

CARSEY AND HIS THUGS.

THE BOGUS LABOR MAN WAYLAYS A "WORLD" REPORTER.

A FIGHT IN THE CORRIDOR OF THE STATE CAPITOL.

Assemblyman Rice Also Assaulted—"The World's" Exposure of Carsey and His Gang, Who Oppose the Weekly Payment Bill, Coaxed Him to Brutality.

(SPECIAL TO THE WORLD.) ALBANY, March 5.—W. A. Carsey and his gang of thugs are now trying to defeat the Weekly Payment bill by blows. To-day they lay in wait in a corridor of the Capitol and knocked down THE WORLD representative who came here to attend the hearing before the Senate Committee on Miscellaneous Corporations. Carsey and his people were shown to be frisks and hypocrites, who have been kicked out of all the State labor organizations. It was shown that they cannot re-admission into a workingmen's convention. They have sold out every association or society that they were ever connected with and they are now in the way of a corporation to oppose the bill. Carsey did not like this exposure in THE WORLD. It hurt them. In the afternoon they will not be able to command their old way for treachery. Dirty work will be cheaper henceforth.

Carsey was wild, and he made up his mind to "get square." He could do this only one way, so he resolved to "knock out" THE WORLD writer. He came to Albany with a crowd of ruffians to assault his man. He got as good as he sent, however, for THE WORLD had many friends present. For a time there was a pitched battle in the corridor. The World man was knocked down by Carsey, who in turn was sent to the door by Assemblyman Rice, of Ulster County, who introduced the Assembly Weekly Payment bill.

Then Carsey's son struck Rice, whose face was torn open by a ring on the thumb's hand. Engineer Duckee, who has made such good arguments for the bill, then took a hand in, while Carsey's other ruffians got frightened and ran away. It all came about in this way. Carsey was the first speaker before the Committee. In spite of the fact that Senator Roesech sat at the table among the Committee members and that the roomswalk of friends of labor, many of whom from their own experience know what renegades Carsey and his crowd are, the fellow launched into a bitter harangue, in which he endeavored to make it appear that he (Carsey) was the only true friend of the laboring man, and that Samuel Gompers was their worst enemy.

As soon as the Committee had adjourned, this foe of the workingman approached Senator Roesech and in a bullying, impudent manner related to him the facts of the assault on the Committee. As he did so his gang, who had sat by themselves during the hearing, came close to his side. Carsey got so angry, and in the midst of it Carsey, Senator Roesech, Assemblyman Rice and Attorney Hinckley, of the Long Island City, who had moved toward the elevator. Carsey had already made several remarks about THE WORLD's interest in the bill, which were all lies.

Finding that Senator Roesech would have nothing to say to him, he transferred his attack to the other side of the door. He reached the street. When opposite the elevator in the corridor Carsey made remarks which called for the aid of his ruffians. Then Carsey was foolish. He lost his temper. The words were not out of his mouth before he was down on the floor, and a tremendous blow on his jaw, which sent him staggering against the wall of the corridor. Instantly the ruffians of the World's office rushed to the aid of the man who had been struck. Assemblyman Rice saw plainly that Carsey was in a bad way, and he rushed to his aid. Carsey was struck in the face, but not seriously hurt. All this took place in one or two minutes. Several of the ruffians were struck up, and Carsey and his ruffians, with a dread of the station-house before them, hastily rushed down the stairs, and were running till they were near the railroad depot. No one was hurt except Mr. Carsey, who has a badly cut eye and will not be able to use it for at least a week.

That W. A. Carsey should have the hardihood to show himself in Albany again astonished every one in the committee-room when he appeared before the Committee last week. He showed the thoroughness of his exposure in THE WORLD of the entire Assembly. He seemed unable to resist the force of the arguments of the Chairman, and he was unable to defend the autobiography of an agent and the man who had been exposed.

You had better come yourself to the Weekly Payment bill," said the Chairman. "I am a laboring man myself and my ruffians ought to be valuable. And, let me tell you, I am a laboring man myself and my ruffians ought to be valuable. Look at Gompers and see how he behaves. Look at his friends and tell me how they behave. Look at those laboring men who are so ready to get together and talk to you about their ruffians, but they represent nobody but themselves."

