Norvell Atkinson, Irving E. Campbell, R. T. Irvine, Joseph E. Willard, James Lewis Anderson, B. P. Alsop, Jr., John A. Lamb, C. Manning, Jr., John S. Eggleston, Lewis C. Williams, E. P. Cox, Ordway Puller, Cunningham Hall, George C. Gregory, Colonel Miles Cary, Hunsdon Cary, Senator C. T. Lassiter, John Pickrell, Irving Weisiger, John L. Graves, Jonathan Bryan, W. Brydon Tennant, Allan Talbott, John B. Young, J. C. Taylor, W. C. Bentley, E. T. Crump, Henry Taylor, W. Crump Tucker, Julien Gunn, John B. Minor, Jr., Dr. John P. Davidson, W. Gray Watson, C. H. Bosley, C. C. Taliaferro, Dr. R. S. Powell.

FULL PROCEEDINGS OF NIGHT'S SESSION

Mr. Stuart, Chief Witness, Tells Why the Lanier Charges Were Not Made Public.

The committee met at three o'clock in the afternoon, but at once adjourned until eight o'clock last night when the session began with Commissioner Stuart on the stand.

Mr. Byrd (chairman)—

Mr. Stuart, will you continue your statement?

Mr. Stuart—

In my testimony yesterday, when I suspended, I had just reached the point where Mr. Fairfax and I consulted Mr. Hunton on the 17th day of May, regarding the request of Mr. Royall, asking us to furnish him a copy of the "charges" made by Mr. Upshur against Major Lanier. Mr. Hunton had advised that the "charges" were "privileged," and that I had determined to request Mr. Upshur to allow us to furnish the charges. We agreed, Mr. Fairfax and I, to get Mr. Upshur to agree to allow us to furnish the "charges" to Mr. Royall.

Ques. Was Judge Crump present?

Ans. No he was out of the city. Mr. Royall, on the 19th sent us another letter, Mr. Fairfax then was out of town, but Judge Crump who had returned, and I agreed to go ahead in the matter without Mr. Fairfax, as I knew how Mr. Fairfax felt. Mr. Upshur seemed to think that the manner in which we had asked for Major Lanier's resignation, did him (Upshur) an injustice. Major Lanier's counsel also objected to the manner in which his client had been dismissed.

Would Not Be Harsh.

"We did not desire to deal harshly with Major Lanier, nor did we desire to injure Mr. Upshur.

We called Mr. Upshur into my office, Judge Crump being with me, on the afternoon of the 19th, and stated to him that Mr. Royall had made the request that a copy of the "charges" be furnished him, and also that either Mr. Royall or Major Lanier had said that a suit for libel was to brought against him. Mr. Upshur then said to me:

"Mr. Stuart, do you know what I would have done had I been a member of this commission and Mr. Royall had come here and asked for a copy of a privileged communication?"

I paused, but said nothing.

Mr. Upshur continued:

"I would have shown him the door."

I then asked Mr. Upshur if he would be willing to make certain "eliminations" from his charges, cutting out the denunciatory parts and leaving only the "charges."

Mr. Upshur replied: "I would do anything in the world for you, but that I cannot do."

"He seemed, however, to be willing to agree to consider what we wished, and asked me to take a pencil and mark out the parts of the charges that I thought should be stricken out.

What Was Marked Out.

"I did strike out certain parts. What I suggested was that there should be stricken out all denunciations, epithets, conclusions of his own and expressions of opinion. I did strike out these, and Mr. Upshur took the paper and said he would consider the matter and let me hear from him.

"When we discussed the matter I advised leaving out these sentences, as they were merely denunciatory expressions of personal opinion:

"To my mind, unless at once corrected, the existing state of affairs will not only bring this commission into contempt and disrepute, but will be a stain upon the fair name of the State, the commissioners and the Governor. I wish it to be distinctly understod that no personal feeling other than contempt and abhorrence is animating me in making this report, which is to be construed as official only, and to lay the several matters before you, and to express my loathing and contempt and most outraged sense of proprieties, and to lay bare the most flagrant malfeasance of office which has ever come to my personal notice."

