man's cherished purpose toward his unfortunate son, who, to use his own plaintive words, was but a child in his struggle with the world, and who, under the providence of God, is forever voiceless to the world as the world is forever voiceless to him—has through the treachery of this designing man been defeated. If there is a fact proved in this case that fact is proved, that his purpose was defeated. Why gentlemen a half dozen witnesses have sworn—and no man challenged them, and no fact proved that raised a suspicion of anything about it—who have testified to the repeated declarations of that old man, before and after this will was made, that he intended the Mills farm for his son George. You will remember before ever this paper was drawn up he gave as one reason for it that George might lose his life by reason of his unfortunate condition if he were down on the road. He insisted upon it then, the Mills farm should be for George. This man Thompson, when he draws up this paper in 1862, doubtless discovered that was one fact so ingenuity could get out of that old man's mind. He clung to his unfortunate son. He might forget all the rest of his house but he would not forget that son, who could not speak for himself. So for the moment he writes down in the notes that Daniel Steenrod gives George the Mills farm, on condition he surrenders everything else. But what takes place. Without any intervention of George Thompson it so happens the Bishop desires to purchase a portion of the Mills farm. Mr. Steenrod does not desire to sell it because it is for George. He wants to buy a little addition to it in order to secure a right of way out to the road so as to throw a little bridge over the creek, and says tenderly to the neighbors, the creek is so high often he is afraid George may be drowned in crossing it—showing this is the purpose of his heart. His son-in-law puts it in the will first but does not leave it there. The old gentleman knows nothing further about it. He supposes that he has devised the proceeds of the sale and the balance of the Mills farm to his son George. Mostly when he spoke at all, he said he had made an equal distribution of his property—as he said to that young man he met on the road he had "made it as nearly equal as he could." He knew nothing about it. There was no equality in it. There could be no equality in a will which gave Mrs. Thompson full two-thirds of all he had—one hundred and fifty thousand dollars at least, upon all the testimony in the case. But these men, Mr. Moore and the Bishop, called on him, and then they says it is for George, they tell the old gentleman it would be better for his son George to have it invested in funds and put at interest. Well the old man will think of that. And what does he say finally one day?—that he will not consent unless it is put at long interest. His affections are gathered about that poor man and he will secure him if he can. It must be eight years. He must have that interest; and it is all for George. More than one witness comes before you swearing that Daniel Steenrod said "it is all for George." A man that intends anything of that sort, unless he is overcome by the infirmities of age, unless his intellect is darkened by the approaching shadows of the grave, cannot be induced to go straight away and take from this unfortunate son—the object of his affection and care—twenty thousand dollars of money. They must explain this thing. They meddled with his will, got it up in the first place, gave all the instructions about it in writing, took him to the door of the scrivener, and literally led him like a lamb to the slaughter. And now the moment he has made this disposition for the benefit of his son George they are on his track again.

We find George Thompson in this work, himself bringing the old man to town to begin it,—and we have found George Thompson concluding it with his own hand. That is enough. George Thompson has meddled in this business in the beginning and meddled with it in the end. He has written in another State a provision in this will without apparently consulting his father-in-law on the subject. It requires explanation. It will never do to explain this by saying George Steenrod is recompensed for it. The object of his father is defeated. He is not recompensed for it all. Why not give George Steenrod the benefit of the thirty thousand dollars received for the hundred acres off the Mills farm? Why, simply because George Thompson would have ten thousand dollars less and Emma Carter would have ten thousand dollars less. Therefore it was necesssary when these parties determined to absorb nearly the entirety of this estate, to get up a codicil. The gentlemen say Daniel Steenrod said to Mr. Jacob he wanted a codicil to his will—that he had sold a portion of the Mills farm and wanted to make a distribution of the proceeds. Well, in the meantime the old gentleman had been talked to and told that would be distributing everything equally. That is the explanation of this matter. You cannot find out all the words of it, and it is not necessary. From what has been proved you can infer the rest. He had been told they were distributing equally, and to make it equal in his codicil he had only to distribute between the three—George, Elizabeth and Emma. That don't indicate a testamentary capacity. That is the substance of Mr. Jacob's testimony. And yet after the thing was done you have the testimony that Daniel Steenrod declared over and over again that money was George's; and he considered he had done, in the language of the witness, "the very best thing for George that could be done"—and manifestly did not know what he *had* done, for George was only to have the benefit of ten thousand dollars.