Why, not long ago I hired a whole carload of them and took them to a meeting of mine. Now they are down on me, and they are into their property. I tell you I am a laboring man myself and my ruffians ought to be valuable. Look at Gompers and see how he behaves. Look at his friends and tell me how they behave. Look at those laboring men who are so ready to get together and talk to you about their ruffians, but they represent nobody but themselves."

Why, not long ago I hired a whole carload of them and took them to a meeting of mine. Now they are down on me, and they are into their property. I tell you I am a laboring man myself and my ruffians ought to be valuable. Look at Gompers and see how he behaves. Look at his friends and tell me how they behave. Look at those laboring men who are so ready to get together and talk to you about their ruffians, but they represent nobody but themselves."

Why, not long ago I hired a whole carload of them and took them to a meeting of mine. Now they are down on me, and they are into their property. I tell you I am a laboring man myself and my ruffians ought to be valuable. Look at Gompers and see how he behaves. Look at his friends and tell me how they behave. Look at those laboring men who are so ready to get together and talk to you about their ruffians, but they represent nobody but themselves."

HIS DEAD SON A THIEF.

THIS ACCUSATION IS MADE BY FRUIT-DEALER MALLARD.

A SUIT INSTITUTED TO RECOVER THE STOLEN MONEY.

The Father, Who Employed Him, Says It Was Impossible for His Son, Out of the Small Salary He Received, to Have Saved Nearly \$3,000, Which He Had in Bank.

John Mallard was the favorite son of Frederick L. Mallard, the owner of four wholesale fruit stores in New York. In August, 1887, the young man married Mamie F. Malone, then only fifteen years old. Up to the time of his marriage he had lived at home with his parents, but soon after this event he went to housekeeping in a flat. Last June the young husband, just twenty-four years old, died. Three months later a child was born to Mrs. Mallard, but it lived only a short time.

Today a suit in Manhattan was filed in the Circuit Court by H. W. Morgenthau to require County Auditor C. D. Criss to provide a list of all persons claiming the delinquent taxes of Senator Brice. Morgenthau, as Tax Collector, in his petition avers that he is acting in accordance with the provisions of an act of the General Assembly of Ohio, passed and taking effect April 10, 1888, according to which, and the contract made with the Commissioners of the State of Ohio, he is entitled to 20 per cent of all taxes collected through his instrumentality which have been illegally avoided, and that said act provides that upon information given, or upon belief of such omission existing, said auditor must compile and list the same.

On Aug. 10, 1888, at the instance of Morgenthau, an auditor was appointed and named on Calvin S. Brice, who was in New York, to appear before him on Aug. 28 and show why returns should not be corrected and omissions placed on the Treasurer's duplicate. This notice was duly served on Brice, personally, but he paid no attention to it, announcing that he would have the same done by his attorney.

He did not appear then nor at any time since, but instead had his attorney, John E. Richie, now Judge of the Court of Common Pleas, appear and request that the matter be laid over indefinitely. This request was kindly complied with, Auditor Criss and Brice being very good friends. Nothing was done until the day of Criss, the new Auditor, came into office, when at Morgenthau's instance a second notice was served on Brice, and stating that in default the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau.

Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau. Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau.

Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau. Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau.

Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau. Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau.

Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau. Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau.

Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau. Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau.

HIS DEAD SON A THIEF.

THIS ACCUSATION IS MADE BY FRUIT-DEALER MALLARD.

A SUIT INSTITUTED TO RECOVER THE STOLEN MONEY.

The Father, Who Employed Him, Says It Was Impossible for His Son, Out of the Small Salary He Received, to Have Saved Nearly \$3,000, Which He Had in Bank.

John Mallard was the favorite son of Frederick L. Mallard, the owner of four wholesale fruit stores in New York. In August, 1887, the young man married Mamie F. Malone, then only fifteen years old. Up to the time of his marriage he had lived at home with his parents, but soon after this event he went to housekeeping in a flat. Last June the young husband, just twenty-four years old, died. Three months later a child was born to Mrs. Mallard, but it lived only a short time.

Today a suit in Manhattan was filed in the Circuit Court by H. W. Morgenthau to require County Auditor C. D. Criss to provide a list of all persons claiming the delinquent taxes of Senator Brice. Morgenthau, as Tax Collector, in his petition avers that he is acting in accordance with the provisions of an act of the General Assembly of Ohio, passed and taking effect April 10, 1888, according to which, and the contract made with the Commissioners of the State of Ohio, he is entitled to 20 per cent of all taxes collected through his instrumentality which have been illegally avoided, and that said act provides that upon information given, or upon belief of such omission existing, said auditor must compile and list the same.