"As to the following sentences, he feigned surprise at my refusal, and as an inducement had the audacity to tell me that Judge Crump, the chairman of this commission, had gone over the matter with him in all its details and not only approved of the scheme, but would become financially interested in it and lend it his support and give it his assistance. You may imagine that I did not believe this statement, for it was too monstrous to give to it even a passing thought."

I said to him: "Mr. Upshur, such language is not only the expression of your own opinion, but of an entirely erroneous one, for Judge Crump is financially interested and a stockholder in the Virginia Corporation Company."

Expression of Opinion.

"Again I advised leaving out this expression of opinion."

The confidence thus reposed in him by the chairman of the commission was immediately betrayed by at once beginning the prostitution of his public office to his private gain, and to the detriment of similarly chartered companies, and placing himself and the Virginia Corporation Company, Incorporated, in the attitude of a bandit, holding up for tribute any one that he might be able to draw into his net.

And also those in which he referred to Mr. Tyler on the ground that his charges had nothing to do with other members of the office force. For much the same reason I wished to eliminate the references to Mr. Upshur's opinion of what Messrs. W. R. Meredith, W. H. Sands or H. W. Anderson would do if they were informed of the existing condition of affairs."

"I made these suggestions because I thought the original 'charges' would get Mr. Upshur into trouble. I will add that my relation with Mr. Upshur was not of such a kind that I would have made him a confidant, if I had had anything to conceal."

Mr. Upshur's Reply.

We heard nothing from our suggestions until May 22d. I would like to say that these suggestions of mine were only suggestions, and may not have been complete, although I looked over the paper carefully. On May 22d I received the following letter:

State Corporation Commission:

Gentlemen,—Referring to my personal interview on the afternoon of May 19th with Chairman Crump and Commissioner Stuart:

In that interview these gentlemen suggested to me that I eliminate certain portions of my report of April 17th and stated that Major Lanier, by his counsel, Mr. W. L. Royall, may institute a suit for damages, based upon certain statements made by me in my privileged communications, as your clerk, to you, as commissioners of the State Corporation Commission, charging him with malfeasance in office.

I have considered the situation carefully.

I do not see how it is possible, at this late date, and after action has been taken by you on my communications above referred to, resulting in your request for Major Lanier's resignation as first assistant clerk of this commission, for me to make any change or modification.

I still hold the opinions as therein expressed, and any modification of my charges or remarks at this time would destroy the integrity and change the character of my reports which preceded the action you subsequently took, and which action I have already protested against.

If reports, modified as Mr. Stuart suggested, were filed by Major Lanier's counsel in his declaration, I could not then swear that they were the reports I made to you.

The reasons animating me, and as expressed in my reports to you remain unchanged and the elimination of the portions indicated would evidence an indecision or doubt on my part, which I do not feel.

The reports, and comments regarding the others named, I cannot find any excuse for modifying, but, on the contrary, my indignation against them, due to their acts subsequent to my reports, has intensified.

If, therefore, you feel that you are caled upon to assist Major Lanier in this matter by furnishing him copy of my reports, I greatly prefer that they be given in full, as originally written.

I have duly considered the consequences if publicity is given this matter in the courts, the possibility of which you have suggested.

I cannot feel, however, that my duty to the State should cause me to be guilty of an act which might be characterized as cowardly, and in a court of justice would place me in a false position.

The copy of my report of April 17th, which I forwarded to Commissioner Stuart on that date, and which he voluntarily handed to me on the 19th instant, after marking the objectionable portions, I have attached to a copy of this letter, which I enclose to Commissioner Stuart.

With great regret that I cannot meet your views and act upon your suggestions, I am, Very respectfully,

JOHN A. UPSHUR,
Clerk State Corporation Commission.

Asked Upshur to Correct It.

Reading that letter, it occurred to me that it was offensive. We had only suggested, and had made no demand on Major Lanier, as I said. I was somewhat surprised at the tone of the letter. We (Judge Crump and I) sent for Mr. Upshur and reminded him that we had no desire to help Major Lanier, and said to him that perhaps, unintentionally, his letter was offensive and desired him to correct it. He said: "I will correct it, as far as I can," or something like that.

