

## PRESIDENT CLEVELAND

### He Will Not Furnish Certain Papers Regarding Suspensions from Office.

#### In a Message to the Senate He Maintains His Right to Withhold Them.

The President sent to the Senate, on the 1st of March, a message stating his position in relation to the suspensions of officials, and defending his action in refusing to send to the Senate papers on file in departments upon which it is assumed by the Senate that the suspensions of certain officials are based. The message was read in the open session of the Senate. It is as follows: To the Senate of the United States:

Ever since the beginning of the present session of the Senate the different heads of the departments attached to the Executive branch of the Government have been plying with various requests and demands from committees of the Senate, from members of the Senate, and at last from the Senate itself, requiring the transmission of reasons for the suspension of certain officials during the recess of that body, or for the papers touching the conduct of such officials, or for all papers and documents relating to such suspensions, or for all documents and papers filed in such departments in relation to the management and conduct of the offices held by such suspended officials. The different terms from time to time adopted in making these requests and demands, the order in which they succeeded each other, and the fact that when made by the Senate the resolution for that purpose was passed in executive session, have led to a presumption, the correctness of which I will, I suppose, be candidly admitted, that from first to last the information thus sought and the papers thus demanded were for use by the Senate and its committees, in considering the propriety of the suspensions referred to.

Though those suspensions are my executive acts, based upon considerations addressed to me alone, and for which I am wholly responsible, I have had no invitation from the Senate to state the position which I have felt constrained to assume in relation to the same, or to interpret for myself my acts and motives in the premises. In this condition of affairs I have forbore addressing the Senate upon the subject lest I might be accused of thrusting myself unbidden upon the attention of that body.

But the report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, lately presented and published, which censures the Attorney General of the United States for his refusal to transmit certain papers relating to a suspension from office, and which also, if I correctly interpret it, evinces a misapprehension of the position of the Executive upon such suspensions, will, I hope, justify this statement.

The President refers to the resolution of the Senate calling for the Dustin papers and the reply of the Attorney General thereto, and says:

Upon this resolution and the answer thereto the issue is thus stated by the Committee on the Judiciary at the outset of the report:

"The important question is whether it is within the constitutional competence of either house of Congress to have access to the official papers and documents in the various public offices of the United States created by laws enacted by themselves."

I do not suppose that "the public offices of the United States" are regulated or controlled in their relations to either house of Congress by the fact that they were created by laws enacted by themselves. It must be that these instrumentalities were created for the use of the people and to answer the general purposes of government under the Constitution and the laws, and that they are unincumbered by any claim in favor of either branch of Congress growing out of their Constitution, and unembarrassed by any obligation to either house of Congress in their creation. The complaint of the committee that access to official papers in the public offices is denied the Senate is met by the statement that at no time has it been the disposition or the intention of the President or any department of the executive branch of the Government to withhold from the Senate official documents or papers filed in any of the public offices. While it is by no means conceded that the Senate has the right in any case to review the act of the Executive in removing or suspending a public officer, upon the basis of official documents or otherwise, it is considered that documents and papers of that nature should, because they are official, be freely transmitted to the Senate upon its demand, pending, pending, pending, for proper and legitimate purposes, to the good faith of that body. And though no such paper or document has been specifically demanded in any of the numerous requests and demands made upon the departments, yet, as often as they have been made, the papers they have been furnished in answer to such applications.

The letter of the Attorney General in response to the resolutions of the Senate in the particular case mentioned in the committee's report was written at my suggestion and by my direction. There had been no official papers or documents filed in his department relating to the case within the period specified in the resolution. The letter was intended, by its description of the papers, to indicate that they had been presented to the Executive with a view to their consideration upon the question of suspension from office.

Against the transmission of such papers and documents I have interposed my advice and direction. This I have done, as the committee suggested in its committee's report, upon the assumption on my part that the Attorney General or any other head of a department "is the servant of the President, and is to give or withhold copies of documents in his office according to the will of the President, or subject to his direction, or otherwise," but because I regarded the papers and documents withheld and addressed to me or intended for my use and action purely unofficial and private, not infrequently confidential, and having reference to the performance of a duty exclusively mine, I considered them in no proper sense as upon the files of the department, but as deposited there for my convenience, remaining still completely under my control. I suppose, if I desired to take them into my custody, I might do so with entire propriety, and if I saw fit to destroy them no one could complain.