Then couple with these circumstances the other facts, and where can there be any doubt in the minds of this jury that somebody else than Daniel Steenrod made this will? First, that George Thompson's wife comes down here from St. Clairsville, where her husband was, with a codicil to this will, which the gentleman says is of no great importance. It is of very great importance. It is in the hand writing of George Thompson. What of that? said the learned gentleman who opened the argument, it don't give George Thompson anything. It gives the one thousand dollars, which by the recital had been given to the servant Leanne, to this widowed woman, Mrs. Edward Steenrod. That is the way the gentleman disposes of it. Well, if that were all there was in it it would not be so surprising. But that is not all. How does it read? Why this second codicil is dated 25th of January, 1864, and reads thus:

Whereas, I, Daniel Steenrod, of the county of Ohio, and near the city of Wheeling, have heretofore made my will and a codicil thereto, relating to my negroes, and especially my servant Leanne, in which I have bequeathed to her ten shares of the bank stock of the Northwestern Bank; and, whereas, the said Leanne has since died, my will is that all of the bequest of said shares of bank stock be, and same are hereby revoked, and my will is that the said shares of bank stock be, and the same are hereby bequeathed to Eliza J. Steenrod.

The recital is, "I have heretofore made my will and a codicil thereto, relating to my negroes, and especially my servant Leanne, in which I have bequeathed to her ten shares of the bank stock of the North Western Bank." Where is that will? When did he make any such will? Now the gentlemen were trying to show you a little while ago these notes were the will of 1852. I tried to show you, gentlemen, they are not. But I ask them to show in these notes of 1852 the devise of ten shares of stock of the North Western Bank to Leanne, and after they have done it, I ask them to dispose of the fact that the books of that bank show that Daniel Steenrod had then no ten shares of stock in that bank. So to take that view of the case, it results he did not know what property he possessed at all. But the truth is, Judge Thompson was dictating the whole concern, and he had made a mistake. It is no use, gentlemen, to try to get along with this matter by showing there is a margin here. There is no margin about it. The testimony, I assert, is positive from the books of that bank, that Daniel Steenrod had no ten shares of stock in the North Western Bank at all. And I say the testimony is equally positive on the part of Mr. Jacob, who drew the will of 1852, that there was no codicil to it. The recital is "my will and a codicil thereto, relating to my negroes, and especially my servant Leanne."

Judge Lee, interrupting—In stating it to the Jury, you said "*by*" a will and codicil. The language is "*in* which I have bequeathed, &c."

Mr. Bingham—Very well, nobody can mistake the intent. He says, "I have heretofore made my will and a codicil thereto, relating to my negroes, and especially my servant Leanne, *in* which," (the gentleman says—I said *by* which) "I have bequeathed to her ten shares of the bank stock of the North Western Bank, &c." There is no difficulty about it at all. I don't care to which the "which" refers, will or codicil. The misfortune for the gentleman is, there is not a particle of proof here that Daniel Steenrod ever made a codicil to any will whatever save the paper now before the jury dated 1862.

What I want to say, further in that connection, is that the recital in this codicil here written by the hand of George W. Thompson is exactly according to the fact touching the paper of 1862. It was a will and codicil thereto. It had relation to his negroes, and all his negroes, so far as the testimony discloses; and it disposes of five. And especially it had relation to Leanne, because it bequeathed to her freedom. All that is in the paper of 1862. But there is no bequest in that paper of ten shares of bank stock in the Northwestern Virginia Bank, or bequest to her in the codicil attached to it, dated 9th November, 1863, of ten shares of stock. What then? This man writing wills over in Ohio for his father-in-law, simply put his foot in it again as he did when he got up the notes requiring the surrender of all right in the trust estate before taking anything under the will. He made a recital which was supported by nothing; which could not be sustained by a living witness; which discloses the fact that when Daniel Steenrod signed it he did not know any better than to sign a recital which he did not know was true, but which, had he known anything, he must have known was not true. He doubtless supposed it was all right, if he supposed at all. The testimony of his little grand-child is that he took it into the room and stayed some time and came out and said he would sign it. I don't care if he said he would write it. It don't alter the case. How are they going to explain it? There is the fact—that paper made over in Ohio, sent over by the wife of George Thompson for Daniel Steenrod to sign. Why, I have not any doubt about the motive of it. Men are not moved to acts of this sort without motive. It was to silence any complaint that this lady, Mrs. Edward Steenrod, might make about the wrong that had been done her children. It was done in the hope, doubtless, that by giving her the thousand dollars in stock—supposing it to be of par value—she would be content to be quiet. And especially, coupled with the fact that unless she took the provision made for her, she should take nothing under the will whatever; and if she did, she must take it on the condition that she released all ground of claim to anything else on the estate. And so it was with her children.

But what next? There is still another codicil. And what is the proof and testimony in regard to that? Why that the very property disposed of by it was the Buchanan estate—which Daniel Steenrod had purchased for the benefit of the Feeney children—intended to give it to them, and which was for their use. To be sure he might have changed his mind,—but the question I am trying to press on the attention of this jury is that there is not a particle of evidence he ever did change his mind. Why, says the gentleman he signed the paper. Aye, sir, but you have the burden of proof cast on you when that paper is written by yourself and wholly unexplained, and written in your own interest; and you must show to this jury that Daniel Steenrod himself dictated the terms and conditions of this last codicil by which George Thompson takes an additional interest here to the exclusion of these Feeney children. I admit that all this law read here justifies all the conclusions and presumptions of the law that the gentlemen insist on provided they go a little further back and prove Daniel Steenrod dictated the terms. I know gentlemen can say, it makes no difference if he accepts them afterwards. I admit it makes no difference if he accepted it, if he did it intelligibly. But the burden is still on you, when we have proved these direct facts, to prove how it came he did this and did understand this whole transaction.