Question by Mr. Byrd—What eliminations did he object to?

Ans. He said he did not desire to mutilate a report, which he said was correct. The mutilated report, he said, would not be a correct report.

Mr. Stuart then read a second letter from Mr. Upshur, in which the chief clerk stated his reasons in full for not desiring to "eliminate." This letter has already been printed in The Times-Dispatch.

His Letter to Upshur.

Mr. Stuart, continuing, said: After receiving that letter of May 23d, Judge Crump and I, feeling that the matter was not exactly as clear as it might be regarding the suggestions we had made to Mr. Upshur, sent him a letter of the 25th. I dictated this letter, and when Mr. Upshur states that Mr. Fairfax told him that Judge Crump had written the ter, which was as follows:

Richmond, May 25, 1905.

Mr. John A. Upshur, Richmond, Va.:

Dear Sir,—Referring to your communication of May 22d, and to your supplementary communication of May 23d, we wish to state that there seems to be a misconception on your part in both of these communications of the exact facts and circumstances referred to. Your first communication was evidently written under misapprehension that we desired you to make some changes or modifications of your charges against A. S. Lanier. Such was not the case, and we note your statement in your second communication that no such request was made by us. That our view of the facts and circumstances may be thoroughly understood, we have stated them, which are as follows:

On the evening of May 19th we called you into our office and informed you that Mr. Royall, claiming to represent A. S. Lanier as his counsel, had served a paper upon the members of the commission, in which he demanded, or requested, a copy of the charges preferred by you as clerk against A. S. Lanier, as first assistant clerk.

We stated to you that inasmuch as a considerable portion of your report of April 17th was in the nature of denunciations and mere expressions of opinions, that it might be well that only such part of that report be furnished to Mr. Royall as was in the nature of specific charges, and stated further that Mr. Royall had not called for a copy of your report, but had called for charges contained therein, and for that reason there was no propriety in furnishing him anything else.

It was further stated to you by us that if you preferred that the entire report should be delivered to Mr. Royall that your wishes in that regard should be respected, and that our suggestions were, to some extent, prompted by the consideration that in the event of litigation between you and Mr. Lanier, it would be much better for you to stand on the charges preferred against Lanier, which charges, it seemed to us, so far as we have investigated, you would be able to sustain. We further stated that it was at least bad policy to deliver to Mr. Royall anything more than he had demanded.

By way of illustration of our meaning, Commissioner Stuart marked certain passages coming under the head of denunciations and expressions of opinion to be cut out, and marked other portions which, as we thought, unnecessarily involved other employes of the office, who were not on trial in this particular case, with the suggestion that they be so modified as to these parties as not to bring them into Major Lanier's case, it being understood, of course, that these charges were duly considered against the parties on their own account and were to be dealt with accordingly.

In your reply of May 22d you have shown a manifest misapprehension of the spirit and purport of our suggestions, which you have corrected to some extent in your communication of May 23d. We wish to say as to our interview held with us on May 22d at noon, which you refer to in your communication of May 23d, that you are laboring under some misapprehension also as to that conversation.

You will, we think, recall the fact that we explained to you fully that in any communication that we might make in response to Mr. Royall's demand for the charges, we would state that a report had been made by you, and that the charges were a part of that report, and that there could be no possible objection either from your standpoint or from Major Lanier's, to the course which we suggested, since it would appear on the face of our communication that the charges were a part of a report, which report we thought best not to present in its original form for the reasons above stated.

It is proper to state that both of the conversation above referred to were held at a time when we were uncertain as to what part of your report should be furnished Mr. Royall, or, in fact, as to whether any of it should be furnished him, and, before taking any action in the matter, is seemed proper to us that your wishes should be consulted, in dealing with a paper from you as clerk to us as commissioners.

The whole object of the two interviews, as was stated to you several times, was that your report might be reduced to specific charges, no charges to be omitted, in order that we might deal with the exact request made to us by Mr. Royall.

In view of all the facts and circumstances attending our interviews and your communications relative thereto, we feel that we should, as we now do, withdraw all suggestions heretofore made in regard to this matter.

