

CONGRESS TODAY.

Health of Blaine and Springer Today.

BOLD ROBBERY.

But They Got Little for Their Pains—Detectives After Them. PITTSBURGH, March 8.—At Finleyville, twenty-three miles south of this city, on the Baltimore & Ohio road, a gang of four highwaymen, this morning assaulted J. K. McMillan, a shifting conductor. After they had bound and gagged him, he was carried some distance away and tied to a post. The desperado then relieved him of his watch and money and after threatening to kill him if he tried to make a noise, they went to the telegraph tower, and at the point of a revolver forced the operator to surrender. He was bound and gagged, after which he was relieved of his valuables. The robbers next turned their attention to the safe in the office. It was locked but they blew it open, the explosion wrecking the office. The report attracted the trainmen in the vicinity, and the desperadoes were frightened off before they could secure the contents of the safe, which was scattered over the room. The entire detective force of the Baltimore & Ohio road, are in pursuit.

Congress Today.

WASHINGTON, March 8.—A message from the president, transmitting the recently negotiated treaty of arbitration, relative to the Behring sea fisheries, has just been laid before the senate. It was accompanied by another recommendation. There was also laid before the senate a message relating to indemnity claims of the Venezuelan Steamship company. House today adjourned, as a mark of respect to the memory of K. Adair, of Kentucky, who died yesterday.

THE GUN FACTORY.

There Are to Be Two Small Affairs Instead of One Large One. WASHINGTON, March 8.—The senate committee on coast defenses are of the opinion that the location of a gun factory on the Pacific coast should be left to the decision of a board of experts to be appointed by the president as provided for in the bill. It appears from the statement of the chief of ordnance that there is to be no large establishment of this kind on the Pacific coast. There will be need of two small establishments for repairs, one to be located at Beale's and the other further north on the Columbia river or on Puget sound. The bill appropriates \$1,000,000 for the erection of a suitable building, and for the purchase of suitable machinery and other materials.

Understand the cabinet has decided to insist on the renewal of the modus vivendi for seals in Behring sea.

Before the Raun investigation committee today, Chandler, assistant secretary of the interior was the first witness. He said he never received charges to the effect that young Raun had taken money for illegal transactions and had no personal knowledge of any person employed in the pension office, was interested in the refrigerator company, of which Commissioner Raun was president.

The New German Minister. WASHINGTON, March 8.—Hollubus, the new German minister to this country, was formally presented to the president this morning.

Is Coming Home. LONDON, March 8.—Charles Foster, secretary of the United States treasury, left for Southampton this noon, and he will embark tomorrow morning for New York.

Before leaving, Secretary Foster said he had heard nothing direct concerning the Behring sea negotiations.

Prohibition Convention. GRAND FORKS, N. D., March 8.—The State Prohibition convention met this morning to elect six delegates to the national convention at St. Louis, June 27th. Alliance and independent forces attempted to capture the convention, but after a sharp fight withdrew. Out of six members to the state central committee, four are fully identified with the alliance party.

Killed by a Boy. FLORENCE, S. C., March 8.—L. W. Tubert, father of the International Order of Maculists and at one time its president, was killed yesterday in a fight with two boys named Barringer. The killing was the result of a whipping he gave one of the boys for alleged scandalous talk about his daughter.

Mrs. Admiral Semmes Dead. MONTELEONE, Ala., March 8.—Mrs. Annie Semmes, widow of the late Admiral Semmes, commander of the confederate cruiser Alabama, died at her home in this city in her 74th year.

Discontent Spreading. BERLIN, March 8.—A dispatch from Leipzig this morning states that discontent among the large number of unemployed working men in that city is spreading.

Blaine and Springer. WASHINGTON, March 8.—Secretary Blaine is better today. Congressman Springer is reported better this morning and improving slowly.

FLOTSAM & JETSAM.

Telegraphic Items From all Parts of the World.

FREE COINAGE.