On Aug. 10, 1888, at the instance of Morgenthau, an auditor was appointed and named on Calvin S. Brice, who was in New York, to appear before him on Aug. 28 and show why returns should not be corrected and omissions placed on the Treasurer's duplicate. This notice was duly served on Brice, personally, but he paid no attention to it, announcing that he would have the same done by his attorney.

He did not appear then nor at any time since, but instead had his attorney, John E. Richie, now Judge of the Court of Common Pleas, appear and request that the matter be laid over indefinitely. This request was kindly complied with, Auditor Criss and Brice being very good friends. Nothing was done until the day of Criss, the new Auditor, came into office, when at Morgenthau's instance a second notice was served on Brice, and stating that in default the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau.

Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau. Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau.

Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau. Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau.

Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau. Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau.

Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau. Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau.

Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau. Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau.

HIS DEAD SON A THIEF.

THIS ACCUSATION IS MADE BY FRUIT-DEALER MALLARD.

A SUIT INSTITUTED TO RECOVER THE STOLEN MONEY.

The Father, Who Employed Him, Says It Was Impossible for His Son, Out of the Small Salary He Received, to Have Saved Nearly \$3,000, Which He Had in Bank.

John Mallard was the favorite son of Frederick L. Mallard, the owner of four wholesale fruit stores in New York. In August, 1887, the young man married Mamie F. Malone, then only fifteen years old. Up to the time of his marriage he had lived at home with his parents, but soon after this event he went to housekeeping in a flat. Last June the young husband, just twenty-four years old, died. Three months later a child was born to Mrs. Mallard, but it lived only a short time.

Today a suit in Manhattan was filed in the Circuit Court by H. W. Morgenthau to require County Auditor C. D. Criss to provide a list of all persons claiming the delinquent taxes of Senator Brice. Morgenthau, as Tax Collector, in his petition avers that he is acting in accordance with the provisions of an act of the General Assembly of Ohio, passed and taking effect April 10, 1888, according to which, and the contract made with the Commissioners of the State of Ohio, he is entitled to 20 per cent of all taxes collected through his instrumentality which have been illegally avoided, and that said act provides that upon information given, or upon belief of such omission existing, said auditor must compile and list the same.

On Aug. 10, 1888, at the instance of Morgenthau, an auditor was appointed and named on Calvin S. Brice, who was in New York, to appear before him on Aug. 28 and show why returns should not be corrected and omissions placed on the Treasurer's duplicate. This notice was duly served on Brice, personally, but he paid no attention to it, announcing that he would have the same done by his attorney.

He did not appear then nor at any time since, but instead had his attorney, John E. Richie, now Judge of the Court of Common Pleas, appear and request that the matter be laid over indefinitely. This request was kindly complied with, Auditor Criss and Brice being very good friends. Nothing was done until the day of Criss, the new Auditor, came into office, when at Morgenthau's instance a second notice was served on Brice, and stating that in default the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau.

Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau. Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau.

Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau. Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau.

Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau. Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau.

Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau. Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau.

Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau. Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau.

HIS DEAD SON A THIEF.

THIS ACCUSATION IS MADE BY FRUIT-DEALER MALLARD.

A SUIT INSTITUTED TO RECOVER THE STOLEN MONEY.

The Father, Who Employed Him, Says It Was Impossible for His Son, Out of the Small Salary He Received, to Have Saved Nearly \$3,000, Which He Had in Bank.

John Mallard was the favorite son of Frederick L. Mallard, the owner of four wholesale fruit stores in New York. In August, 1887, the young man married Mamie F. Malone, then only fifteen years old. Up to the time of his marriage he had lived at home with his parents, but soon after this event he went to housekeeping in a flat. Last June the young husband, just twenty-four years old, died. Three months later a child was born to Mrs. Mallard, but it lived only a short time.

Today a suit in Manhattan was filed in the Circuit Court by H. W. Morgenthau to require County Auditor C. D. Criss to provide a list of all persons claiming the delinquent taxes of Senator Brice. Morgenthau, as Tax Collector, in his petition avers that he is acting in accordance with the provisions of an act of the General Assembly of Ohio, passed and taking effect April 10, 1888, according to which, and the contract made with the Commissioners of the State of Ohio, he is entitled to 20 per cent of all taxes collected through his instrumentality which have been illegally avoided, and that said act provides that upon information given, or upon belief of such omission existing, said auditor must compile and list the same.