What does he do last? Makes this further codicil to his will about six weeks perhaps before he died:

In the further disposition of my estate, I, Daniel Steenrod, of the county of Ohio, do make and declare this paper writing as a further codicil to my will heretofore made, since which time I have purchased a tract of land lying next or across the creek from the place which I purchased from the late Thomas Paull, Esq., this last purchase made by me being from the Buchanan estate; and I hereby devise the same in equal shares and interests to my three children, Elizabeth S. Thompson, Emma L. Carter, and George W. Steenrod, in fee, and yet to have and to hold the same to the same trustees and uses and powers as my other devises to my said daughters, as contained in a codicil to my said will. Given under my hand this 10th day of March, 1864.

That is proved and admitted to be in the handwriting of George Thompson, giving his wife an additional interest in this estate, and depriving these Feeney children of the interest this old man himself said he intended for them.

Now in this state of the case, gentlemen come here and say everything is fair in this transaction. The burden is not upon us to show that Daniel Steenrod was imposed on and defrauded. We have accepted our share of that burden, and have shown that this party that takes the largest interest of his estate in his own family has written the substance of his whole will. He wrote the paper of 1862—codicils and everything in it; and the notes before you will go with you to your room, because they are put in evidence—all in the handwriting of George Thompson and nobody else. The point I have been urging on you is, Who testifies that this old man dictated the terms of that paper to Thompson? Nobody. What answer do gentlemen make to it? That this old gentleman, Mr. Jacob, testifies that Mr. Steenrod told him these were the terms and he wanted Mr. Jacob to copy it out; whereas, there was no evidence he had ever read them at all, or ever even heard them at all. O, the gentleman says, that is inferable from the fact he handed the instructions to Mr. Jacob. That depends on the amount of confidence he reposed in George Thompson. It seems he had great confidence. Supposing Thompson had told him he had made an equal distribution of the estate, and especially that he had given the most to his son George, and dealt equally with all his children, is not there evidence before the jury that he had such confidence in his son-in-law that he would believe him and go there to Mr. Jacob, as directed, and tell him to write out the will according to the notes furnished him? No doubt of it at all. He had full confidence in Judge Thompson. The testimony shows he had; it shows his admiration of him; that he considers him an ornament to his house—and doubtless, by his talents, in some sense he was. Now I say, by the authority of these books, and by the rule of common sense, the jury are justified in inferring this old man was imposed upon in these notes, by every declaration he made before, and every declaration he made after, the fact. Let them explain.

And then couple with it the other fact that this man puts into that will, what no intelligent honest man ever could have put into it, knowing he was devising to his children his own lands, lands which he had the right to dispose of according to his own good purpose. What sensible man could say to his own children, You must release these other tracts of my land, which I give to these other children, before you can take the devise I give you. And yet that is in the notes and in the will, and that is there, I assert, for the purpose, on the part of George Thompson, of depriving these children of his dead brother of the trust estate which he knew the father held in his hands at the time, and which to-day, on the testimony, is worth Thirty thousand dollars—the Carroll farm.

The gentleman may say, There was some estate in Lewis Steenrod which may have passed to these other parties. There was no estate passed by Lewis to all these devisees and legatees—none passed by his will to Daniel Steenrod, Jr., none by Lewis' will to Eliza J. Steenrod or to Mrs. Emma B. Carter, and no estate passed by Lewis will to the children of Mary Feeney, deceased. Yet this provision I am talking about extends to every legatee and every devisee named in that will; and the gentlemen therefore can make no explanation of it.

And then comes the further evidence of this man meddling and tinkering with the will of this old man to suit his own purposes—writing in another State an unintelligible codicil, which no man can question makes a recital contrary to the fact; reciting that Daniel Steenrod had devised ten shares of bank stock to Leanne, his servant, when in fact he had made no such devise either in the will or codicil to which the recital refers. There is the will and codicil in contest before you, relating, in the language of the recital, to the negroes, and especially to the servant Leanne—giving two to Elizabeth Thompson and two to another of his children, until twenty-one years of age, and declaring, especially and bequeathing to Leanne her freedom; yet there is no one share, much less ten shares, of bank stock given to Leanne in the will or codicil. Yet it "relates to" his "negroes, and especially to Leanne," and it concerns her in that interest which concerns us most on this side of the grave—her personal liberty. And yet the recital in this codicil, written by George Thompson, is not true. Gentlemen undertake to explain it by getting up a dust about the will of 1852. I say the context of that will is not before the jury. Then I say if you examine these notes, which are claimed to be notes of that will, they too are in the hand writing of George Thompson; and you will look through them in vain for a bequest of ten shares of stock to his servant girl Leanne, for it is not there; and if you were to find it there, it would be contrary to that other fact, for the testimony of the bank officers is that he had no ten shares there at that time. So fix it as you will this man has botched this business and overleaped himself in attempting to make a will that would stand in a court of justice.