The papers and documents that are now the objects of the Senate's quest consist of letters and representations addressed to the Executive or intended for his inspection; they are kept in the Executive's private files and are not presented by private citizens who are not in the least interested thereto by any official invitation or at all subject to official control. While some of them are entitled to executive consideration, many of them are so irrelevant, or in the light of other facts, so worthless, that they have not been given the least weight in determining the question to which they are supposed to relate. Are all these, simply because they are preserved, to be considered official documents, or subject to the inspection of the Senate? If not, who is to determine which belong to this class? Are the motives and purposes of the Senate, as they are day by day developed, such as would be satisfied with my selection? Am I to submit to them at the risk of being charged with making a suspension from office upon evidence which was not even considered? Are these papers to be regarded official because they have not only been presented but preserved in the public offices? The nature and character remain the same whether they are kept in the Executive's mansion or deposited in the departments. There is no mysterious power of transmission in departmental custody, nor is there magic in the undefined and sacred solemnity of departmental files. The papers and documents in the files of the public offices is a stumbling block in the way of the performance of senatorial duty, it can be easily removed.

The papers and documents which have been described derive no official character from any constitutional duty, or from any requirement making them necessary to the performance of the official duty of the Executive. It will not be denied, I suppose, that the President may suspend a public officer in the entire absence of any papers or documents to aid his official judgment and discretion. And I am quite pre-

pared to avow that the cases are not few in which suspensions from office have depended more upon oral representations made to me by citizens of known good repute, and by members of the House of Representatives and Senators of the United States, than upon any letters and documents presented for my examination. I have not felt justified in suspecting the veracity, integrity, patriotism, or good faith of Senators, or ignoring their representations, because they were not in party affiliation with the majority of their associates; and I recall a few suspensions which bear the approval of individual members of the Senate, politically with the majority in the Senate. While, therefore, I am constrained to deny the right of the Senate to the papers and documents described, so far as the right to the same is based upon the claim that they are in any view of the subject official, I am not less unequivocally to dispute the right of the Senate, by the aid of any documents whatever, or in any way save through the judicial process of trial on impeachment, to review or reverse the act of the Executive in the removal of officials during the recess of the Senate of Federal officials.

I believe the power to remove or suspend such officials is vested in the President alone by the Constitution, which in express terms provides that the executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America, and that "he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed." The Senate belongs to the legislative branch of the Government. When the Constitution by express provision superadded to its legislative duties the right to advise and consent to appointments to office, and to sit as a court of impeachment it conferred upon that body all the control and regulation of executive action supposed to be necessary for the safety of the people; and this express and special grant of such exclusive powers, not in any way related to or growing out of general senatorial duty, and in itself a departure from the general plan of our Government, should be held, under a familiar maxim of construction, to exclude every other right of interference with executive functions.

In the first Congress which assembled after the adoption of the Constitution, comprising many who aided in its preparation, a legislative construction was given to that instrument in which the independence of the Executive in the matter of removals from office was fully sustained. I think it will be found that, in the subsequent discussions of this question, there was generally, if not at all times, a proposition pending to in some way curtail this power of the President by legislation, which furnished evidence that to limit such power it was supposed to be necessary to supplement the Constitution by such legislation.

The first enactment of this description was passed under a stress of partisanship and political bitterness, and was contained in the President's impeachment. The law provided that the Federal officers to whom it applied could only be suspended during the recess of the Senate when shown by evidence satisfactory to the President to be guilty of treason, bribery, or crime, or when incapable or disqualified to perform their duties, and that, within twenty days after the next meeting of the Senate, it should be the duty of the President to report to the Senate the reasons for his action in the case. This statute passed in 1867, when Congress was overwhelmingly and bitterly opposed, politically, to the President, may be regarded as an indication that even when it was thought necessary by a Congress composed of the majority of the executive to the legislature will to furnish a law for that purpose, instead of attempting to reach the object intended by an investigation of any pretended constitutional right. The law which thus and which was a statute-book was plain in its terms, and its intent needed no avowal. If valid and now in operation it would justify the present course of the Senate and command the obedience of the Executive to its demands. It may, however, be remarked in passing that the President had the privilege of presenting to the body which assumed to review his executive acts his reasons therefor, instead of being excluded from explanation or judged by papers found in the department.

