acting in self-defence in following Armstrong up the upper rooms, I presume, the Judge explained, or ought he to have retreated when he found he was going for the pistol? MELVIN DOREMUS, Foreman.'

In determining this question, gentlemen, you must determine whether the defendant's duty to retreat without danger to his life or without serious bodily injury."

The Judge then took up a copy of THE SUN of Sunday and read from it a portion of his charge, as follows:

"Now, gentlemen, I will direct your attention to the rules applicable to the justification of a homicide on the ground of self-defence. It is made clearly a fundamental rule of law that a homicide is justifiable when done necessarily in self-defence, or in defence of his family, or to prevent a felony, or a bodily injury. The justification in the last of these cases is by way of self-defence in a civil sense. The law does not compel a man to submit to a felonious assault, or to