Then, to conclude the whole, see this man Thompson remorselessly pursuing with his rapacious greed the children of his own dead sister here, towards whom this old man had manifested the utmost tenderness; of whose dead mother he had said, she was his "cherished child," that he was attracted to her and won to her by her gentle charities—that charity which we are told is the "divinest of all the virtues," and which "covereth a multitude of sins." He had told more than one she was his cherished child. He told the Bishop he had the tenderest regard for her memory, and intended to make ample provision for her children. And yet this man Thompson, in the last hours of Daniel Steenrod's life,—in the month of March, 1864—only about six weeks before he died,—writes out with his own hand—God only knows where or on whose suggestion—a new codicil to his father-in-law's will, and has it attested by two persons, Kiel and Porter, who manifestly know nothing of the origin of the transaction and don't know whether he ever read it all or ever requested it to be done, and brings it into court and attempts to defeat by that codicil—as they attempted by the other codicil touching the distribution of the thirty thousand dollars received for the Mills farm—the expressed and declared intent of this old man toward the children of his dead daughter, as declared down to the very hour of his death.

Gentlemen, it won't do. I say in the language of this law which I have read here, it becomes the Court and Jury in a case like this, especially where the testament is the testament of an aged man, to be very careful before they give it their support by their verdict or finding. I call you back to the language of the Court of New York, and the language of Erskine on this subject where in Justice Davies says, in delivering his opinion in the Parish will case, that Erskine "justly and truthfully adds:"

* * * That the protection of the law is in no cases more needed than it is in those where the mind has become too much enfeebled to comprehend more objects than one, and most especially when that one object may be so forced upon the attention of the invalid as to shut out all others that might require consideration and therefore the question which their lordships propose to decide in this case is not whether Mr. Baker knew what he was giving all his property to his wife, and excluding all his other relations from any share in it; but whether he was at that time capable of recollecting who those relations were, of understanding their claims upon his regard and bounty, and of deliberately forming an intelligent purpose of excluding them from any share of his property.

And remember those other words of the same authority. He must have understood "the manner in which it was to be distributed" by the paper he signed.

If, gentlemen, you will carry that with you to your room, as the law which will govern you in deciding this question, I do not fear the verdict of your judgment. Indeed, I have proceeded step by step in this hurried argument—all too hurried in a case involving such important interests and governing principles—with a perfect assurance this Jury will be satisfied—and that is all, His Honor will tell you, is required—upon the testimony, this is not the valid last will and testament, or any part of it, of Daniel Steenrod. It cannot be the valid last will and testament of Daniel Steenrod, for the reason it works a gross injustice to the children of his dead son, for whose memory he expressed the tenderest regard, thirty years after he was in his grave, when he said that he "pitied" his "poor Edward;" when he said to Edward's widowed wife that he held this trust for her children; when he gave her an annual bounty, and finally took her son to his house and advised him to go on the property he held in trust for him, and in doing so to do justice to himself, and justice to the memory of his dead father by buying out his sisters. That he said that, I do not believe a Juror doubts. I know none of the counsel on the other side doubts it. They attempted to break down the witness, but utterly failed; and instead of breaking down the witness Daniel Steenrod speaks yet through the tongues of his neighbors, bearing true witness to all her assertions: that the Carroll estate was intended for Daniel when he was gone. Then comes that other declaration of this old man, at utter variance with the provisions of this will, that the Mills farm was for his unfortunate son, George. He refuses to sell it for that reason, seeks out a neighbor to purchase an additional right of way to the road, to secure that son against danger by the floods. And finally when the Bishop persuades him, he sells it that George may have the money safely invested and draw the interest; and after he has been juggled out of it by the interference of these parties, he still supposes it is all right and says it is the best arrangement that could be made for George. This is the testimony in the case; and yet the gentlemen ask you to say this paper is the last will and testament of this man. The language of the law, and the language of common sense is, that if it is contrary to the declared intentions and purposes of the supposed testator, both before and after making the paper, it is not his will and testament. I think I have said enough, and more than enough, to satisfy you, on the testimony of the witnesses, it is contrary to the declared intentions of the testator. When you couple with the fact that it is in the hand writing of the chief beneficiary; who gathers through this instrument full one half the estate of this old man, I think you cannot doubt. Why, says the gentleman, she was very kind to her father. I am not disposed to doubt that she was. I trust she did regard that law of the stone tables: "Honor thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee." But on that subject, gentlemen, allow me to say, there is not one syllable of testimony that she had any more tender regard or any more care for her father than had that widow who is stripped of her rights by this infernal device.