Two years after the law of 1867 was passed, and with less than five years after the inauguration of the President in political accord with both branches of Congress, the sections of the act regulating suspensions from office during the recess of the Senate were entirely repealed, and in their place were substituted provisions which, instead of justifying the causes of suspension to misconduct, crime, disability, or disqualification, expressly permitted such suspension by the President "in his discretion," and completely abandoned the requirement obliging him to report to the Senate the reasons for his action. With these modifications, and with all branches of the Government in political harmony, and in the absence of partisan incentive to capricious discussion, the law, as it was left by the amendment of 1869, was such a derogative of executive authority, and yet the great General and patriotic citizen who, on the 4th day of March, 1869, assumed the duties of chief executive, and for whose freer administration of his high office the most helpful restraints of the law of 1867 were removed, removed, mindful of his obligation to defend and protect every prerogative of his great trust, and apprehensive of the injury threatened the public service in the continued operation of these statutes, even in their modified form, in his first annual message to Congress their repeal and set forth their unconstitutional character and hurtful tendency. I am unable to state whether or not this recommendation for a repeal of these laws has been since repeated. If it has not, the reason can probably be found in the experience which has since followed, and that the necessities of the political situation but rarely developed their vicious character.

And so it happens that after an extension of nearly twenty years of almost innocuous desuetude, these laws have been again repealed, and the repealed as well as the unreppealed, and put in the way of an executive who is willing, if permitted, to attempt an improvement in the methods of administration. The constitutionality of these laws is by no means admitted. But why should the President be required to defend and protect every prerogative of his great trust, and apprehensive of the injury threatened the public service in the continued operation of these statutes, even in their modified form, in his first annual message to Congress their repeal and set forth their unconstitutional character and hurtful tendency. I am unable to state whether or not this recommendation for a repeal of these laws has been since repeated. If it has not, the reason can probably be found in the experience which has since followed, and that the necessities of the political situation but rarely developed their vicious character.

The requests and demands which by the score have for nearly three years been made upon the different departments of the Government, whatever may be their form, have but one complexion. They assume the right of the Senate to sit in judgment upon the exercise of my executive function, for which I am solely responsible to the people. I am not to be required to advise and consent to their appointment. I shall continue, as I have thus far done, to furnish, at the request of the confirming body, all the information I possess touching the fitness of the nominees for the offices to which they are appointed, both when they are proposed to fill vacancies and to take the places of suspended officials. Upon a refusal to confirm I shall not assume the right to ask the reasons for the action of the Senate, nor question its determination. I cannot think that anything more is required to secure worthy incumbents in public office than a careful and independent discharge of our respective duties within their well-defined limits. Though the propriety of suspensions might be better assured if the action of the President was subject to review by the Senate, yet if the Constitution and the laws have placed this responsibility upon the executive branch of the Government it should not be divided nor the discretion which it involved relinquished.

It has been suggested that the present Executive having pledged himself not to remove officials except for cause, the fact of their suspension implies such misconduct on the part of a suspended official as injures his character and reputation, and therefore the Senate should review the case for his vindication. I am of opinion that certain officials should not, in my opinion, be removed during the continuance of the term for which they were appointed solely for the purpose of putting in their place those in political affiliation with the appointing power, and this desire was more recently followed by a description of official partisanship which ought not to entitle those in whom it was exhibited to consideration. It is not apparent how an adherence to the course thus announced carries with it the consequences de-

scribed. If in any degree the suggestion is worthy of consideration it is to be hoped that there may be a definite action upon just suspension in the justice of the Executive.

Every pledge which I have made by which I have placed a limitation upon my exercise of Executive power has been faithfully redeemed. Of course the pretense is not put forth that no mistakes have been committed; but not a suspension has been made except it appeared to my satisfaction that the public welfare would be improved thereby. Many applications for suspension have been denied, and the adherence to the rule laid down to govern my action in such suspensions has caused much irritation and impatience on the part of those who have insisted upon more changes in the offices.