Yours truly,

BEVERLY T. CRUMP,
H. C. STUART.

Mr. Fairfax had returned when this letter was written. It was submitted to him and he endorsed upon it that he concurred in the decision of the commission. He then took the letter and delivered it to Mr. Upshur at his desk.

Referred to Attorney-General.

About this time it occurred to us that we had an attorney-general, and that we ought to refer this question to him. Accordingly we submitted the whole matter to Attorney-General Anderson, who gave as his opinion that the communication from Mr. Upshur was clearly a privileged communication, and not a public record. The letter of the Corporation Commission to Attorney-General Anderson and his reply thereto have already been printed in The Times-Dispatch.

"When we got this opinion," continued Mr. Stuart, "we felt that it would be absolutely improper to deliver the charges to Mr. Royall. On the day we received the opinion of the Attorney-General we received another letter from Mr. Upshur, a rehash of the various questions about which we had been corresponding. (This letter was not read.) After we received the Attorney-General's opinion and gave it careful consideration, we determined to make a reply to Mr. Royall's request, which was in these words:

"'Under all the circumstances of this case, Mr. Lanier most respectfully insists that the commission shall either recall its demand for his resignation or furnish him with a complete copy of the charges that have been made against him, and set a day for a formal public hearing upon them.'

Letter to Mr. Upshur.

"On the same day we addressed a communication to Mr. Upshur, enclosing him a copy of the attorney-general's opinion, and a copy of our letter to Mr. Royall. We also wrote him the following letter:

Richmond, May, 20, 1905.

John A. Upshur, Esq., Richmond, Va.:

Dear Sir,—You will find enclosed herewith copy of a letter addressed by the commission to W. L. Royall, Esq., attorney for A. S. Lanier, from which you will observe that the commission has declined to furnish him a copy of the report made by you as chief clerk, containing charges against Mr. Lanier, first assistant clerk.

We note in a communication addressed by you to the commission, under date of May 25th, that you quote in full a letter addressed to you by A. S. Lanier, in which letter Mr. Lanier calls on you for a copy of the charges made against him to the commission. In view of the fact that you may hesitate to furnish a copy of this report to Mr. Lanier, because it was an official communication, addressed to the commission, it is the desire of the commission that you shall feel entirely at liberty to furnish Mr. Lanier with a copy of this report if you desire to do so.

Yours very truly,

(Signed by members of Corporation Commission.)

This letter was the only one withheld from the press through a desire not to embarrass Mr. Upshur by letting it be known that he could give out the charges if he chose.

"We felt that under the advice of the Attorney-General the commission should bear the responsibility, and we have done it ever since."

"Mr. Upshur was the only man in this State or any State who had the legal and moral right to make the charges public, and HE DIDN'T DO IT."

I don't recall anything else. I have stated everything I can remember, but I will be glad to answer any questions.

Why Not Investigated.

Ques. by Mr. Byrd: I see that Mr. Upshur filed his report containing these charges on April 17th; that subsequent to that time you called Mr. Lanier and others into your room and discussed these matters. Both Lanier and Upshur demanded an investigation. Why did you not go into it?

Ans.: For the reason that Major Lanier was the witness who convinced us by his own testimony that he ought to go, and we did not think an investigation necessary.

Ques.: Do you not think it would have been fairer to Major Lanier to have confronted him with the witnesses?

Ans.: If we had seen then what we see now, I think we would have given the charges to Major Lanier.

Ques.: When you called Major Lanier in, was Judge Crump present?

Ans.: Yes, he was.

Ques. Did Judge Crump tell you at that time that he was a stockholder in the Virginia Corporation Company?

Ans. He did not.

Ques. Did Judge Crump concur in the order, dismissing Lanier?

Ans. He wrote the order—Mr. Fairfax and I concurred.

Ques. Did Judge Crump tell you that he held stock in the Virginia Corporation Company?

Ans. He did not. We first learned that Judge Crump was a stockholder when Mr. Royall told us.

No Consternation.

Ques. Did this communication of Mr. Royall, which it has been said, special consternation on the commission, state that Judge Crump had given authority for the Virginia Corporation Company.

Ans. I won't admit that there was any consternation in the commission at any time.

Ques. I am simply reciting what the witness said—Had Major Lanier any official connection with the Virginia Corporation Company while he was employed by the commission?

Ans. I do not know. He has stated what his connection with that Company were.

Ques. Assuming that the charges were intemperate, was there any reason why he should not have had the charges read to him before he threatened suit?

Ans. I think he did have them read to him practically.

Ques. Was this charge read to him (quoting from charge)?

He Feigned Surprise.

Ans. I don't think it was. I don't consider that a charge. If it is, I have a very incorrect idea of what a charge is. There was no concerted action in the commission in going over the charges. We never read them together at all, and they were taken up in the manner I have indicated.

Ques. Do you not consider it a charge?

Ans. It may be a charge, but I do not so consider it. I can point out other charges.

Mr. Stuart then read several charges from the original paper.

Ques. Do you consider these charges (read "bandit" paragraph)?

Ans. I consider it a denunciation.

Ques. Your suggestions were, then, to protect Mr. Upshur?

Ans. I have already stated so on oath.

Ques. Was Upshur ever invited to meet you in Mr. Hunton's office.

have been.

Mr. Stuart then explained conference in Mr. Hunton's office.

Charges Stated to Lanier.

Question by Senator Sears—When you gentlemen had Major Lanier come into your office, you went over enough of the charges with him to acquaint him with what the charges were?

Ans. We did, and he admitted all that he has admitted here.

Ques. If you had not been satisfied you would have called witnesses, would you not?

Ans. Certainly, we would. We felt that we were the proper judges as to whether or not Major Lanier should be removed. He seemed to think he had the right to demand a public trial. We did not think so.

Question by Mr. Hunton—After your conversation with Major Lanier, did he admit that he had been wrong?

Ans. He never admitted that he had done wrong, but he did admit that he understood that he had embarrassed the commission, and said that if he remained with the commission he would not again act as he had done.

Dismissed Because of Conduct.

Question by Judge Sims—Was it Major Lanier's conduct or connection with the Virginia Corporation Company that led to his dismissal?

Ans. His conduct.

Ques. Please state instances.

Ans. I think it would be intolerable for an official of the Corporation Commission to solicit clients from those appearing before the body as citizens.

Here Major Lanier jumped to his feet and asked to be heard. Chairman Byrd said: "We will hear you later."

Continuing Mr. Stuart said: "We thought that it was wrong for him to send out notices to companies offering to reduce their taxes. We feel that the affairs of this company were entirely too mixed with the affairs of the commission."

Question by Senator Sims—How do you consider the connection of Judge Crump with the Virginia Corporation Company?

"As a most unfortunate indiscretion, and one into which a man of a different temperament would not have been ensnared—I should have said, drawn."

Unfortunate Indiscretion.

By Mr. Sims:

Ques. Was it thought by the commission that Judge Crump approved of this conduct of Major Lanier or that it was known to him?

Ans. Well, I want to make this statement: The commission had given a great deal of very serious thought along that line, and I suppose it is better for me to make a very full and absolutely frank statement at this point. And I want to preface it by saying that it is the conclusion reached by myself and my colleague, Mr. Fairfax, reached at the time when it was most under consideration.

We felt that the conduct as charged by Mr. Upshur, and to some extent, admitted by Major Lanier, constituted an offense, an offense against the commission, an offense committed by its officers in the interest of this Virginia Corporation Company, and that was such an offense as that we deemed it proper that we should ask the resignation of these gentlemen. I have not gone into particulars as to the magnitude of that offense. I think the public mind is somewhat inflamed even on that. But I say it was not proper, and it was wrong, and whether the emoluments were large or not did not effect the principle—measured in dollars and cents, it would have always been a small affair.

But aside from that, Judge Crump owned a share of stock in this company. The question is, what amount of censure should be visited upon a man for the ownership of a share of stock in this company. As I understand it, Judge Crump's offense, if any, begins and ends with the ownership of that share of stock. So far as we know and believe, he was a silent stockholder in that company; by silent, I mean that he was not an active stockholder in that company.