On Aug. 10, 1888, at the instance of Morgenthau, an auditor was appointed and named on Calvin S. Brice, who was in New York, to appear before him on Aug. 28 and show why returns should not be corrected and omissions placed on the Treasurer's duplicate. This notice was duly served on Brice, personally, but he paid no attention to it, announcing that he would have the same done by his attorney.

He did not appear then nor at any time since, but instead had his attorney, John E. Richie, now Judge of the Court of Common Pleas, appear and request that the matter be laid over indefinitely. This request was kindly complied with, Auditor Criss and Brice being very good friends. Nothing was done until the day of Criss, the new Auditor, came into office, when at Morgenthau's instance a second notice was served on Brice, and stating that in default the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau.

Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau. Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau.

Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau. Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau.

Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau. Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau.

Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau. Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau.

Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau. Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau.

HIS DEAD SON A THIEF.

THIS ACCUSATION IS MADE BY FRUIT-DEALER MALLARD.

A SUIT INSTITUTED TO RECOVER THE STOLEN MONEY.

The Father, Who Employed Him, Says It Was Impossible for His Son, Out of the Small Salary He Received, to Have Saved Nearly \$3,000, Which He Had in Bank.

John Mallard was the favorite son of Frederick L. Mallard, the owner of four wholesale fruit stores in New York. In August, 1887, the young man married Mamie F. Malone, then only fifteen years old. Up to the time of his marriage he had lived at home with his parents, but soon after this event he went to housekeeping in a flat. Last June the young husband, just twenty-four years old, died. Three months later a child was born to Mrs. Mallard, but it lived only a short time.

Today a suit in Manhattan was filed in the Circuit Court by H. W. Morgenthau to require County Auditor C. D. Criss to provide a list of all persons claiming the delinquent taxes of Senator Brice. Morgenthau, as Tax Collector, in his petition avers that he is acting in accordance with the provisions of an act of the General Assembly of Ohio, passed and taking effect April 10, 1888, according to which, and the contract made with the Commissioners of the State of Ohio, he is entitled to 20 per cent of all taxes collected through his instrumentality which have been illegally avoided, and that said act provides that upon information given, or upon belief of such omission existing, said auditor must compile and list the same.

On Aug. 10, 1888, at the instance of Morgenthau, an auditor was appointed and named on Calvin S. Brice, who was in New York, to appear before him on Aug. 28 and show why returns should not be corrected and omissions placed on the Treasurer's duplicate. This notice was duly served on Brice, personally, but he paid no attention to it, announcing that he would have the same done by his attorney.

He did not appear then nor at any time since, but instead had his attorney, John E. Richie, now Judge of the Court of Common Pleas, appear and request that the matter be laid over indefinitely. This request was kindly complied with, Auditor Criss and Brice being very good friends. Nothing was done until the day of Criss, the new Auditor, came into office, when at Morgenthau's instance a second notice was served on Brice, and stating that in default the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau.

Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau. Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau.

Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau. Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau.

Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau. Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau.

Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau. Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau.

Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau. Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau.

HIS DEAD SON A THIEF.

THIS ACCUSATION IS MADE BY FRUIT-DEALER MALLARD.

A SUIT INSTITUTED TO RECOVER THE STOLEN MONEY.

The Father, Who Employed Him, Says It Was Impossible for His Son, Out of the Small Salary He Received, to Have Saved Nearly \$3,000, Which He Had in Bank.

HIS DEAD SON A THIEF.

THIS ACCUSATION IS MADE BY FRUIT-DEALER MALLARD.

A SUIT INSTITUTED TO RECOVER THE STOLEN MONEY.

The Father, Who Employed Him, Says It Was Impossible for His Son, Out of the Small Salary He Received, to Have Saved Nearly \$3,000, Which He Had in Bank.

HIS DEAD SON A THIEF.

THIS ACCUSATION IS MADE BY FRUIT-DEALER MALLARD.

A SUIT INSTITUTED TO RECOVER THE STOLEN MONEY.

The Father, Who Employed Him, Says It Was Impossible for His Son, Out of the Small Salary He Received, to Have Saved Nearly \$3,000, Which He Had in Bank.

HIS DEAD SON A THIEF.

THIS ACCUSATION IS MADE BY FRUIT-DEALER MALLARD.

A SUIT INSTITUTED TO RECOVER THE STOLEN MONEY.

The Father, Who Employed Him, Says It Was Impossible for His Son, Out of the Small Salary He Received, to Have Saved Nearly \$3,000, Which He Had in Bank.

HIS DEAD SON A THIEF.

THIS ACCUSATION IS MADE BY FRUIT-DEALER MALLARD.

A SUIT INSTITUTED TO RECOVER THE STOLEN MONEY.

The Father, Who Employed Him, Says It Was Impossible for His Son, Out of the Small Salary He Received, to Have Saved Nearly \$3,000, Which He Had in Bank.

HIS DEAD SON A THIEF.

THIS ACCUSATION IS MADE BY FRUIT-DEALER MALLARD.

A SUIT INSTITUTED TO RECOVER THE STOLEN MONEY.

The Father, Who Employed Him, Says It Was Impossible for His Son, Out of the Small Salary He Received, to Have Saved Nearly \$3,000, Which He Had in Bank.

HIS DEAD SON A THIEF.

THIS ACCUSATION IS MADE BY FRUIT-DEALER MALLARD.

A SUIT INSTITUTED TO RECOVER THE STOLEN MONEY.

The Father, Who Employed Him, Says It Was Impossible for His Son, Out of the Small Salary He Received, to Have Saved Nearly \$3,000, Which He Had in Bank.

John Mallard was the favorite son of Frederick L. Mallard, the owner of four wholesale fruit stores in New York. In August, 1887, the young man married Mamie F. Malone, then only fifteen years old. Up to the time of his marriage he had lived at home with his parents, but soon after this event he went to housekeeping in a flat. Last June the young husband, just twenty-four years old, died. Three months later a child was born to Mrs. Mallard, but it lived only a short time.

Today a suit in Manhattan was filed in the Circuit Court by H. W. Morgenthau to require County Auditor C. D. Criss to provide a list of all persons claiming the delinquent taxes of Senator Brice. Morgenthau, as Tax Collector, in his petition avers that he is acting in accordance with the provisions of an act of the General Assembly of Ohio, passed and taking effect April 10, 1888, according to which, and the contract made with the Commissioners of the State of Ohio, he is entitled to 20 per cent of all taxes collected through his instrumentality which have been illegally avoided, and that said act provides that upon information given, or upon belief of such omission existing, said auditor must compile and list the same.

On Aug. 10, 1888, at the instance of Morgenthau, an auditor was appointed and named on Calvin S. Brice, who was in New York, to appear before him on Aug. 28 and show why returns should not be corrected and omissions placed on the Treasurer's duplicate. This notice was duly served on Brice, personally, but he paid no attention to it, announcing that he would have the same done by his attorney.

He did not appear then nor at any time since, but instead had his attorney, John E. Richie, now Judge of the Court of Common Pleas, appear and request that the matter be laid over indefinitely. This request was kindly complied with, Auditor Criss and Brice being very good friends. Nothing was done until the day of Criss, the new Auditor, came into office, when at Morgenthau's instance a second notice was served on Brice, and stating that in default the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau.

Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau. Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau.

Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau. Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau.

Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau. Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau.

Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau. Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau.

Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau. Brice and Corcoran, the defendant named in the petition, were both in New York at the time the Auditor would proceed to assess and correct the tax duplicate on evidence furnished by Morgenthau.

HIS DEAD SON A THIEF.

THIS ACCUSATION IS MADE BY FRUIT-DEALER MALLARD.

A SUIT INSTITUTED TO RECOVER THE STOLEN MONEY.

The Father, Who Employed Him, Says It Was Impossible for His Son, Out of the Small Salary He Received, to Have Saved Nearly \$3,000, Which He Had in Bank.

HIS DEAD SON A THIEF.

THIS ACCUSATION IS MADE BY FRUIT-DEALER MALLARD.

A SUIT INSTITUTED TO RECOVER THE STOLEN MONEY.

The Father, Who Employed Him, Says It Was Impossible for His Son, Out of the Small Salary He Received, to Have Saved Nearly \$3,000, Which He Had in Bank.

HIS DEAD SON A THIEF.

THIS ACCUSATION IS MADE BY FRUIT-DEALER MALLARD.