The pledges I have made were made to the people, and to them I am responsible for the manner in which they have been redeemed. I am not responsible to the Senate, and I am unwilling to submit my actions and official conduct to them for judgment. There are no grounds for an allegation that the fear of being forced to submit to my professional influences me in declining to submit to the demands of the Senate. I have not constantly refused to suspend officials, and thus incurred the displeasure of political friends, and yet willfully broken faith with the people for the sake of being false to them.

Neither the discontent of party friends nor the allurements constantly offered of confirmations of appointments conditioned upon the avowal that suspensions have been made on party grounds alone, nor the threat proposed in the resolutions before the Senate that no confirmations will be made unless the demands of that body be complied with, is sufficient to discourage or deter me from following in the way which I am convinced leads to better government for the people. GROVER CLEVELAND, Executive Mansion, Washington, D. C., March 1, 1896.

#### THE MESSAGE IN THE SENATE.

##### Edmunds Likens It to One of King Charles I.—Referred to a Committee.

When the message had been read in the Senate, Mr. Edmunds arose and said that it reminded him of the communications of King Charles I. to the British Parliament. The President, he said, had, unintentionally, no doubt, entirely misstated the question involved between himself and the Senate. Continuing, the Senator said:

I think I am safe in saying that it is the first time in the history of the Republic that any President of the United States has undertaken to interfere with the deliberations of either house of Congress on a question pending before them otherwise than by messages on the state of the Union, which the Constitution commands him to make from time to time. This message is devoted solely to a question for the Senate itself, regard to itself, that it has under consideration. That it is so similar to anything in this country as somewhat extraordinary, if, in these days of reform, anything at all can be thought extraordinary, I send to the Senate, and I am sure that communications to the heads of departments—not his heads of departments, but the heads of departments created by law—directed them to transmit certain official papers, and that is all. The President of the United States undertakes to change the law, and to do so by a message to the Senate of his reasons for putting a civil officer, as it might be called, "under arrest"—with which the Senate has not undertaken in any way to make any question at all. By every message he has sent this body—and they are all public messages—and he has asked the consent to the removal of one officer and the appointment of another. That is what he has done, and the Senate is calling for those papers—to say nothing of wider considerations about it. The law which thus and which was a statute-book was plain in its terms, and its intent needed no avowal. If valid and now in operation it would justify the present course of the Senate and command the obedience of the Executive to its demands. It may, however, be remarked in passing that the President had the privilege of presenting to the body which assumed to review his executive acts his reasons therefor, instead of being excluded from explanation or judged by papers found in the department.

Mr. Edmunds moved that the President's message be referred to the Judiciary Committee. Mr. Tamm, of Tennessee, remarked that, for reasons to which he could not then refer, he had no desire to discuss the matter involved, and moved that the message be printed and laid on the table—the usual course, he said. After a little parrying between the two Senators the message was sent to the Judiciary Committee.

#### SENATOR PUGH'S REPORT.

##### The Minority Report of the Judiciary Committee Replies to the Majority.

Mr. Pugh, of Alabama, submitted to the Senate, on the 1st of March, the report of the minority of the Judiciary Committee on the removal from office of United States District Attorney Dustin of Alabama. It is very long, and contains no resolutions. It says that the majority of the Senate, composed of 95 per cent. of the offices were filled by Republicans. Notwithstanding the great demand of his supporters for offices and the fact that good reasons for the removal of Republicans were abundant, removals from office have been sparingly made.

In the case of Dustin the report says that Dustin has made no complaint that he was wronged. The whole point at issue is the right to the possession of a single document relating to his removal from office, and the removal of Dustin. The decision of the President that the document is not a public one must, the report says, be accepted as conclusive. The minority admits that all public documents relating to any subject over which Congress has power are subject to its review, and that the right to a mandamus to produce the document is a right to a mandamus to produce the document, and that the only rightful custodian of such papers is the President.

