

FIXED FOR A CENTURY

Corner-Stone Laid of Chemawa Dormitory.

QUARTERS FOR 150 INDIAN BOYS

Hermann and Gatch Speak at Commencement of Construction on Mitchell Hall—Letter to Folks Living a Century Hence.

SALEM, Or., April 21.—(Special.)—The corner-stone of Mitchell Hall, the new boys' dormitory at Chemawa Indian Training School, was laid this morning with appropriate ceremonies. Hon. Frank Hermann delivered an address of welcome and Hon. Binger Hermann delivered the occasional address. Before the stone was sealed, there was placed in its cavity a glass jar containing numerous articles, among them being a letter addressed to the people who will reside in this vicinity 100 years hence, when it is presumed the building will have served its usefulness and will be torn down. It was expected that a large crowd would attend the exercises from Salem, but the attendance was very small.

Before the formal exercises, the Chemawa Indian band gave a concert which was much enjoyed by all who were present. At 9 o'clock Mayor C. P. Bishop, of Salem, called the assemblage to order and after stating the purpose of the gathering introduced Rev. W. D. Day, of Salem, who, in accordance with the ritual of the Catholic church, invoked divine blessing upon the building and the work to which it is dedicated. In brief address, in which he spoke eloquently of the liberal policy of this Government in the training of the hands and intellects of the Indian children, Hon. Frank Hermann, who introduced the principal speaker, Hon. Binger Hermann.

Mr. Hermann recounted the efforts that had been put forth in the years during which the Chemawa Indian Training School has grown to be one of the leading institutions of the kind in the United States. He said that the citizens of Salem donated the land upon which the school was first established, and that the Indian children themselves had worked in the boyards to earn the money with which 50 acres of the present school grounds had been purchased. He said that no other nation maintained such a magnificent system of education for its native and that in the continuance of this work by the Government the Indian children are given an opportunity to make for themselves a place in the world of science and industry and perseverance, in order that their own lives may be successful. He asserted that there are better opportunities for the boys of 1893 than there were for the boys of 1803, and encouraged the youth of this day to strive for the achievement of all that is best in life.

Assistant Superintendent W. P. Campbell read a letter from Superintendent T. W. Potter, expressing regret at his necessary absence in California, and in the following letter, which is intended to be read by the people who live in this section of the country in the year 2003: United States Indian Training School Agency, Chemawa, Or., April 21, 1903. To Those Who May Open This Stone, Greeting: On this 21st day of April, A. D. 1903, at 9 A. M., the 600 pupils and 50 employees of this school gathered around this building to celebrate the laying of its corner-stone. We have deposited in this stone, with many friends from Salem and the surrounding country assembled around this building to celebrate the laying of its corner-stone. We have deposited in this stone, with many friends from Salem and the surrounding country assembled around this building to celebrate the laying of its corner-stone. We have deposited in this stone, with many friends from Salem and the surrounding country assembled around this building to celebrate the laying of its corner-stone.

This building was built by the Government of the United States as a dormitory for the large boys who are pupils at this school. The names you will find deposited in this stone. The contractor who is constructing this building is Mr. Charles A. Gray, of Salem. We judge a copy of the program for this day, by which you will see that the dedication address has been delivered by Hon. Binger Hermann, of Portland, and the address of welcome by Hon. Frank Hermann, of Salem. While those of you who are here today celebrating the laying of the corner-stone will all be sleeping under the sod and forgetting the world, we cannot refrain from writing you this letter, which we hope will be of as much interest to you in 100 years as it is of pleasure to us, and while we wish we could take a leap of 100 years from today, and see the wonderful development of science and invention which will no doubt be enjoyed by those who are fortunate to live at that time, yet we will have, no doubt, to be contented with our lot and thankful that we are enjoying the enlightenment of civilization and advancement of this day and age. We have not the flying machine and many other new and wonderful things which you are enjoying, but we are proud to know that we have thousands of inventions and improvements which would astonish our forefathers 100 years ago.

Wishing you and yours happiness and pleasure which we have enjoyed, we remain your true friends, the superintendent, employees, pupils and friends of Chemawa School.

T. W. POTTER, Superintendent.
W. P. CAMPBELL, Assistant Superintendent.
P. S. We have named this building Mitchell Hall, because it was chiefly due to Senator John H. Mitchell's efforts in the Congress of the United States that the \$25,000 required for its construction was granted. Therefore, in his honor we do name it Mitchell Hall.

The mementoes were placed in the stone and the cavity sealed by the contractor, Charles A. Gray, after which prayer was offered by Rev. Mr. St. Pierre, and the exercises closed with the playing of "America" by the band.

The new dormitory will be 37 by 25 feet, with a maximum width of 65 feet. It will be of brick, two stories high, and will accommodate 150 boys. The cost will be \$25,000.

LETTER WAS TOO LATE.

New District Attorney Wants Judgment Opened in Luelling Case.

OREGON CITY, Or., April 21.—(Special.)—District Attorney Charles A. Gray has taken action upon the bill, which was introduced by Senator John H. Mitchell, to have the judgment in the case of Luelling v. Harrison Allen opened. The bill was introduced within ten days after it was filed, as required by law. The case is a suit of the County of Clatsop against the County of Clatsop, for \$100,000, with interest, bringing the total amount to about \$100,000. Luelling was elected Recorder on the Populist ticket in 1896 and held office until 1898. During that time he presented bills to the Board of County Commissioners for deputy hire, but the board never took action upon the bills. Several months ago Luelling, through Attorney Grant E. Dimick and George L. Story, presented his claim to the Commissioners, and it was disallowed. Following this, he filed a suit in the Circuit Court against the county. Summons was served on County Clerk Frank A. Sligh, and he notified Deputy District Attorney J. U. Campbell, who at that time was holding down the chief clerkship of the House ways and means committee at Salem. Campbell sent

the papers to the District Attorney, and he returned to the County Clerk a motion to strike out certain portions of the complaint. But the motion was mailed a day too late, and reached the clerk after the expiration of the time in which an answer could be filed.

The defendant therefore was in default and Luelling obtained judgment for the amount sued for. The District Attorney has now filed a motion to open the judgment, and this motion will be argued in the Circuit Court tomorrow.

HULSE MAKES CONFESSION.

Acknowledges Harboring McKinnley and Basing Arms for Him.

BAKERSFIELD, Cal., April 21.—Al Hulse, a companion of outlaw James McKinnley, made a partial confession tonight to Deputy Sheriff Gas Lower. The prisoner now admits that he was an accomplice of McKinnley to the extent of having harbored him in his room and assisted in bringing him to Bakersfield, and that McKinnley had been his companion for two days. He also acknowledged having purchased the ammunition and the arms with which the officers were killed.

He says it was the intention of the outlaw and himself to leave town in a day or two, as soon as the former was sufficiently rested to undertake the journey. Hulse still persists in denying that he was actually present when the shooting was done.

He is bordering on a nervous collapse, due to the fact that the officials will not furnish him opium, to the use of which he is said to be addicted.

Tonight there is a subdued air all over town. At the County Jail a number of officers are congregated. It is felt that, if the night passes without a demonstration, the prospects of the law being allowed to take its course will be much improved.

DENIED A FRANCHISE.

Baker City Council Will Not Let Road In.

BAKER CITY, Or., April 21.—(Special.)—The City Council tonight refused to grant a franchise to the Oregon & Idaho Central Railroad Company for a right of way and terminal facilities to enter this city. This is the proposed Seven Devils road, a company for the construction of which was organized last Fall. The vote was 4 for and 2 against, with one member absent. The ordinance failed for want of a legal majority of the membership of the Council.

Before rejection the ordinance was amended so as to require the road to be completed at far as Richland, a distance of 40 miles from this city. Before the vote was taken Mr. Voss offered to fix the time limit for the completion of the first 40 miles at 18 months, but this proposition was not considered. It is claimed that an organization of citizens known as the Citizens' League, made up of about 20 merchants, capitalists and brokers, was opposed to the granting of the franchise because it would mean the loss of the city to the Harriman interest in some where in the background.

An ordinance was passed for the issuance of \$40,000 worth of 5 per cent bonds to build a City Hall, and \$10,000 worth of 5 per cent bonds in part payment of a sewer system.

CIRCUIT COURT AT ALBANY.

One Couple Divorced, Another Would Like to Be.

ALBANY, Or., April 21.—(Special.)—Judge R. P. McCreary recovered the department of the Circuit Court today and granted a divorce to Mrs. J. R. Rumbaugh, whose husband eloped with another woman, and was convicted of adultery in Alaska.

The suit of divorce was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county. Mrs. Thomas Froman, for divorce, was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county. Mrs. Thomas Froman, for divorce, was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county.

The suit of divorce was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county. Mrs. Thomas Froman, for divorce, was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county.

The suit of divorce was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county. Mrs. Thomas Froman, for divorce, was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county.

The suit of divorce was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county. Mrs. Thomas Froman, for divorce, was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county.

The suit of divorce was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county. Mrs. Thomas Froman, for divorce, was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county.

The suit of divorce was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county. Mrs. Thomas Froman, for divorce, was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county.

The suit of divorce was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county. Mrs. Thomas Froman, for divorce, was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county.

The suit of divorce was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county. Mrs. Thomas Froman, for divorce, was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county.

The suit of divorce was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county. Mrs. Thomas Froman, for divorce, was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county.

The suit of divorce was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county. Mrs. Thomas Froman, for divorce, was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county.

The suit of divorce was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county. Mrs. Thomas Froman, for divorce, was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county.

The suit of divorce was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county. Mrs. Thomas Froman, for divorce, was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county.

The suit of divorce was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county. Mrs. Thomas Froman, for divorce, was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county.

The suit of divorce was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county. Mrs. Thomas Froman, for divorce, was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county.

The suit of divorce was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county. Mrs. Thomas Froman, for divorce, was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county.

The suit of divorce was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county. Mrs. Thomas Froman, for divorce, was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county.

The suit of divorce was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county. Mrs. Thomas Froman, for divorce, was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county.

The suit of divorce was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county. Mrs. Thomas Froman, for divorce, was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county.

The suit of divorce was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county. Mrs. Thomas Froman, for divorce, was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county.

The suit of divorce was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county. Mrs. Thomas Froman, for divorce, was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county.

The suit of divorce was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county. Mrs. Thomas Froman, for divorce, was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county.

The suit of divorce was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county. Mrs. Thomas Froman, for divorce, was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county.

The suit of divorce was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county. Mrs. Thomas Froman, for divorce, was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county.

The suit of divorce was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county. Mrs. Thomas Froman, for divorce, was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county.

The suit of divorce was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county. Mrs. Thomas Froman, for divorce, was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county.

The suit of divorce was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county. Mrs. Thomas Froman, for divorce, was then taken up. This suit is the most sensational ever held in this county.

COAL ROADS UNDER FIRE

INTERSTATE COMMISSION INVESTIGATES TRUST.

Charges of Discrimination Made by Hearst are Met by Statement That His Figures are Wrong.

NEW YORK, April 21.—The Interstate Commerce Commission sat in this city today to consider the complaint of William R. Hearst, that certain coal-carrying roads are violating the interstate commerce law. The defendant roads are the Philadelphia & Reading, the Lehigh Valley, the Central of New Jersey, the New York, Susquehanna & Western, the Erie, the Ontario & Western, the Delaware, and Hudson, the Pennsylvania and the Baltimore & Ohio.

The specific complaints of Mr. Hearst are that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

Mr. Hearst's complaint is that the roads charge unreasonable rates, that they unjustly discriminate in favor of the bituminous against the anthracite coal companies, and that they have contrived, in violation of the anti-trust sections of the interstate commerce law, to form a trust.

CROSSED THE PLAINS

MANY YEARS AGO

EUGENE, Or., April 21.—(Special.)

Mary E. Andrews was born in Tippecanoe County, Indiana, November 1, 1851, where she grew up to womanhood, and in 1882 was married to Joseph G. Gray. Soon after their marriage the young couple started for Oregon, coming across the plains with ox teams.

They came direct to Lane County and located in the Mohawk Valley, where they lived for four years, and then removed to Eugene, and made their permanent home. She left seven sons and daughters, as follows:

J. W. Gray, Huntington; Dr. J. C. Gray, Eugene; Mrs. B. P. Alley