Now, I want to express my opinion, the opinion that I have expressed, to Judge Crump and have expressed to Judge Crump's friends, and have never concealed from anybody with whom I have discussed the subject, that it was an unfortunate indiscretion of Judge Crump even to be a stockholder in this company—a most unfortunate indiscretion, and one that a man of a different temperament from Judge Crump would have never been caught in. I have used the wrong word there—would never have allowed himself to drift into.

Why Crump Took Stock.

"I think, from my study of Judge Crump, that he is not a man that looks very closely at the financial side of anything from a practical standpoint.

I think he was completely absorbed with the idea that some company ought to be organized to do this charter work and take the burden off of him; he had been harping on that and talking about it for weeks and months, that so much work came to the commission which the commission had to perform that ought to be performed by somebody else; and I think that he was so taken up with that side of the question that it absolutely obscured any other question involved, even the consideration of the propriety of his owning a share of that stock.

Now, as we consider it and believe that was the beginning and end of Judge Crump's offense, if any. I don't know what word to use. I do not intend to use it in any unkind way. I thought over it; my friend, Mr. Fairfax, thought over it. We were distressed, of course; distressed because of the high esteem we had for Judge Crump, that he had put himself in a position to be criticised, and, in some degree, criticised with some justice in the matter of an indiscretion.

I thought, though, in the first place, of the fifty years that Judge Crump had spent in this city, where he is best known; of the fact that he was called to one of the principal judgeships of this city by a practically unanimous vote of his fellow-lawyers; of a long career, absolutely without blemish or spot, for if there was ever a pure-minded man in this State, according to the representation I have always had of Judge Crump, he is that man.

I thought of the two years of close association I have had with him; of the dealings we have had with the great public service corporations, the corporations which the law has authorized and directed this commission to regulate and control; of those great institutions and the great power that they have and the great influence that they have, and of the dealings which Judge Crump had had with them, along with his colleagues. I had seen him sit on questions involving very large amounts. I had seen him pass on delicate questions, as between the State and these great corporations. I had known that he was filled with the love of his State, and that his highest ambition was to do some honorable service for his State, and in every way I had tried him during those two years he had never failed to ring true.

No Improper Influence.

And then I thought of this little one hundred dollar stock subscription, involving relations perhaps with these industrial corporations where the commission has no authority. The relations between the Corporation Commission and these industrial companys is absolutely fixed by law. The charters which were to be granted by this so-called charter bureau are free; there is no discretion in the commission; the powers come from the general law and not from the commission; the commission deals with them ministerially. So that the relation between the commission and the industrial corporations, or the ordinary corporations were of such a character as to forbid the idea that any improper influence could arise from the mere ownership of a share of stock in this corporation company.

Now I felt that cmfwypcnfwypywp

Now I felt that such a life, and such a character, and such service to his State as I and my colleague could freely attest to, it was vain for any man to attempt to build a character if one indiscretion should weigh against it and determine that character.

I say without hesitation that I consider Judge Crump as high a man and as honorable a man as I have ever been in contact with. I feel it my duty to say it, because I believe it. I believe it in my heart and soul.

If I had believed that he had subscribed to that stock with any improper purpose, I would not for one moment have been willing to serve on the commission with him, nor would Mr. Fairfax.

Only An Indiscretion.

I admit, and admit regretfully, that it was an indiscretion, but one along a line which might have escaped the observation of other people, as well as Judge Crump. I think if he had taken time to think about it; if he could have looked into the future if he could have had demonstrated before him the possibilities which might follow from an intimate connection of that company with the affairs of the Corporation Commission, that he would never have been the owner of even one share of its stock.

It may be, gentlemen, that I have put something in the nature of a plea in this evidence. It is not so intended. It is intended, gentlemen, as evidence, and I hope you will so consider it.

Question by Mr. Byrd—It would seem that you do not believe the testimony of Major Lanier and Mr. Campbell that Judge Crump was kept advised of the affairs of the Virginia Corporation Company.

Ans. I did not hear the testimony that way.

Mr. Stuart then stood aside.

Statement By Mr. Lanier.