The minority expresses surprise at the appearance in the majority report of the resolution relating to the preference of appointing honorably discharged soldiers and sailors, and asks by what authority such a resolution was reported, and what it has to do with the Dustin case. The information of the majority is that Dustin never was a Union soldier, but on the contrary was a Confederate soldier or sympathizer, and they believe the intent of the resolution was to secure political and partisan advantage. In conclusion, the report denies the right of the Senate to the President for the alleged violation of his public duty. It admits that the President did declare that he would not remove officials merely because they were Republicans, but says he at the same time declared that he would deprecate any action on the part of Congress to remove officials who had been guilty of offensive partisanship. The President, it says, declines to submit voluntarily to the decisions of a tribunal having no jurisdiction over the question, the sufficiency of such cause for suspensions, especially when his fear is that such conduct in the office might be a precedent for the removal of a majority as a reason for the retention of the incumbent in office.

In relation to the reasons of the President for removing officials the report says that the document is not a public one, and that it contains only a partial statement of the causes, facts, and reasons, while in a large majority of the cases the President relied on oral testimony, which it would be impossible for him to remember or reproduce in every case, so as to put the Senate in possession of all the facts which governed him in the suspension, even if the Senate had the authority under the Constitution or laws of the United States to call him to an account.

#### FOR LOVE OF ADVENTURE.

##### Four Thousand Five Hundred Miles in a Canoe.

[New Orleans dispatch.]

Two brothers, from Pittsfield, Mass., W. E. and H. F. Hermance, aged respectively twenty-three and eighteen years, arrived in the city yesterday from Livingston, Mont., having traveled the distance of 4,500 miles in an open, light canoe, since July 4, 1885. The trip was made purely for love of adventure. The hardships of the trip have a romantic color, but, beyond a little spell of sickness, they have made the long voyage in safety, although they had unwelcome adventures with Indians and blizzards. The Eda is fifteen feet long, thirty-four inches beam, is made of yellow pine, and is provided with dry storage compartments. They are provided with a gun and cooking utensils, and camped out every night.

The cable cars in Kansas City carry weather signals.

## AWAKENING CHINA'S ZEAL.

### Minister Denby Tells How the Adoption of Railroads Is Being Urged in the Far East.

#### Factories of Glass, Woolen Goods, and Paper Springing Up Rapidly in That Country.

[Washington telegram.]

Mr. Charles Denby, United States Minister to China, has sent some interesting dispatches to Mr. Bayard which deal with two questions of vital import to the development and safety of the empire. The first is the construction of railroads, which Li Hung Chang is urging with all the vigor of his intellect. The other is the building of a navy to replace the useless junks which at present fly the imperial flag, and to organize a system of coast defenses adequate to protect the harbors and shores of the country. Mr. Denby says:

I have the honor to state, as a matter of interest to the great many persons in the United States and as a part of the current history of China, the position of that empire as to the construction of railroads:

The most prominent man in China to-day is Li Hung Chang, who is grand Secretary of the empire, Viceroy of the province, and one of the heads of the Admiralty Board. His residence is at Tien-Tsin, but he lately spent some weeks at Peking. He has for some years been in favor of building railroads. He has had a hard fight in China to have his views approved. The opposition comes chiefly from the censors and the Board of Revenue. The censors represent that numbers of men would be thrown out of employment, graves would be desecrated, and internal troubles would ensue. The Board of Revenue claims that if railroads are built the whole revenue service of China would have to be changed. It seems likely in effect that the Leken tax, which is one of the chief sources of revenue to China, would have to be abandoned or materially modified. This is a consummation that the foreigners most ardently desire. Li Hung Chang, through all the changes of men and measures, has maintained his power, and there seems every reason to believe that he will succeed in his plan of constructing railroads.

I send to the department the dying memorial of Tso Tsung Tang, which contains a able presentation of the argument in favor of constructing railroads in China. By way of parenthesis I may say that a dying official always leaves a posthumous memorial to the Government. It also happens when that he is dead some distinguished honorary office is conferred on him by imperial decree. This memorial to Tso Tsung Tang preceded by a very few days the visit of Li Hung Chang to the capital, and furnished him a fine opportunity to press his rail road views. It was considered by the Board of Revenue, that the best mode of inviting the attention of the members of the Government to the merits of railroads would be to exhibit a working model of an American roadway and rolling stock.

Last September a working model of an American railroad train, consisting of locomotive and tender, mail and baggage cars, passenger cars, Pullman parlor and sleeping cars, different kinds of freight cars, together with 100 feet of main track and sidings, switches, turn-tables, etc.—in fact, a complete representation of an American railroad in miniature—was exhibited to Li Hung Chang. It was, by order of Li Hung Chang, taken to Peking and exhibited by him to Prince Chun, the Emperor's father, and two days later it was taken to the imperial palace and exhibited to the Emperor and the Empress dowager. Their majesties were much interested, and spent some time in a minute examination of the model. It was the first complete representation they had ever seen of a railroad. After examination they agreed to allow Li Hung Chang to prepare for the introduction of steam-cars.

#### FORMED A COMPACT.

##### The Coal Operators and Miners of Five States Arrange a Price Scale.

[Columbus (Ohio) special.]

The National Convention of Coal Miners and Operators, which concluded its business in this city this evening, is no doubt one of the most important in results obtained of any convention which has been held in the labor interest since the spirit of arbitration has taken the place of other methods for the settlement of difficulties. Both miners and operatives express the opinion that they have formed the groundwork for the amicable settlement of all future troubles which may arise, and they also hope, inasmuch as they have enlisted the more intelligent and liberal element of both classes, that the compact will get stronger with each year. In order that the results might not be temporary, the convention provided for another meeting at Columbus on the second Tuesday of February, 1887, when the present scale of prices will be subject to revision.

The scale was amended so as to cut out Staunton, Mount Olive, and Springfield, Ill., on the ground that these sections were not represented and were not at the Pittsburgh convention, and adopted as follows:

Pittsburgh, 70 cents per ton; Hocking Valley, 60 cents; Indiana block, 80 cents; Indiana bituminous, No. 1, 65 cents; Indiana bituminous, No. 2, 75 cents; Wilmington, Ill., 95 cents; Streator, 80 cents; Grape Creek, 75 cents; Mount Olive, 50 cents; Staunton, 50 cents; Springfield, 62 cents; Des Moines, Iowa, 90 cents; in West Virginia, the Kanawha district, reduced prices to be restored to 75 cents; Reynolds-ville, Fairmount screen coal, 71 cents.

A board of arbitration was elected, consisting of two miners and two operators from each of the five States represented in the scale, to which shall be referred all questions of a national character.

#### A WIZARD WEDDED.

##### Marriage of Thomas A. Edison to Miss Mina Miller, of Akron, Ohio.

[Akron (Ohio) dispatch.]

Thomas A. Edison, the electrician, and Mina, daughter of Lewis Miller, the millionaire manufacturer, were married at "Oak Place," the elegant home of the Millers in the western part of the city. The nuptials were conducted according to the form of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Mr. F. W. Tappan, U. S. N., of New York, acted as best man. The bride was given away by her father, and there were no bridesmaids.

The bride was attired in white silk, with duchess and point lace, square neck, laced corsage, and wore diamond and pearl ornaments, including a costly pearl necklace, the gift of the groom. The groom was attired in black, wearing a Prince Albert coat and black tie, and with hands undressed. His present to the bride was a diamond and pearl necklace valued at \$3,000, while authenticated rumor has it that he also transferred to her \$1,000,000 worth of real estate. Among the other presents were many sets of the richest and most elegant silver table and ornamental ware, besides a Westminster clock with chimes, diamond bracelets, diamond, ruby, and sapphire pins, a solid column of onyx, with gold capital, and many other rare and costly jewels.

Congratulations were received under an immense floral wishbone, composed principally of roses, after which dinner was served by a chef from Chicago.

## INDIANA STATE NEWS.

—Ground has been broken for the water-works at Vincennes.

—Martinsville has about determined to illuminate with the electric light.

—"Uncle Lucian" Rous, of Thorntown, the first male child born in Vevay, died recently, aged 82.

—Abram Kahn, a prominent Jew and stock buyer at South Bend, shot himself through the head.