I stand here to argue this case on the law and testimony; and if gentlemen insist there is evidence here, I challenge them now to name it. I am not going to take anything for granted. I stand on my rights and the rights of my clients. I have stated this testimony throughout fairly. All I ask is justice, and I demand justice at your hands, and expect it to be given because I am satisfied, although an entire stranger to you, you are men possessed of a sense of justice, who understand the obligation of your own oaths and need no suggestion from anybody on the subject. The care and attention you have given to the consideration of this subject from the inception of the trial to this moment is assurance altogether satisfactory to me that you intend to do your duty. I have endeavored to do mine. And when that duty is pronounced by you I have no doubt it will accord with the declared purposes of Daniel Steenrod; that the right of the old man slumbering in his grave to dispose of his own property according to his declared purposes will be vindicated by a jury of his countrymen; and that, inasmuch as he had declared his purpose, before and after the execution of these papers that all the proceeds of that Mills farm was to go to his unfortunate son, the jury will say it shall be done accordingly, notwithstanding the device of George W. Thompson to put ten thousand dollars into his own pocket at the expense of his unfortunate brother, whose wrongs must speak through the lips of strangers since his own are sealed in eternal silence and his own relatives instead of redressing those wrongs are the authors of them; that, again, his declared intention to execute as a just man, so that he could go to his God in peace, as he told his old neighbor in his own simple words,—to execute the trust committed to him by his poor son Edward whom he had pitied, that he intended the farm should go to Daniel when he was gone, and advised Daniel to pay out his two sisters, paying them each their third of their father's estate vested in him,—was his will, and shall be carried out by your verdict; that this imputation shall not be cast on this man's memory by this contrivance and device brought up by his son-in-law, that he would evade the enforcement of the trust against the estate by putting into his will the atrocious provision that no one, legatee or devisee, should take under this will save those who would quit claim and release all right and title they had or might have to anything devised by it to others; that you will not aid a contrivance of this sort, especially when the declarations of Daniel Steenrod are in direct contravention of any such purpose. The purpose appears also in the notes of George Thompson, read here in the presence of court and jury. They will attend you to your room. They were kept, doubtless, without consideration by the venerable man, Mr. Jacob. There is no taint on him in this matter. Perhaps he had no knowledge of the trust before. But Daniel Steenrod had knowledge of the trust; and he made no concealment of it, and intended none. He told it to his neighbors as well as the mother of Edward's children, that it was their property. And therefore, by your verdict, if you do justice, you must set this will aside.

These gentlemen say this trust may be executed in another way. Gentlemen, that is giving away the whole case. If it can be executed in another way, that is evidence it ought to be executed in this way; because if that is a fact, why then it is a fraud, it is an expressed fraud by whomsoever made; and fraud vitiates whatever it touches. It is the heart of the will; and the will itself, if that be your conclusion, is damned.

I say again, gentlemen, I acquit Daniel Steenrod of any purpose of this sort. The testimony is conclusive there never was any such purpose in his mind. His purpose was to do justice to all his children; and if he has failed of this purpose, it is simply because, in the language of the authority read by the gentleman, he was circumvented by a cunning and designing man who had his confidence and was therefore enabled to betray him.

I leave the case with you, gentlemen, thanking you for the attention you have given me.

The Intelligencer.

A. W. CAMPBELL. J. A. HAGANS.
JOHN FREW. G. D. HALL.

CAMPBELL, FREW & CO.
EDITORS AND PROPRIETORS.

FRIDAY MORNING, NOVEMBER 9.

The New York City Vote.

We spoke yesterday of the "dangerous elements" of society represented in Hoffman's immense "democratic" majority in New York city. The *Tribune* says that "the democrats of New York city are of all ignorant men the most ignorant." Worse than even their ignorance are their dangerous characteristics. They have voted, says the *Tribune*, "for high taxes, filthy streets, disease and death, robbery, high and low, and a 'Ring' which includes all vices, and is the foe of all virtues."

The Price of Flour.

The St. Clairsville *Chronicle* under the head of "*outrageous extortion*" complains that flour is selling in that place for $15 50 per barrel. We go one dollar better than that over here. But then, as the Hibernian said about hanging, there is everything in getting used to the process. Our people have become used to high prices for all kinds of provisions and hence have nearly lost the disposition to turn a word or utter a protest. Famine prices no longer excite them. We fear that the antidote prescribed by the *Chronicle* against the present price of flour will not meet the emergency—viz: "to do without it for awhile." We are too far off the Lent season to think of affecting the market in that way. The remedy therefore might be found worse than the disease. Bread is the staff of life in most families, and now that the price of corn is getting so high, even that substitute can hardly be prescribed as an offset for flour. Within the last two or three weeks a very panicky feeling has existed in the wheat and flour markets on the strength of statistics affecting to show an unusually short and inadequate supply. There has been a speculative advance based upon these statistics. And yet we notice that the choicest grades of flour are quoted in Pittsburgh at $13.75 per barrel. The market here and in our surrounding country ought not to be above this quotation one would naturally think, but the disagreeable fact is, that notwithstanding our rich agricultural country, we always pay the maximum prices for nearly every agricultural product. This is a metropolitan feature of our lives than we can lay undisputed claim to.