The Bland Bill Will be Considered for Three Days. WASHINGTON, March 8.—The free coinage issue will not be postponed until after election, as previously stated. The issue must be disposed of by the house before the date of the national convention. The free coinage men of both parties are of course highly elated. The leading men in the Democratic party are filled with dismal forebodings, while anti-free coinage Republicans, who comprise 50 per cent. of the Republican membership in the house, are disposed to view the situation with complacency. The vote yesterday indicated that the house will surely pass the Bland bill, so decisive and overwhelming was the victory of the advocates of free coinage. It was a significant feature of the proceedings that on all disputes that arose on the parliamentary question, the anti-free coinage men did most of the talking. To one unfamiliar with the political methods the conclusion would be irresistible, after listening to the denunciation of Speaker Crisp's rulings, to the impassioned oratory and direful predictions of those opposed to the Bland bill, that free coinage would be swept away in a whirlwind of popular indignation, yet when the vote came, not on the silver resolution alone, but on all auxiliary questions the free coinage men came to the front in unbroken phalanx, and by vote of over two to one routed their opponents. On last and vital proposition, that the setting apart three days for consideration of the Bland bill, free coinage men won by the overwhelming vote of 190 to 80.

ROW AMONG ITALIANS.

A Gang of Railroad Laborers Have a Sunday Afternoon. TUXEDO, N. Y., March 8.—Between 5 and 6 o'clock Sunday evening there was a riot among a large number of Italian laborers employed by the Erie Railroad company at this place. The Italians occupy a section of the town known as "Little Italy," and they usually spend Sundays drinking beer and fighting. Sunday afternoon the "growlers" had been actively rushed, and by evening many of the men were fighting drunk. A dispute arose between a couple of hot-headed men which quickly led to blows. The friends of each of the fighters came to their assistance, and soon the fight became general.

In a reckless manner. One of the pistol bulls killed Michael Demotto. Five other Italians, whose names are not known, were terribly slashed with knives in the hands of their frenzied assailants. Captain Busch, of Tuxedo, with a force of officers descended upon the rioters, and after a hard battle quelled the disturbance. Several of the ringleaders in the riot were placed under arrest.

ONE FORM OF INSANITY.

Sea Captain Imagines His Men Want to Kill Him. LONDON, March 8.—A strange story comes from the island of St. Helena by the British ship Regent, Captain Treadwell, which sailed from Calcutta November 30, for New York. The vessel arrived at St. Helena on February 7, and reported to the authorities that some time before Captain Treadwell had locked himself in his cabin, and had discharged several shots from his revolver. From the report received here it does not appear that an entrance was forced into the cabin, or that any effort was made to discover the reason for shooting. The mate took charge of the ship and ran for St. Helena, and upon its arrival there gave the report above mentioned. The port officials, who boarded the ship, broke in the door of the captain's cabin and found him lying insensible. An examination revealed the fact that he had four wounds in his head and body. Medical assistance was at once summoned for the wounded man, and he afterwards regained consciousness. He subsequently stated that the crew of the Regent, headed by the chief mate, had mutinied and threatened to kill him. He believed it was their intention to fire the ship and then abandon her, leaving him on board to perish. Seeing them, as he supposed, setting fire to the vessel, he went into his cabin, locked his door and tried to blow his brains out. The captain's improbable story was not believed, and an examination was made as to his sanity. Physicians decided that he was insane, and he should be sent home to England in care of a doctor. He and his medical attendant sailed on the British steamer Dunbar Castle, which called at St. Helena on her way from Table bay for London, and arrived here yesterday. The doctor extracted the bullets from the captain's head and body on the voyage. The Regent has been detained at St. Helena, the governor not deeming it desirable to allow her to proceed in charge of the mate.

A Crank in Church.

ANDERSON, Ind., March 8.—"I am the king, and everyone of you must pay tribute to me," shouted a crank Sunday as he entered the East Lynn church, one of the most fashionable congregations in the city, and strode up the main aisle brandishing a six-shooter and a butcher-knife. The preacher's prayer was cut short when women screamed and fainted, and some of the men jumped out of the windows. Six men overpowered the maniac and took him to jail. He proved to be Henry J. Lawrence, a well-to-do farmer, whose mind had been unbalanced by the grief and by the desertion of his wife.