—Harry Bannister, proprietor of the hotel at La Fontaine, south of Wabash, fell dead with heart disease.

—Fire broke out the other morning in a saloon in a business part of Poseyville, destroying the entire block.

—At an auction sale of walnut in Delphi, with bidders present from four States, 120 growing trees brought \$6,600.

—It is estimated that 1,000 hogs have died of cholera during the past six months at Fox's Station, near Wabash.

—George D. Wingate, of Thornton, committed suicide by hanging himself with a halter to the rafters of his barn.

—A mail train struck John Brack, who was walking on the track just east of Fort Wayne, and he died in a few minutes.

—The warehouse belonging to the Elkhart Iron-Works Company, containing about 600 sulky plows, was destroyed by fire.

—A "Law and Order" League has been organized at Marion, which is backed by all the churches in the town and the temperance element.

—H. C. Holloway, digging a well on a farm east of La Porte, came across a large vein of soft coal, samples of which proved to be first-class.

—M. Spangle, a conductor on the Lake Shore and Michigan Southern Railroad, was run over at Elkhart by a switch-engine and instantly killed.

—Mrs. Thomas A. Hendricks has been chosen a member of the Board of Directors of the Hecla Mining Company, to fill the place of her husband.

—Oscar Baldwin recovered \$9,966 in the Gibson County Court against the Evansville and Terre Haute, for the loss of a foot while employed as brakeman.

—During the trial of a State case at Upland, one of the jurors crawled out of a window and went home before a verdict was reached. A constable found him in bed.

—Fort Wayne Lodge, No. 14, I. O. O. F., has purchased, for \$21,000, corner property within one block of the Court House. A fine edifice will probably be erected next summer.

—Fire the other night destroyed the engine-house at Mount Vernon, but the apparatus was saved. Citizens had barely got to bed when another alarm was sounded, calling the department to the east side of the public square. Half a block was in flames and destroyed, among which was the Democrat office.

—David J. Mackey, President of the Evansville and Terre Haute and Evansville and Indianapolis Railways, was arrested to answer the charge of contempt of court. Some time ago the Daviess County Court rendered judgment of \$1,800 against Mackey's road for trespass, but Mackey ignored the order, and as the court could not stop the railroad it took possession of the President.

—Hon. Hugh McCulloch, ex-Secretary of the United States Treasury, has deeded to the city of Fort Wayne his title to the old Broadway Cemetery of ten acres, from which most of the dead bodies have been removed, and which has become of great value. The condition of the deed, which the City Council has by ordinance accepted, is that the property shall be kept improved and be known as McCulloch Park.

—Mr. Thornton F. Tyson, one of the oldest residents of Cass County, has completely lost his reason, and application will be made for his admission into the insane asylum. After years of toil Mr. Tyson amassed a fortune of between \$20,000 and \$25,000. He recently began to speculate in Chicago margins, and the result was he lost his entire fortune, \$17,000 going at one time. The result was mental wreck and ruin.

—A decided sensation has been caused by Charley Maurice, a cowboy tough, at Logansport, Ohio. He saddled his horse, filled his hide with whiskey, and started out to take in the town. He rode into three saloons, and ordered drinks at the muzzle of a revolver. He attempted to ride up to the general-delivery window in the postoffice, but was headed off by the police, who jerked him from his horse and threw him in jail.

—At the Grand Lodge of the Indiana Knights of Honor the election of officers resulted as follows: Grand Dictator, J. B. Hill, of Richmond; Vice Dictator, J. B. Wartmann, of Evansville; Assistant Dictator, Adolph S. Lane, of Vincennes; Chaplain, Rev. A. J. Neff; Guide, Richard Bryson, of Clay City; Reporter, James W. Jacobs, of Jeffersonville; Treasurer, Walter B. Godfrey, of New Albany; Sentinel, Jesse Cook, of Westfield; Supreme Representative, T. H. Clapp, of Indianapolis; Trustees, Herman Kreuger, of Kendallville; Isaac E. Crews, of Greencastle; Allen W. Conduitt, of Indianapolis; State Medical Examiner, Dr. T. N. Bryan, of Indianapolis.