Major Lanier made a statement. He said that Judge Crump had told him that he must not hold office in the Virginia Corporation Company, and that he therefore did not hold office in that company. He said he had never solicited business in the office of the State Corporation Commission except once and on that occasion after he had given the visitor advice, he suggested that the visitor, who owned a newspaper, call on Mr. Campbell and secure a charter and give advertisement for the fee."

Major Lanier then began an argument.

Mr. Byrd said: "Major Lanier, I have already called your attention to the fact that you must not argue the case. If you have facts to state, state them, but without preface."

Major Lanier said: "I think it is only fair to say that I do not know if Judge Crump knew of all my acts regarding the Virginia Corporation Company. He may not have known them, but I never did anything to conceal my acts. It is my belief that I told Judge Crump of our action in seeking to reduce the taxation of industrial corporations."

Crump Did Not Know.

Mr. Campbell then went upon the stand and stated that Judge Crump was not aware of the fact that letters were copied in the office of the commission as far as he knew, nor that he (Campbell) had worked at night at the office of the commission.

Mr. Upshur: May I ask a question?

The Chairman: Yes, sir.

Mr. Upshur: What Mr. Campbell has stated is directly—

The Chairman (interrupting): You can ask a question, but you must not argue.

Mr. Upshur: "I want to ask this question: If the change in Mr. Campbell to-night from what he said and what is printed in the paper to-day is due to the interview he had with the commissioners to-day?

Mr. Lanier to Mr. Campbell: Answer it.

Mr. Campbell: I will say that I have seen no one of the commissioners to-day except as I have seen them sitting here.

Mr. Upshur: I have advices—

The Chairman (interrupting): "We don't want your advices, we want facts."

Mr. Upshur: I will produce a witness to-morrow who saw Mr. Campbell and Mr. Lanier go to the office of ——

The Chairman (interrupting): "Don't give me what he told you, bring your witness here."

Mr. Campbell: I will admit that I went to the office, but I saw none of the commission, except that I caught a glimpse of Mr. Stuart through the door when it was opened this far (indicating a few inches).

Campbell At the Office.

Major Lanier again went on the stand and said "Judge Crump told me that there was no impropriety in Mr. Campbell coming to the office of the commission at night with me, but that he thought he should not come except when an official was present."

Mr. R. T. Wilson then testified as to his relations with Mr. Upshur, which had apparently been very cool.

The committee then rose until to-day at 3 o'clock, when Judge Crump will take the stand.

Rev. Dr. P. S. Henson says the country is going insane because it refuses to take sufficient rest.

"Berry's for Clothes."

The advance samples of the new Spring Hats are ready to-day--just the experimental shapes.

If you want to be the first with a new head-piece, come right in.

Dunlap--more popular (if possible) than ever.

Stetson--soft and stiff, if you want them.

Heath--the leading English hat.

And all the other best makes from $1.50 up.

O. H. Berry & Co.
MEN'S & BOYS' OUTFITTERS

SLOAN'S LINIMENT

A Sure Remedy for Lame Back Neuralgia Sprains & Bruises

PRICE 25¢ 50¢ & $1.00

SOLD BY All Druggists

Dr. Earl S. Sloan
BOSTON MASS. U.S.A.

THE CABLE COMPANY PIANOS

$2,000,000 capital guarantees the Cable Line of Pianos.

The Highest Pinnacle of Musical Excellence

Has Been Attained by the Manufacturers of the

Mason & Hamlin ... Pianos ...

The combined skill and experience of over half century of manufacturer, by men and sons of men who have spent their lives building pianos.

The selection regardless of price of the most perfect material to be obtained for piano manufacture, the exclusive patents of the Mason & Hamlin action and various component parts, has developed the Mason & Hamlin Piano into the standard instrument which sets the measure of excellence for all other pianos.

The Mason & Hamlin tone is matchless.

The Mason & Hamlin case design is the acme of richness and dignity.

The Mason & Hamlin durability will stand any wear and tear.

The Mason & Hamlin Piano, side by side comparison, is superior to any piano manufactured in the world.

The Cable Company,
J. G. CORLEY, Manager. Richmond, Va.

QUICK LOANS

On Furniture, Pianos, &c., without removal from your possession. Lowest Rates. No Publicity.

The Weekly Payment on a Loan of—

$10	8	$ .50
$15	8	.75
$20	8	.85
$25	8	1.15
$30	8	1.35
$35	8	1.60
$40	8	1.75
$45	8	1.90
$50	8	2.15

Other companies paid off and more money advanced on easier terms.

If you cannot call personally, write or telephone, and our confidential agent will call on you.

'Phone 4312.

RICHMOND LOAN CO.
103 NORTH NINTH STREET.
Second Floor Front.

Can Cancer Be Cured? It Can.

Without the use of the knife or X-Ray we cure Cancers, Tumors and Chronic Sores, charging nothing for examination. Our patients are our best friends. Come and see the cancers we have removed and cured from our now happy patients, and are daily curing. They are wonderful. If then you are not satisfied, we will pay all your expenses.

KELLAM HOSPITAL,
1615 West Main Street,
Richmond, Va.

Roses,
Cut Flowers
and Designs.
Largest Stock.
Hammond,
Florist,
109 E. Broad St.

PHONE 392-L
DUCKHARDT STAMP & SEAL CO
RUBBER STAMPS
STENCILS AND SEALS
12 N. SEVENTH ST. RICHMOND, VA.

Now Is the Time

Chance for Profit Offered The Times-Dispatch Readers. Let No One Fail to Benefit.

Imperfect cooking and hurried eating result in indigestion. At first the stomach and digestive organs are strong enough to accommodate themselves to all manner of ill treatment, but the time soon comes, when the walls of the stomach are inflamed, and the gastric juices are not secreted in sufficient quantity to digest the food, so that it is passed through the system imperfectly digested, giving but little nutrition and strength.

If one can only recognize the symptoms of indigestion in the early stages, he is then in position to protect himself by proper attention. "He is twice armed who is fore warned."

Now is the time to be benefitted. Just as soon as you find that your food can be tasted after eating, when the abdomen swells or bloats, when the tongue is furred, the breath heavy, the appetite poor, the head dull and aching occasionally, then is the time for treatment with Mi-o-na. It costs but 50c a box.

This reliable remedy is a perfect restorer and strengthener of the whole digestive system. It restores lost functions to the stomach, strengthens the nervous system, and enables one to eat what he likes without fear of distress or trouble.

If you cannot obtain Mi-o-na of your druggist, it will be sent by mail, postpaid, on receipt of price. Sample sufficient to show its value will be forwarded on request. The R. T. Booth Co., Ithaca, N. Y.

A Perfect Combination

of Hops and Malt, cured by nine months' time. The rich, nutty flavor of the grain is peculiarly noticeable and gives a most palatable and pleasant flavor to

Fehr's Malt Tonic

Not only an invigorant of acknowledged value, but a nourishing liquid food, good alike for the sick or well. It is a builder of brain, brawn and bone. Try it today.

FOR SALE BY ALL DRUGGISTS.

FEHR'S MALT TONIC DEPT., Louisville, Ky.

TROOPS OF STATE GUARD THE CITY

(Continued From First Page.)

will be in command of the troops at Springfield.

shooting has been a feature to-night, and has added to the general terror. Two negro women, who jumped from the second story of their homes when assailed by the mobs, were seriously hurt and were taken to the hospital.

MINORITY LOSES.

Report Voted Down By Committee.

At a meeting of the House Committee on Chesapeake Bay and its Tributaries yesterday afternoon, the minority report of the Virginia delegation in the recent oyster conference with representatives of the Maryland Legislature was voted down by an overwhelming majority. The delegation was divided on the question of closing the Potomac River for two years. The minority report favored closing. The action of the committee practically makes it certain that there will be no such law enacted in the present Virginia Legislature.

A business in Australia is that of lending engagement rings and wedding trousseaus.

TO CURE A COLD IN ONE DAY.
Take LAXATIVE BROMO QUININE Tablets. Druggists refund money if it fails to cure. E. W. GROVE'S signature is on each box. 25c.