Some parties believe that flour will be even higher than it is now. They point to the present prices of wheat at Cincinnati, our governing market, as an indication that the price is upward in its tendency.

How they Swore in Baltimore.

The Baltimore *American* says that the swearing in that city on Tuesday last beat that of "our army in Flanders" all to flinders. Here is its paragraph on the subject:

"One of the results of yesterday's election in this city which ought to be gratifying, is the proof that everybody is loyal, that they always gloried in the success of the Union and supported the Government in all its war measures for the suppression of the rebellion. We beg nobody will ever say anything more about oaths—iron-clad or otherwise. When men who have heretofore been ranked as "Southern sympathizers" swear that they gloried in Lee's defeat, and rather liked to see a colored Union soldier whip a Rebel soldier than otherwise, we think there is no use in further swearing."

The same sort of swearing was done throughout West Virginia before the last election. The "Conservatives" were advised by their leaders that the oaths prescribed were unconstitutional, null and void, and, therefore, not binding on their consciences. The advice of these leaders, to sail in and swear, was followed in hundreds, if not in thousands of instances where the truth was grossly outraged. The end, however, justified the means in the estimation of these swearers. Anything was right to defeat the Radicals. So their leaders, editors, and speakers told them, and so they practised at the polls.

ELECTION RETURNS.

NICHOLAS COUNTY.

Union.	*Copperhead.*
GOVERNOR.	
A. I. Boreman.....118	Benj. H. Smith.....67
SECRETARY OF STATE.	
John S. Witcher....117	J. W. Kennedy.....68
AUDITOR.	
J. M. McWhorter... 117	Peter Darnel.....68
TREASURER.	
Jacob H. Bristor...117	John S. Burdett.....68
ATTORNEY GENERAL.	
Thayer Melvin.....117	N. Richardson.....68
JUDGE OF SUPREME COURT.	
Edwin Maxwell.....118	R. L. Berkshire.....73
CONGRESS.	
Daniel Polsley.....115	John H. Oley.....69
STATE SENATE, 7TH DISTRICT.	
Greenbury Slack....116	C. C. Miller.....27
HOUSE OF DELEGATES.	
James Gross.....117	Wm. Y. Callaghan.68
SHERIFF.	
J. G. Malcom.....114	G. W. Dunbar.....71
CLERK OF CIRCUIT COURT.	
Jas. S. Craig.....110	A. J. Jones.....71
RECORDER.	
Jas. S. Craig.....120	John G. Young.....62
PROSECUTING ATTORNEY.	
T. G. Putnam.....70	F. J. Baxter.....42
COUNTY TREASURER.	
Owen Duffy.....117	M. R. Hereford.....59
COUNTY SURVEYOR.	
J. H. Robinson.....112	C. A. Mc Clung.....69
ASSESSOR.	
Owen Duffy.....118	Samuel Rader.....72

What the People Meant in the Late Elections.

The New York *Post*, a paper that strongly inclined for a good while to support Mr. Johnson's policy, and that went with him until discovering that there was no hope of saving him from his fell purpose of war upon the Union men of the country in the interests of the rebels, comments as follows upon the vote of last Tuesday:

"The vote means that the people still think, in the words of Mr. Johnson, "traitors should be punished and treason must be made odious;" they still hold as they did in 1864, in the words of Mr. Johnson, "the old rulers of the South must be put aside and new men brought forward." They still believe, in the words of Mr. Johnson, "loyal men ought to rule, wherever they are found." They will not trust the Government in the hands of party leaders who during the war were against the Union, and who now everywhere where they have power and influence nominate and elect such men as Fernando Wood, Chanler, Brooks, John Morrissey, &c.

The elections ought to attract attention in the Southern States. They show the temper and determination of the Northern people, just as much as the elections of 1864. If the Southern leaders had submitted immediately after those elections they might have obtained other terms than they afterwards got, and saved their States many ruinous losses. They chose, however, to be obstinate, and fight it out to the bitter end. Let them not repeat that blunder now. If they accept the amendment they will obtain security now, which they may vainly seek after a while."

Rolling Mill and Nail Works down at Bellaire.

The St. Clairsville *Chronicle* of yesterday contains the following notice of a new rolling mill project entertained down at Bellaire:

"We are glad to learn that the project of establishing an extensive rolling mill and nail works at Bellaire will be carried through successfully. Enough stock has been subscribed to insure its success, and the work will be prosecuted vigorously.

The works will be located on the farm of Mr. Wm. G. Barnard, at the upper end of the town. Mr. Barnard is a heavy stockholder. The balance of the stock will be owned exclusively by the operatives. About 300 men will be employed, coming mainly from the La Belle Iron Works, Wheeling, and from Steubenville and Pittsburgh.

This is an important enterprise to the people of this county. It will bring into the county hundreds of the very best kind of men, who will give renewed activity to the growth and wealth and enterprise of the county, and especially to the town of Bellaire.

A project is on foot to build a large number of dwelling houses in Bellaire, to be occupied by the population these iron works will bring in. Now, let the holders of lots be liberal and reasonable, and a mighty impetus can be given to the growth and solid prosperity of Bellair.

There is every inducement to capitalists to establish manufactories in Pease and Pultney townships. If money can be realized in Wheeling, where the taxes are twice as great, surely more money can be made on investment on this side the river.

It is expected that the mill will be completed by the first of May next.

Another Sixty-day Bill Protested.

The New York *Commercial Advertiser* revives the following quotation from Mr. Seward's speech at Niagara Falls on the 3d of September last, when he and the President were on their way West:

"I want the Republicans to nominate the man (Fenton) they intend to nominate for Governor of the State of New York, to test their principles, and in the election now some weeks off, if he is not defeated by a majority of forty thousand, do not call me a prophet."

After quoting this extract from Mr. Sewrrd's speech the *Commercial Advertiser* proceeds to remark as follows.

"If the intelligence from the Empire State does not cure our distinguished fellow citizen of his proneness to augury and prophesy, we fear nothing will; and yet, Governor Fenton's vote by no means indicates the full extent of the opposition to "my policy" in this State. The Republicans probably could not have nominated a more objectionable candidate, owing to his pardon of Zeno Burnham, and other criminals. Add to this, the fact that many German Republicans were alienated, because of the Sunday law, and we may safely conclude that Governor Fenton's majority does not represent the majority of those in New York who are opposed to the policy which Secretary Seward says he feels called upon to adhere to. Judging from the returns before us Governor Fenton is re-elected by not far from nine thousand majority, or a gain of two thousand on his vote in 1864.

Going it on Head Lines.

Brother Raymond, of the New York *Times*, will never join the Democracy any more, we think. His recantation of that heresy seems to be thoroughgoing. He daily gives evidence of a desire to throw off fervently and mightily on his late associates. The display heads over the late election returns in his newspaper are such as these:

"*Republican Gains in all the Rural Counties.*" "*God made the Country, Man made the Town.*" "*New Jersey sends a lot of new Republican Congressmen.*" "*The Outside States Adhere to their Old Faith.*" "*General Results, a Radical gain in Congress, and an Increased Republican Majority on the Popular Vote.*" "*Final Repudiation of the Democratic Party!*" "*The Reaffirmation of the October Verdict.*"

The Steenrod Will Case,

We publish this morning a verbatim report of the speech made by Hon. Jno. A. Bingham in the Steenrod will case, on behalf of the contestants. The case has excited an unusual degree of interest in this community, and we need not therefore apologize to our readers for giving so much space to this speech.

FUNERAL NOTICE.

The funeral of EDWIN HORNBROOK, who was killed on the B. & O. R. R., on Wednesday evening, 7th inst, will take place this morning at 10 o'clock, from the residence of E. Burt, Market street between Madison and Jefferson. Friends of the family are respectfully invited to attend.

MARRIED.

On Thursday, November 8th, 1866, at the residence of the bride's father, in Zanesville, Ohio, by Rev. C. D. Battelle, Mr. WINNIE S. BLDNEY and Miss LIZZIE A. BATELLE, both of Covington, Ky. No cards.

DIED.

On Wednesday evening, Nov. 7th, on board steamer Bayard, near Rochester, Pa. Mrs. N. PIGMAN.

Funeral will take place from the residence of J. R. Greer, on Quincy street, at 10 o'clock this morning. Friends are invited to attend.

Special Notices.

Ogbert's Vegetable Ambrosia or the World's Hair Restorer.

It is the only preparation that is warranted to restore gray hair to its original color.

It will prevent hair from falling off.

It supercedes Hair-Dyes.

It completely eradicates scurf and dandruff

Kills hair eaters, so destructive to the roots of the hair, and cures all diseases or humors of the scalp, thereby preventing baldness.

As a Hair Dresser it has no equal, giving brash, dry and wiry hair a moist, soft and glossy appearance. Sold in Wheeling by Laughlin, Smith & Co.; Bushfield, Wallace & Co. in Moundsville by Stidger & Blair, C. McC Jones. In Martinsville, O. by Dr. I. Welrich, John Douglass, and all respectable dealers. C. H. ODBERT,
Wheeling, W. Va.

To whom all orders should be addressed. oc3-1yd

METCALFE'S GREAT RHEUMATIC REMEDY.—This new and wonderful medicine acts like magic, curing Rheumatism of years' standing in a few days.
aug22-1y T. H. LOGAN & CO., Ag'ts.

ITCH! ITCH! ITCH!
SCRATCH! SCRATCH! SCRATCH!
WHEATON'S OINTMENT
Will Cure the Itch in 48 Hours.

Also, cures Salt Rheum, Ulcers, Chilblains, and all eruptions of the skin. Price 50 cents. For sale by all druggists. By sending 60 cents to Weeks & Potter, sole agents, 170, Washington street, Boston, it will be forwarded by mail, free of postage, to any part of the United States. jn4-6m

Piso's Cure for Consumption!

FIFTY THOUSAND persons die annually from Consumption in the United States. (See census for 1860.)

This remedy has been for several years used, in practice by eminent physicians, with such marked success, that it is now, by urgent request, offered to the public as an infallible remedy for lung and throat diseases. Not every one in the advanced stages of consumption can be cured, but many have been, and many more are now receiving benefit from its use, and this long after all other known remedies have failed. As an evidence of our sincerity in the above statements, we WARRANT IT TO GIVE SATISFACTION! Sold Wholesale and Retail by EDMUND BOCKING, Druggist, No. 1 Odd Fellows' Hall, Wheeling, West Va. au25

DR. KNIGHTS'
HAIR DRESSING.
A VEGETABLE PREPARATION.

For beautifying and promoting the luxuriant growth of hair.

It prevents the hair from falling off or turning gray.

It removes dandruff, cleanses the scalp, cures nervous headache, and all those distressing affections induced by the use of oily or alcoholic Hair Dressings.

Its invigorating properties insure luxuriant locks, including the curl, and by its persistent use the hair is restored to bald heads when such a result is possible.

It is splendidly perfumed, will not stain or soil the skin or any article of apparel, and is universally approved—especially by ladies and children.

Buy no other. Price 75 cents per Bottle.

Prepared by DR. E. R. KNIGHTS, Chemist, Melrose, Mass.

Sold by the trade by LAUGHLINS & BUSHFIELD, Wheeling, and at retail by all Druggists, also by T. H. Logan & Co., and Logan List & Co. sep19-3md&w

MARRIAGE AND CELIBACY, an Essay of Warning and Instruction for Young Men. Also Diseases and Abuses which prostrate the vital powers, with sure means of relief. Sent free of charge in sealed letter envelopes. Address, Dr. J. SKILLIN HOUGHTON, Howard Association, Philadelphia, Pa. au16-3md&w

Colgate's Aromatic Vegetable Soap.

A superior **Toilet Soap,** prepared from refined **Vegetable Oils** in combination with **Glycerine,** and especially designed for the use of **Ladies** and for the **Nursery.** Its perfume is exquisite, and its washing properties unrivalled. For sale by all druggists. feb27-1yd&w

THE HOLIDAYS

ARE COMING, THE SEASON WHEN hearts rejoice in giving and receiving presents. In view of this we have collected, as usual, an assortment of novelties to suit everybody and their children. Our stock embraces some very fine goods. In

FANCY GOODS

We have
Buttons,
Trimmings,
Ribbons,
Embroidery,
Knitting and Working materials in great variety,

BRUSHES AND COMBS, FINE FANS,

Hair Braids, Curls, Pads and Ornaments for the Head.

Hosiery and Gloves,

Woolen Goods,
Beltings and Buckles, a variety of styles.
Slipper Patterns, embroidered;
Childrens' Furs,
Embroidery and Laces,

Traveling Baskets and Leather Satchels,

Rocking Horses,
Carts, Wheelbarrows, &c., &c.,

And so many articles that it would be almost impossible to give a full list.

CALL AND EXAMINE OUR STOCK.

D. NICOLL & BRO.,
Main street, between Union and Monroe. nov3-1y

Extensive Milinery Establishment!
NO. 904 WALNUT STREET,
PHILADELPHIA.

MADAMOISELLE KEOGH,
MILLINER DE PARIS,

HAVING REBUILT AND GREATLY enlarged her place of business, has now on hand an entire new assortment of the very best styles of

FRENCH MILLINERY.

Through her numerous agents in Paris, she is enabled to present in advance of other establishments the very latest European styles in Bonnets, Head Dresses, Caps, Feathers, Ribbons, Frames, etc.

THE SALES ROOMS

Are constantly stocked with the choicest goods, and those sending orders can be accommodated at the shortest possible notice.

THE MOURNING DEPARTMENT

Is thoroughly organized, and has been made a speciality in the Establishment.

THE WHOLESALE DEPARTMENT

Offers great inducements to Milliners, who can at any time be furnished with patterns bonnets of the very latest styles, prior to their being exposed at retail.

N.B.—French, English and German Spoken. nov2-6m

S. S. COOK. SAM'L F. BERRY. THOS. S. GORDON
COOK, BERRY & GORDON,
Receiving, Forwarding and Commission Merchants, Steamboat Ag'ts & Wharf Boat Prop's,
PARKERSBURG, W. VA,

AGENTS FOR ALL THE REGULAR STEAMERS, PITTSBURG and CINCINNATI Packet lines. Cash advances made on consignments.

Having every facility for the prompt shipment of goods to parties in the surrounding country, shippers will consult their own interests by