

NOT EVEN PRUDENT

ATTORNEY GENERAL CHILDS' CHARACTERIZATION OF DULUTH WATERWORKS MANAGERS.

WOULD FORFEIT A CHARTER.

HE FILES THE INFORMATION ASKED FOR BY CITY ATTORNEY BENHAM.

CAN NOT HEAR LAW POINTS.

HE SAYS, IN THE FACE OF SUCH A TERRIBLE MENACE TO THE PUBLIC HEALTH.

Duluth's water works case will go into the supreme court at once. Attorney General Childs has determined that the charges made by City Attorney Benham on behalf of the city of Duluth, are sufficient to warrant him in bringing proceedings for the forfeiture of the charter of the company and in the statement accompanying his decision, he does not mince words at all in speaking of the neglect of the officers of the company to properly care for the service they were giving the community to which they owe their franchise.

After rehearing the application and the grounds on which it is asked, he says: That the first ground is not supported strongly enough to merit serious consideration. The question of motive is dealt with as follows: "I am aware of nothing in the evidence which can seriously be urged as indicative of an unworthy motive on the part of the officers of the company to properly care for the service they were giving the community to which they owe their franchise."

The second ground is not supported strongly enough to merit serious consideration. The question of motive is dealt with as follows: "I am aware of nothing in the evidence which can seriously be urged as indicative of an unworthy motive on the part of the officers of the company to properly care for the service they were giving the community to which they owe their franchise."

The third ground is not supported strongly enough to merit serious consideration. The question of motive is dealt with as follows: "I am aware of nothing in the evidence which can seriously be urged as indicative of an unworthy motive on the part of the officers of the company to properly care for the service they were giving the community to which they owe their franchise."

The fourth ground is not supported strongly enough to merit serious consideration. The question of motive is dealt with as follows: "I am aware of nothing in the evidence which can seriously be urged as indicative of an unworthy motive on the part of the officers of the company to properly care for the service they were giving the community to which they owe their franchise."

The fifth ground is not supported strongly enough to merit serious consideration. The question of motive is dealt with as follows: "I am aware of nothing in the evidence which can seriously be urged as indicative of an unworthy motive on the part of the officers of the company to properly care for the service they were giving the community to which they owe their franchise."

The sixth ground is not supported strongly enough to merit serious consideration. The question of motive is dealt with as follows: "I am aware of nothing in the evidence which can seriously be urged as indicative of an unworthy motive on the part of the officers of the company to properly care for the service they were giving the community to which they owe their franchise."

The seventh ground is not supported strongly enough to merit serious consideration. The question of motive is dealt with as follows: "I am aware of nothing in the evidence which can seriously be urged as indicative of an unworthy motive on the part of the officers of the company to properly care for the service they were giving the community to which they owe their franchise."

The eighth ground is not supported strongly enough to merit serious consideration. The question of motive is dealt with as follows: "I am aware of nothing in the evidence which can seriously be urged as indicative of an unworthy motive on the part of the officers of the company to properly care for the service they were giving the community to which they owe their franchise."

The ninth ground is not supported strongly enough to merit serious consideration. The question of motive is dealt with as follows: "I am aware of nothing in the evidence which can seriously be urged as indicative of an unworthy motive on the part of the officers of the company to properly care for the service they were giving the community to which they owe their franchise."

The tenth ground is not supported strongly enough to merit serious consideration. The question of motive is dealt with as follows: "I am aware of nothing in the evidence which can seriously be urged as indicative of an unworthy motive on the part of the officers of the company to properly care for the service they were giving the community to which they owe their franchise."

The eleventh ground is not supported strongly enough to merit serious consideration. The question of motive is dealt with as follows: "I am aware of nothing in the evidence which can seriously be urged as indicative of an unworthy motive on the part of the officers of the company to properly care for the service they were giving the community to which they owe their franchise."

The twelfth ground is not supported strongly enough to merit serious consideration. The question of motive is dealt with as follows: "I am aware of nothing in the evidence which can seriously be urged as indicative of an unworthy motive on the part of the officers of the company to properly care for the service they were giving the community to which they owe their franchise."

The thirteenth ground is not supported strongly enough to merit serious consideration. The question of motive is dealt with as follows: "I am aware of nothing in the evidence which can seriously be urged as indicative of an unworthy motive on the part of the officers of the company to properly care for the service they were giving the community to which they owe their franchise."

The fourteenth ground is not supported strongly enough to merit serious consideration. The question of motive is dealt with as follows: "I am aware of nothing in the evidence which can seriously be urged as indicative of an unworthy motive on the part of the officers of the company to properly care for the service they were giving the community to which they owe their franchise."

The fifteenth ground is not supported strongly enough to merit serious consideration. The question of motive is dealt with as follows: "I am aware of nothing in the evidence which can seriously be urged as indicative of an unworthy motive on the part of the officers of the company to properly care for the service they were giving the community to which they owe their franchise."

The sixteenth ground is not supported strongly enough to merit serious consideration. The question of motive is dealt with as follows: "I am aware of nothing in the evidence which can seriously be urged as indicative of an unworthy motive on the part of the officers of the company to properly care for the service they were giving the community to which they owe their franchise."

The seventeenth ground is not supported strongly enough to merit serious consideration. The question of motive is dealt with as follows: "I am aware of nothing in the evidence which can seriously be urged as indicative of an unworthy motive on the part of the officers of the company to properly care for the service they were giving the community to which they owe their franchise."

The eighteenth ground is not supported strongly enough to merit serious consideration. The question of motive is dealt with as follows: "I am aware of nothing in the evidence which can seriously be urged as indicative of an unworthy motive on the part of the officers of the company to properly care for the service they were giving the community to which they owe their franchise."

The nineteenth ground is not supported strongly enough to merit serious consideration. The question of motive is dealt with as follows: "I am aware of nothing in the evidence which can seriously be urged as indicative of an unworthy motive on the part of the officers of the company to properly care for the service they were giving the community to which they owe their franchise."

The twentieth ground is not supported strongly enough to merit serious consideration. The question of motive is dealt with as follows: "I am aware of nothing in the evidence which can seriously be urged as indicative of an unworthy motive on the part of the officers of the company to properly care for the service they were giving the community to which they owe their franchise."

The twenty-first ground is not supported strongly enough to merit serious consideration. The question of motive is dealt with as follows: "I am aware of nothing in the evidence which can seriously be urged as indicative of an unworthy motive on the part of the officers of the company to properly care for the service they were giving the community to which they owe their franchise."

The twenty-second ground is not supported strongly enough to merit serious consideration. The question of motive is dealt with as follows: "I am aware of nothing in the evidence which can seriously be urged as indicative of an unworthy motive on the part of the officers of the company to properly care for the service they were giving the community to which they owe their franchise."

The twenty-third ground is not supported strongly enough to merit serious consideration. The question of motive is dealt with as follows: "I am aware of nothing in the evidence which can seriously be urged as indicative of an unworthy motive on the part of the officers of the company to properly care for the service they were giving the community to which they owe their franchise."

The twenty-fourth ground is not supported strongly enough to merit serious consideration. The question of motive is dealt with as follows: "I am aware of nothing in the evidence which can seriously be urged as indicative of an unworthy motive on the part of the officers of the company to properly care for the service they were giving the community to which they owe their franchise."

The twenty-fifth ground is not supported strongly enough to merit serious consideration. The question of motive is dealt with as follows: "I am aware of nothing in the evidence which can seriously be urged as indicative of an unworthy motive on the part of the officers of the company to properly care for the service they were giving the community to which they owe their franchise."

The twenty-sixth ground is not supported strongly enough to merit serious consideration. The question of motive is dealt with as follows: "I am aware of nothing in the evidence which can seriously be urged as indicative of an unworthy motive on the part of the officers of the company to properly care for the service they were giving the community to which they owe their franchise."

The twenty-seventh ground is not supported strongly enough to merit serious consideration. The question of motive is dealt with as follows: "I am aware of nothing in the evidence which can seriously be urged as indicative of an unworthy motive on the part of the officers of the company to properly care for the service they were giving the community to which they owe their franchise."

The twenty-eighth ground is not supported strongly enough to merit serious consideration. The question of motive is dealt with as follows: "I am aware of nothing in the evidence which can seriously be urged as indicative of an unworthy motive on the part of the officers of the company to properly care for the service they were giving the community to which they owe their franchise."

The twenty-ninth ground is not supported strongly enough to merit serious consideration. The question of motive is dealt with as follows: "I am aware of nothing in the evidence which can seriously be urged as indicative of an unworthy motive on the part of the officers of the company to properly care for the service they were giving the community to which they owe their franchise."

The thirtieth ground is not supported strongly enough to merit serious consideration. The question of motive is dealt with as follows: "I am aware of nothing in the evidence which can seriously be urged as indicative of an unworthy motive on the part of the officers of the company to properly care for the service they were giving the community to which they owe their franchise."

The thirty-first ground is not supported strongly enough to merit serious consideration. The question of motive is dealt with as follows: "I am aware of nothing in the evidence which can seriously be urged as indicative of an unworthy motive on the part of the officers of the company to properly care for the service they were giving the community to which they owe their franchise."

The thirty-second ground is not supported strongly enough to merit serious consideration. The question of motive is dealt with as follows: "I am aware of nothing in the evidence which can seriously be urged as indicative of an unworthy motive on the part of the officers of the company to properly care for the service they were giving the community to which they owe their franchise."

MILL CHIMNEY STANDS

MINNEAPOLIS' ASSESSED VALUATION IS NOT TOUCHED BY THE STATE BOARD.

DULUTH REDUCED A TENTH.

ZENITH CITY PARES BETTER THAN ITS GREATER BROTHERS INLAND.

MANY COUNTIES ARE BENEFITED

By Reductions Made in the Finishing Days of the Long Official Season.

The state board of equalization spent a hard day yesterday tinkering with the valuations in the various counties in the state, but at the end they had the consolation that they were within sight of the completion of their labors, as all that remains is the adjustment of the burden to be put upon the telegraph and telephone companies.

Hennepin county's assessment, after a long fight, was left as it was returned by the city board and the county auditor. Duluth fared even better, getting a reduction of 10 per cent in the assessor's figures.

The former city had a big delegation over to the assessor's office in order to keep itself constantly advised of the progress of the water which it distributes through its mains. Its patrons are entitled to assume that the utmost vigilance will be exercised by the assessor to guard against its impurities.

The assessor's figures, however, a serious disregard of duty in and in violation of the law, and the assessor is charged with the duty of seeing that the public welfare requires that such conduct shall be charged home to the corporation itself.

Finally, however, the board passed the figures returned. This is quite a reduction from the figures of 1894, which were reduced 5 per cent by the city board.

A number of other changes were made on the board, and the following towns and city lots, the following changes were made:

Carver county, 10 per cent increase; Dakota, increase, 5 per cent; Meeker, increase, 5 per cent; Morrison, increase, 10 per cent; Otter Tail, increase, 10 per cent; Renville, increase, 10 per cent; Rice, increase, 5 per cent; St. Louis, increase, 10 per cent; Stevens, increase, 10 per cent; Stearns, increase, 20 per cent; Stevens, increase, 15 per cent; Waseca, increase, 5 per cent; Wright, increase, 5 per cent.

In Class 7, the average value of lands per acre, the increases formerly decided upon by the board were taken off in the following counties:

Atkin, Anoka, Fillmore, Grant, Le Sueur, Marshall, Martin, Pipestone, Polk, Miller, Sacer, Sherburne, Traverse, Waseca, Wadena, Wilkin.

In Becker county the 40 per cent increase previously ordered was reduced to 30 per cent.

Big Stone will be increased 10 per cent instead of 5.

The 15 per cent increase in Brown, Houston, Lincoln and Wilkin counties were reduced to 10.

In Carver, Faribault and Rice counties, where a 10 per cent increase had been ordered, the assessor's valuations were reduced to 5 per cent.

Stearns county had been ordered to be increased 25 per cent, but it was decided to lift it to 15 per cent. Todd counties were similarly treated.

Goodhue county, which had been raised 30 per cent, will only be elevated 10 per cent. Kandiyohi county, Otter Tail were raised 50 per cent, but yesterday it was decided to let them off with 25.

Lyons, which had been ordered raised 35 per cent, will get off with 20.

Morrison, Pope and Stevens counties had all been ordered raised an even third, but they will now get off with 10 per cent.

Stearns, which had been ordered fatted 62-3 per cent, will get off with a 40 per cent raise. Swift county, which had been scheduled to go 45 per cent, will go up but 25. Wabasha, which was in the 25 per cent class, was placed in the 10.

The board will meet at 10 o'clock this morning, which will probably be its last session.

ABERN CASE DROPPED.

Police Score a Victory Over Prosecutor Oppenheim.

The case of Police Officer John Aherm accused of having assaulted Peter Murphy the hotel runner, was yesterday dismissed by Judge Orr.

Stuart's Dyspepsia Tablets cure dyspepsia, bloating, sour stomach, nervousness, constipation and every form of stomach trouble, safely and permanently, except cancer of the stomach. Sold by druggists at 50 cents, full-sized package.

COURT CURTAINS.

Matthew H. Beers and others, as executors of the will of Samuel Innes, has sued Thomas Cochran on a New York judgment for \$174.

Edith Bennett sued for divorce on grounds of desertion.

Robert B. Whitacre vs. Henry H. Gregg; action to recover \$2,000 alleged to be due on promissory note. Writ of attachment issued.

Christina McMullen vs. George E. McMullen; action for divorce on grounds of desertion.

Stuart's Dyspepsia Tablets cure dyspepsia, bloating, sour stomach, nervousness, constipation and every form of stomach trouble, safely and permanently, except cancer of the stomach. Sold by druggists at 50 cents, full-sized package.

MILL CHIMNEY STANDS

MINNEAPOLIS' ASSESSED VALUATION IS NOT TOUCHED BY THE STATE BOARD.

DULUTH REDUCED A TENTH.

ZENITH CITY PARES BETTER THAN ITS GREATER BROTHERS INLAND.

MANY COUNTIES ARE BENEFITED

By Reductions Made in the Finishing Days of the Long Official Season.

The state board of equalization spent a hard day yesterday tinkering with the valuations in the various counties in the state, but at the end they had the consolation that they were within sight of the completion of their labors, as all that remains is the adjustment of the burden to be put upon the telegraph and telephone companies.

Hennepin county's assessment, after a long fight, was left as it was returned by the city board and the county auditor. Duluth fared even better, getting a reduction of 10 per cent in the assessor's figures.

The former city had a big delegation over to the assessor's office in order to keep itself constantly advised of the progress of the water which it distributes through its mains. Its patrons are entitled to assume that the utmost vigilance will be exercised by the assessor to guard against its impurities.

The assessor's figures, however, a serious disregard of duty in and in violation of the law, and the assessor is charged with the duty of seeing that the public welfare requires that such conduct shall be charged home to the corporation itself.

Finally, however, the board passed the figures returned. This is quite a reduction from the figures of 1894, which were reduced 5 per cent by the city board.

A number of other changes were made on the board, and the following towns and city lots, the following changes were made:

Carver county, 10 per cent increase; Dakota, increase, 5 per cent; Meeker, increase, 5 per cent; Morrison, increase, 10 per cent; Otter Tail, increase, 10 per cent; Renville, increase, 10 per cent; Rice, increase, 5 per cent; St. Louis, increase, 10 per cent; Stevens, increase, 10 per cent; Stearns, increase, 20 per cent; Stevens, increase, 15 per cent; Waseca, increase, 5 per cent; Wright, increase, 5 per cent.

In Class 7, the average value of lands per acre, the increases formerly decided upon by the board were taken off in the following counties:

Atkin, Anoka, Fillmore, Grant, Le Sueur, Marshall, Martin, Pipestone, Polk, Miller, Sacer, Sherburne, Traverse, Waseca, Wadena, Wilkin.

In Becker county the 40 per cent increase previously ordered was reduced to 30 per cent.

Big Stone will be increased 10 per cent instead of 5.

The 15 per cent increase in Brown, Houston, Lincoln and Wilkin counties were reduced to 10.

In Carver, Faribault and Rice counties, where a 10 per cent increase had been ordered, the assessor's valuations were reduced to 5 per cent.

Stearns county had been ordered to be increased 25 per cent, but it was decided to lift it to 15 per cent. Todd counties were similarly treated.

Goodhue county, which had been raised 30 per cent, will only be elevated 10 per cent. Kandiyohi county, Otter Tail were raised 50 per cent, but yesterday it was decided to let them off with 25.

Lyons, which had been ordered raised 35 per cent, will get off with 20.

Morrison, Pope and Stevens counties had all been ordered raised an even third, but they will now get off with 10 per cent.

Stearns, which had been ordered fatted 62-3 per cent, will get off with a 40 per cent raise. Swift county, which had been scheduled to go 45 per cent, will go up but 25. Wabasha, which was in the 25 per cent class, was placed in the 10.

The board will meet at 10 o'clock this morning, which will probably be its last session.

ABERN CASE DROPPED.

Police Score a Victory Over Prosecutor Oppenheim.

The case of Police Officer John Aherm accused of having assaulted Peter Murphy the hotel runner, was yesterday dismissed by Judge Orr.

Stuart's Dyspepsia Tablets cure dyspepsia, bloating, sour stomach, nervousness, constipation and every form of stomach trouble, safely and permanently, except cancer of the stomach. Sold by druggists at 50 cents, full-sized package.

COURT CURTAINS.

Matthew H. Beers and others, as executors of the will of Samuel Innes, has sued Thomas Cochran on a New York judgment for \$174.

Edith Bennett sued for divorce on grounds of desertion.

Robert B. Whitacre vs. Henry H. Gregg; action to recover \$2,000 alleged to be due on promissory note. Writ of attachment issued.

Christina McMullen vs. George E. McMullen; action for divorce on grounds of desertion.

Stuart's Dyspepsia Tablets cure dyspepsia, bloating, sour stomach, nervousness, constipation and every form of stomach trouble, safely and permanently, except cancer of the stomach. Sold by druggists at 50 cents, full-sized package.

SAVORS OF THE SOO

ITS PASSENGER AGENTS AND OFFICE CLERKS ORGANIZE A NEW COMPANY.

HAS THREE MILLION DOLLARS.

IT WILL BE KNOWN AS THE DULUTH, SUPERIOR & WESTERN.

FROM DULUTH TO ANYWHERE

In the Red River Valley, Seems to Be the Road's Prospective Itinerary.

Three million dollars is the amount of capital stock accredited to the Duluth, Superior & Western Railroad company, which filed articles of incorporation in the office of the secretary of state yesterday, and, as it proceeded through its attorneys, Munn, Boyesen & Thygeson, to deposit the necessary fee of \$1,525 for filing the articles, it is safe to assume that it knows or thinks it knows where the money is coming from, in spite of the fact that none of the incorporators are known to the general public as bloated bondholders, or even railroad magnates.

The articles state the purpose of the road to be the construction of a line westerly and northwesterly from Duluth, or some point in its vicinity, to some point on the boundary of Minnesota, in the northwestern corner of the state, either on the Red River of the North or on the northern boundary between the river and Lake of the Woods, or to both of these points.

The project, it will be seen, is delightfully vague, but there seems to be reason to believe that the selection of this terminus will depend upon the location of the Canadian Pacific's new branch between the international boundary. That road is evidently seeking an outlet direct to Duluth.

The personnel of the incorporators would indicate this. They are nine in number, three each from St. