

THE JOURNAL.

Published at the Post Office at New Bern, N. C. Second-class matter.

NEW BERN, N. C., OCT. 6 1897.

THEY say Senator Vance has learned to play the fiddle. He must take his violin with him when he goes on to stir up the voters next summer.

THE Massachusetts Republicans have nominated Oliver Ames for Governor and adopted a protective tariff platform and in favor of proper national aid to education.

THE President started last Friday on his three weeks' Western and Southern trip. He will be warmly greeted at every station where it is known that his train will stop.

The election on the Prohibition amendment to the constitution of Tennessee was held last Thursday and the vote was very close with indications that the amendment is defeated. The ladies worked at the polls, giving free lunches and personally soliciting votes. What a power they could wield in elections if they were to go into it with a will.

The people of Asheville have succeeded in persuading the President to give them a call on his return trip from the South and West. He will arrive there on the morning of the 21st inst. and will drive through the city and view the natural scenery from several suburban points. The queen city of the West will do the thing right.

SAM RANDALL will start the machinery at the opening of the Piedmont Exposition which begins on the 10th inst. It is said that his invitation to do this is second handed, it being first tendered to Sunset Cox. When the vast machinery begins to hum on that occasion Sam will doubtless be ready to exclaim, "Protection did it with its big hatchet."

Charlotte, S. C., gets apples and cabbage by the car-load from Asheville, N. C. Wilmington is supplied from the Northern market - Will Star.

Another evidence of a strip of land between two States. The C. C. ought to be extended to Asheville and the A. & N. C. R. ought to be extended to Sanford and put under a management that will make New Bern and Morehead City the terminus. Then we will begin to have a State system of railways that will build up the towns of the State.

A WAR of words between Protestants and Catholics is going on in Charlotte. May it be confined to words, and words fitly spoken by both sides. The civilization of the age is too far advanced to countenance any other war than a war of words on religious matters. The darkest pages of the world's history are the records of wars engendered by religious differences. As the world becomes more civilized and enlightened, the people become more tolerant and considerate and men are taught to recognize the right of others to religious opinions.

THE New York State Democratic Convention strongly endorsed President Cleveland. The World's opposition and criticisms have not amounted to much with the New York Democrats, and if it continues its course it will likely swing off into a silly Sun Butler movement when the campaign opens in earnest next year. The convention in one respect followed the example of the Republicans and put a Fred at the head of the ticket, Frederick Cook being nominated by acclamation for Secretary of State. The convention seems to have been harmonious, and the platform speaks with no uncertain sound in demanding a reduction of taxation. It demands that a reduction of one hundred millions be made straightway.

WE appreciate the position taken by our valued contemporary, the Goldsboro Argus, in regard to introducing side issues in the political contest next year. Ordinarily we would be with the Argus on this point but this section of the State has not been treated with that consideration to which it is entitled, and it strikes us that it never will unless the Democrats herein demand it. We cannot allow our material interest to suffer longer simply to gratify certain corporations that have designed schemes detrimental to our interest, and if the Democratic party takes on to the coat tails of these schemers, or is led by them, it must not be expected that the sufferers by such conduct will be very enthusiastic in promoting those whose object it is to strike them down.

WOMEN IN POLITICS. The Wilmington Star makes the following timely remarks concerning the late prohibition campaign in Tennessee:

After the electioneering of the women of Tennessee, attending the hustings, bribing voters with appetizing luncheon, and bringing to bear upon the men their bewitching smiles and persuasive appeals, that State is now ready for an amendment to the Constitution to allow women to vote. The women's rights strikers in the North will take fresh courage at such an anomalous Southern demonstration. When women turn electioneers around the polls it is time for the men to retire:

"Oh rock the cradle, Jimmy, And rock the cradle long."

THE SOUTH'S WONDERFUL GROWTH.

The Baltimore Manufacturers' Record gives the following summary of the amount of capital and capital stock represented by the list of new enterprises, the enlargement of old plants and the rebuilding of mills after being burned, in the South for the first nine months of 1897, and compares with the corresponding time of 1896:

Table with 2 columns: Year and Amount. Rows include Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia.

It has been said that the investment of so large an amount in Southern industries has caused the stringency in the money market in New York. Whether or not this is true, the large increase annually of such investments is a hopeful sign for the South and evidence that money is safer and paying better here than in speculations on Wall Street.

THE WINNING TICKET.

The Hillsboro Recorder says: We repeat that the winning ticket in North Carolina at the next election is Thomas J. Jarvis for Governor and Julian S. Carr for Lieutenant Governor. Ordinarily, the Democrats will win over twenty thousand majority in the last general election, ought to win with any good man against whom there are not special objections in some sections of the State, but the Republicans are encouraged by their partial victory last year and the Democrats are correspondingly distrustful of their ability to hold their own. A newspaper, like any other individual, has a right to suggest who would make a good Governor and who would likely be able to carry the full strength of his party. The Journalist has suggested that Judge Gilmer is a man thoroughly known throughout the State, and would be enthusiastically supported in many sections, notwithstanding he is from the same town of the present Governor. But there is a strong feeling in this section to make Jarvis the candidate. Whether it will be Jarvis, Gilmer, Clark or Holt it will require hard, judicious work to bring the people to the polls.

The people of this section have a grievance that ought to be righted before the campaign opens. They have been denied the privilege of traffic with other sections of the State by the foreign corporations controlling the most important railway lines in the State, and when they sought to better themselves by an extension of the railroad which gave them the only hope of reaching the interior with their business, they met opposition from one who above all others should have been their friend. In the future, politics will be more a matter of business with our people than mere sentiment. To be stabled in the house of one's friends is more humiliating than an open defeat by the enemy. The winning ticket, to win must be one that will have the confidence of all sections.

THE CAUSE OF POVERTY.

The followers of Henry George say that poverty comes because everybody don't own land. This theory cannot apply to Eastern Carolina for it is well known that too much land has made many men poor. The simple ownership of land does not prevent poverty. Industry, sobriety, honesty and economy are the weapons to fight poverty. A man who has a good share of these qualities can own land if he wants it without their being any one to prevent it. There is a vast deal of truth in the old saying that "every man is the architect of his own fortune." Smart men like Henry George can easily make men believe that their poverty is attributable to some one else's conduct; they are half inclined to believe this any way. But after all, common sense suggests that nine-tenths of the cases of extreme poverty are brought about by the conduct of those thus afflicted.

THE State Supreme Court has turned out thirty-four new lawyers. Four of these are from the county of Guilford. Julian S. Mann of Hyde county was one of the number.

The Progress of the Nation. The annual address of the Southern county N. Y. Fair was delivered this year by the Hon. Amos J. Cummings. It is one of the most instructive and eloquent addresses we ever read. We give the opening paragraph: "We are on the threshold of the twentieth century. In seventeen years the world will be a hundred years old. The present century has succeeded all its predecessors in the development of the arts and sciences; the nation has outstripped all other nations in rapidity of growth, in thrift, in enterprise, in wealth, and in material and intellectual progress. Smoke from its steamships is funneled over every sea. The whistles of its locomotives are heard on every continent. It has harnessed nature's lightning-tamed by Franklin, and sent it into the depths of the ocean and to the uttermost parts of the earth. Its flag has been borne within 100 miles of the North Pole. Its scholars and its authors have doubled the domain of literature. Its inventors have tripled the area of the field of science. The bravery of its soldiers has strengthened the wings of liberty. The industry of its farmers has made it the granary of the globe."

Our mails are irregular on this point. We don't know who is to blame, but think it is the carrier. Some time we see him pass going one way, then a little while going back again. Yesterday he had a regular runaway, lost his horse, got thrown from his horse and the last we saw of him he was walking on his way having found his mail bag about a mile back. The contractor does not carry the mail but gives it to a negro boy on a wild, runaway horse most of the time. Is that right or lawful? We think not.

The late Spencer F. Baird, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution and United States Fish Commissioner, was probably better known abroad than any other American ornithologist of the present day; and it is due to his influence that America has become the country in which birds are more thoroughly and scientifically studied than anywhere else in the world.

Electric Bitters. This remedy is becoming so well known and so popular as to need no special mention. All who have used Electric Bitters sing the same song of praise. A pure medicine does not exist and it is guaranteed to do all that is claimed. Electric Bitters will cure all diseases of the liver and kidneys, will remove pimples, boils, skin rheum and other affections caused by impure blood. Will drive malaria from the system and prevent as well as cure all malarial fevers. For cure of headache, constipation and indigestion try Electric Bitters. Entire satisfaction guaranteed or money refunded. Price 50c and \$1.00 per bottle at R. N. Duffy's drug store.

Aurora Items.

Mr. Broomer and Mr. Bonner is the third man. The school boys will relieve the minority of the night. Mr. Weisger and family have returned from Ocracoke.

Mr. H. W. Ayres has finished his addition to his dwelling. Mrs. Capt. Lane of Pendleton is in town visiting Mr. R. H. Lane. Mr. W. J. Bell has made one more in exchange for better than 2 in return.

The carpenters have finished the addition for L. H. Thompson on Main Street.

Mr. R. H. Lane is having the lumber put together for a new dwelling in his town.

Moore, B. T. Bonner and family and W. A. Harvey and family have returned from Ocracoke.

A heavy load of coals is at our wharf. We are living now. Plenty fat beef, osslets, chickens, eggs, etc.

Prof. Bonner commenced the fall session of Aurora High School on the 28th. Send on the boys and girls.

Dr. P. P. Gates has been attending a patient in our town. The Doctor is a promising young physician and is deservedly popular.

Our farmers are buying large quantities of extra shells for agricultural purposes. Looked for signs. Clear up the new and time the old lands.

Rev. L. O. Wolfe has been holding a series of meetings at Providence. He began his protracted meeting at this place on Wednesday night, Oct. 5th.

A role out of an evening on the Respass road will convince one of the vim and energy of that people as they see them going from their homes with a load of the night. Dr. Chapman and family have returned from Ocracoke. The Doctor looks healthy and good natured and reports the "Progress" still progressing in spite of the "ink water."

Dr. E. P. Bramer has a very extensive practice in this and adjoining counties. He will make improvement; so it Doctors, that is what we need to make our town prosper.

At trout picking, ginning, hauling, pea picking, etc. gives employment to a great many that would be doing nothing. Let's have a factory that will give them work all the year.

Well some of the readers of the Journal tell us what is best to do without boys? Farming or manufacturing or what? Tell us something. Let's put them to work at anything but mending and darning.

Onslow County Items.

Miss Mable Ward has gone back to her school at Mr. C. Stephenson's, near Hillsboro.

S. W. Venters, agent for Hamilton & Co's steam mills, sold two engines and saw mills last week to parties in the county. We think Mr. Venters ought to advertise in the Journal and let people know he is agent for such a good and reliable firm.

Mr. John Morris is making sugar cane syrup, or sorghum, as it is called, and it is very nice. He will make about 25 gallons and we think other farmers ought to make it. It don't cost much only the mill to grind in the boiling is not much.

Mr. C. Stephens the largest land holder and farmer in the county, says his cotton is only about one-half good, but Mr. Benj. Grover thinks his crop is about an average. Mr. G. is making wine from Sump-pung grapes, he puts 2 his good sugar to one bushel of grapes.

Our merchants around here, especially at Richlands, now have their fall goods and nobody outside the village knows it. Why don't you advertise? Mr. Mills, Mr. Sylvester, Mr. Hill and Mr. Hill and other then the folks would know who and where you were and what you were doing.

Rev. E. A. Best, Missionary Baptist minister for over 30 years, died at his residence at Richland, last Monday, the 26th inst. of bronchial pneumonia, at the advanced age of 72 years, leaving an affectionate wife, several children and grand-children to mourn his death. His funeral will be preached about the first of next week, on which time the Masonic burial services of which he was a good member, will be performed over his remains.

The President's Trip Expenses.

WASHINGTON, Sept. 28. - An interesting item of the President's trip taken from the beautiful and splendid novel, "Last Days of Pompeii," by Lytton Bulwer, a writer who has had long and equal success in his career as a novelist.

Glancius, a young and noble Albanian, who has been led to deep thoughts by the young portions of Pompeii, on seeing the High Priest of Isis, who is leaving his old habits and friends, while at a tavern kept by one of his companions, a slave girl, Nidia, comes to him in a fit of rage.

The President has suggested that the special car should have a regular express, the official mail by saying that all the express trains are run on a schedule, which any delay on a particular makes the train, but he is not at any stopping place, might seriously interfere with the regular patrons of the road, and be more or less inconvenient, and should be easily prevented. The roads, under any arrangement, are taking a great responsibility, and prefer to transport the party on a special, which will be the right of way, and when he is controlled by the General Superintendent. The President will stock the buffet car itself, but the expense will be a large one, and the increased charges, which have appeared.

The World's able staff of correspondents have been at Starburg yesterday to feel the pulse of the representative Democrats of the State. Of the 184 delegates to the convention 105 were sent as to their respective counties and requested to furnish estimates of the probable Prohibition and Labor votes in this State in November.

Mr. Cleveland had 16000 spoken supporters among the Hillsboro voters of the Hillsboro. Mr. Harman J. and Mr. Hewitt 2, Strange to say, 127 gentlemen were found to be non-committal.

Estimates of the Labor vote in this State are as follows: The majority of the delegates found the figures below 70,000. As to the Prohibition vote, the estimates ranged from 20,000 to 30,000. The bulk of the opinion seemed to be that the Prohibitionists would poll more than 10,000 votes.

These opinions, given for what they are worth, may be said to be both interesting and instructive. - S. W. Hill.

James County Items.

Commissioners met in session today. Small attendance.

There are confined in jail at Trenton some persons who are charged with the murder of a man who was shot on the cotton crop.

Mullets and trout are plentiful at Trenton today, but command very high prices.

Our Trenton friends are having plenty of good fish this fall at a very reasonable price.

Eggs 12 cents per dozen, corn, new, 50 cents per bushel, seed corn 2.85 and 2.95 cents.

Our citizens have had a full crop of grapes and the most of them are being followed in wine.

The timber here is not so good as it used to be. The sound of the axe-man and the falling of trees can be heard in every direction.

Not much sickness in our county at this time - a few chills which soon disappear after taking a few doses of quinine.

William McDonald is gathering up the taxes of the insolvents and is having splendid success as the most of them are cashing up.

Sheriff Koonce and Mr. Julian Bender have opened a new drug store and grocery store in the new store and bran new goods.

Hogs are eagerly acquired for in our county. Cholera and empty corn cribs have thinned them so close that many of the farmers have sought to get rid of their surplus and approve of a man like Uncle Erastus who was interrogated about marrying again. "Why?" said Erastus, "I have not the conscience to marry again. I am a widower, I said he, 'I have not paid for my wife's tombstone yet.' Well, who has been pursuing the undertaker's business for these many years, at least a year ago an accident happened to a train through the breaking of an axle and a number of passengers were injured. Sam was brought against the railroad company for damages. The company showed that the car had been built for them by skillful car-builders, and while in the process of this company, both with respect to materials and workmanship, and again when it was completed was carefully inspected in every particular. It had been in use with safety sixteen months before the accident. The car-builders and the manufacturer approved and skillful manufacturer and that the defect in it as was shown could not have been detected by the most careful examination. The plaintiff showed that the fault in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the best material for the axle. The court was responsible for all defects which might at any time during the process of manufacturing. The plaintiff showed that the defect in the axle could have been detected while it was being made by a process of bending, and that the company had not used the