

LATE NEWS BY WIRE

Mr. Hurst Notified of His Nomination. Mr. Hurst was notified of his nomination for governor by the committee of the democratic state convention this morning.

MONTGOMERY COUNTY REPUBLICANS

The Object of Senator Brice in Ohio. Senator Brice is in Ohio on a tour of inspection, and is expected to return to the state capital in a few days.

THE POLITICAL FIELD

Special Dispatch to The Evening Star. BALTIMORE, Md., August 8.—Mr. John E. Hurst was officially notified of his nomination for governor by the committee of the democratic state convention this morning.

When the committee called on Mr. Hurst in the counting room of his Hopkins place establishment, they found the nominee in his shirt sleeves, and up to the elbows in work.

Mr. Hurst greeted his visitors cordially and put on his coat during the ceremony of notification, at the close of which he accepted the nomination, and informed the committee that he would send them his official letter of acceptance in a few days, and that he would outline his course in case of his election in that letter.

As soon as the committee had withdrawn Mr. Hurst was interviewed in the street by a reporter, and he stated that he was very deep in the business of the Hurst-Purnell Company again.

The attitude of State Senator Thomas G. Hayes was not changed in the slightest degree, and he is, if anything, more outspoken than ever in his expressions of indignation against Senator Brice for the latter's desertion of him prior to the convening of the delegates to the democratic state convention.

Trying to Placate Hayes. All efforts to placate Mr. Hayes have proved ignominious failures, and the stand taken by him is occasioning the bosses no little anxiety.

The latest overtures for reconciliation were made by Mr. Brice, but were spurned by the disappointed aspirant for the nomination.

The mission of conciliation was intrusted to ex-Governor Elihu Jackson, who called on Mr. Hayes, and met with the chilled kind of a reception.

Not only did Mr. Hayes refuse to consider the overtures, but he insisted that Mr. Brice was the traitor to his (Hayes) cause in so far as he had deserted him prior to the convening of the delegates to the democratic state convention.

The contest among the republicans as the time for their state convention approaches is going on in a most exciting manner, and the Lowndes and Malster factions are outdoing each other in the extravagance of their claims.

The popular belief is that Mr. Malster will receive the nomination on the first ballot, as those in charge of his interests are much more astute than the managers of the Malster faction.

Awaiting the Primaries. Both sides are eagerly awaiting the primaries, which will be held in Baltimore on Monday, when a bitter and exciting contest is assured.

The Malster men claim twenty-one votes, and the Lowndes faction is out with a like claim, and no little trouble will ensue in case any crooked work is undertaken.

It is probably the hardest primary fight the city has ever witnessed, with the result in doubt. The Lowndes people "have the window," and thus the inside track.

IN MONTGOMERY COUNTY

Republicans Likely to Indorse Mr. Malster. Special Dispatch to The Evening Star.

ROCKFORD, Ill., August 8.—Promptly at 10 o'clock today Chairman R. H. Miles of the republican central committee of Montgomery county called the county convention to order.

Mr. Thos. C. Noyes was unanimously elected chairman of the convention and was called to the chair. Mr. Noyes, in his speech of acceptance, predicted for the republican party of Maryland a decided victory.

William F. Proctor and Ignatius Belt were appointed secretaries of the meeting.

A committee, composed of one delegate from each of the thirteen districts in the county, was appointed to draw up resolutions to be presented to the convention, and to select delegates to both the state and judicial conventions.

The judicial delegates will be elected at 1 o'clock to-day, and the state convention will convene at 2 o'clock to-day.

A recess was taken at 1 o'clock to allow the committee to complete its work.

SENATOR BRICE'S OBJECT.

Wants Ohio Democrats to Declare for Sound Money. COLUMBUS, Ohio, August 8.—A very close friend of Senator Brice today said to the representative of the Associated Press, in regard to the position which the Senator occupied in the contest pending among the democrats of Ohio, that his sole object is to obtain in the coming state convention an expression for good money.

He wishes the integrity of the democratic party to be made secure. All other matters which naturally belong to the canvass going on, and matters which do not legitimately belong to it, things injected into it, are of minor importance.

So far as concerns the candidates on the state and county tickets for the members of the general assembly and the selection of United States senators, he has nothing to say, or by the people he has nothing to say in comparison with the main object to be attained, and it is not his intention to engage in any side issues merely to detract from the ultimate aim.

Out of 550 delegates elected to the state convention 400 are said by this gentleman to be for sound money.

IN A DEADLOCK.

Ballooting at Jackson, Miss., for Attorney General. JACKSON, Miss., August 8.—Representative Hall presented a lively scene this morning before 10 o'clock, when a thousand delegates to the democratic convention were on hand and working like beavers.

The seekers after the remaining offices seemed to appreciate the fact that they were entering on the home stretch and were ready for the contest.

Speculation was rife as to what had been done during the hours intervening between the meeting at 11 o'clock and the hour of meeting this morning.

It was rumored that Hudson, one of the candidates for attorney general, would withdraw early in the ballooting in favor of Johnson, but the rumor could not be verified prior to the meeting time.

Combinations of all sorts and for all offices were hinted.

Senator George, chairman of the convention, rapped sharply at 9:45 and announced that the order of business was to continue ballooting, which was taken up.

Mr. George called on Mr. Stoddard county asked the chair to find out if Adam Boyd of Neshoba, a "gold bug," was in the house, that some of the free silver people had expressed a longing to see a real live "gold bug."

Mr. Stoddard of Rankin stated that Mr. Boyd had escaped the deadlock on the attorney general still remains unbroken.

THE SUGAR HEARING

Senator Blanchard Speaks for the County. The hearing in the sugar bounty case now pending before Controller Bowler was resumed in the office rooms of the latter this morning.

Another large and interested crowd was present, among them many men prominent in public affairs. Senator Blanchard began the day's proceedings, speaking from a carefully prepared manuscript.

In substance he said that he and the gentlemen associated with him would present the argument under three general heads. They would contend, first, that the controller of the treasury is without authority to question the validity of an act of Congress; second, that the appropriation called in question is of constitutional character; third, that the no-constitutionality, strong equities existed justifying Congress in making the appropriation, and that Congress has equitable jurisdiction.

The Senator said he would address himself more particularly to the first contention, touching only in a general way upon the second and third. He would endeavor to amplify the argument upon them. He briefly referred to the sugar bounty legislation of the McKinley and Wilson tariff acts, and then to the act of Congress requiring the bounty authorized to be paid upon the presentation of such proof of manufacture and production as shall be required by the commissioner of internal revenue.

The controller, he urged, is simply a ministerial officer. He can not investigate, he can not execute the law as he finds it. The most that can be claimed for him is that he is a ministerial officer. He must execute the law as he finds it. He must execute the law as he finds it. He must execute the law as he finds it.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

After quoting numerous authorities and citing decisions, Mr. Blanchard asserted that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

THE WIRE WILL REMAIN

The Commissioners Will Not Remove Them From Widened G Street. The Commissioners will not attempt to compel the Western Union Telegraph Company to bury its overhead wires on G street when the latter is widened.

After a careful investigation of the law the Commissioners are powerless in the matter, and have no authority of law which warrants them in proceeding against the company.

Not only that, but when the street is widened the application of the telegraph company to remove its poles to the street line will be approved, for the reason that when Congress voted the appropriation to widen the street, in the absence of any specific statement, it is implied that Congress was willing that the telegraph company should maintain its overhead wires and enjoy the privileges of a utility granted by Congress.

Then, again, the law which prohibits the erection of overhead wires states specifically that no additional wires shall be erected, but that the wires already in place shall be maintained. The telegraph company does not propose, it is said, to erect any additional wires. It is said, if the company were to ask permission to change its route and put its wires along some other street, the Commissioners might, very properly, refuse the permit to string them overhead, and might compel the company to place its wires underground, if the latter had to use the street.

It is in this particular instance it is stated the Commissioners will make no further move, they nevertheless are expected to appear before the next Congress to fight before the next Congress for legislation compelling them all to go underground.

SEVERE CRITICISM OF MR. BOWLER

Income Tax Law Cited as a Comparison. The hearing in the sugar bounty case now pending before Controller Bowler was resumed in the office rooms of the latter this morning.

Another large and interested crowd was present, among them many men prominent in public affairs. Senator Blanchard began the day's proceedings, speaking from a carefully prepared manuscript.

In substance he said that he and the gentlemen associated with him would present the argument under three general heads. They would contend, first, that the controller of the treasury is without authority to question the validity of an act of Congress; second, that the appropriation called in question is of constitutional character; third, that the no-constitutionality, strong equities existed justifying Congress in making the appropriation, and that Congress has equitable jurisdiction.

The Senator said he would address himself more particularly to the first contention, touching only in a general way upon the second and third. He would endeavor to amplify the argument upon them. He briefly referred to the sugar bounty legislation of the McKinley and Wilson tariff acts, and then to the act of Congress requiring the bounty authorized to be paid upon the presentation of such proof of manufacture and production as shall be required by the commissioner of internal revenue.

The controller, he urged, is simply a ministerial officer. He can not investigate, he can not execute the law as he finds it. The most that can be claimed for him is that he is a ministerial officer. He must execute the law as he finds it. He must execute the law as he finds it.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

After quoting numerous authorities and citing decisions, Mr. Blanchard asserted that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.

Mr. Blanchard contended that the person holding the office of controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer. He contended that the controller is not a ministerial officer, but a subordinate executive officer.