Whitecaps in Minnesota. MINNEAPOLIS, March 8.—Intelligence from Egin, Minn., is received that Saturday night a band of whitecaps visited the farmhouse of John Reid, dragged Sidney Green, a farmer, from his bed and gave him a coat of tar and feathers, rode him on a cart, and ordered him to leave the country. He returned to Reid's house, but was ordered away. Refusing to go, a warrant was sworn out yesterday for his arrest, and he is now in jail. The whitecapping grew out of an elopement in which Green and Farmer Crawford's wife were the principals.

MURDER AND SUICIDE.

The Awful Deed of a Walla Walla Laborer. WALLA WALLA, March 8.—Yesterday morning at 6 o'clock Theodore Heitz, a laborer, shot his wife five times and then killed himself. Heitz and his wife separated last week, she going to live with her sister, Mrs. Kellan. Thursday last Mrs. Heitz sent her brother-in-law her hints to get her trunk. Her husband and brother-in-law had a fight, in which the latter stabbed the former in the cheek and was arrested and fined. Yesterday morning Heitz went to the house where his wife was stopping and, drawing a pistol, fired six shots at his wife, who ran out in the street and fell dead. He then went to the old depot, about 100 yards distant, and shot himself in the heart and throat. He died in a few minutes.

Playing Insanity.

CHICAGO, March 8.—Dr. Henry M. Scudder, who is charged with murdering his mother-in-law, and who is confined in the detention hospital pending examination as to his sanity, seized a heavy chair Sunday afternoon and with a powerful swing brought it down on the defenseless head of a lunatic. The victim dropped as if he had been shot, and the doctor was proceeding to kill him when the attendants rushed up and seized him. It required the combined strength of three men to disarm the physician and put him in his cell. When asked why he assailed the lunatic he said, "Voices told me to do it, because the man was in league with my wife and the others against me." His son and father called to see him yesterday. He seemed pleased to see his son, but would not speak to his father, who, he said, was in league with the people who were trying to ruin him. From the doctor's conversation it seems that he considers that he is a victim of a huge conspiracy which began with his arrest for irregularities in the insurance matter. He appears to be the Dunton family as the chief conspirators. A young woman who has done considerable work as a typewriter for Dr. Scudder, says: "I have had plenty of opportunities to study him, and I believe that he is a diabolical."

Supreme Court.

SALEM, March 7, '92. Mary Rodney Adair and Samuel D. Adair, appellants, vs. Bethenia A. Owens Adair and John Adair, respondents; appeal from Clatsop county. Judgment reversed and the cause remanded to the court below with directions to proceed in accordance with this opinion. Opinion by Strahan, chief justice. Petitions for rehearing were denied in the following cases: B. Vandusen et al. vs. C. W. Shively et al.; Hodson vs. Goodale, Hale vs. Cottle, Doernbecher vs. The Columbia City Lumbering Co., Margarette Marshall et al. vs. Annie E. Williams, and Cyrus Smith vs. G. R. A. K. Frazer vs. Henry Jones; motion to restate on docket denied. Fowle, appellant, vs. Temperance House, respondent; motion filed to dismiss appeal. Twenty days time was granted to file motion in the case of M. R. Adair and S. D. Adair vs. B. A. O. Adair and J. Adair. FARM LOANS.—Spalding & Rogers have money to loan at reasonable rates. STATE OF OREGON, CITY OF TOLSON, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FRANK J. CHENEY. FRANK J. CHENEY, Plaintiff, vs. FRANK J. CHENEY, Defendant. The said Frank J. Cheney is the senior partner of the firm of F. J. CHENEY & CO., doing business in the City of Toledo, Ohio, and is the owner of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY SHARES OF THE COMMON STOCK OF CATAWRH CURE CO., INCORPORATED IN OHIO, which cannot be sold by the said FR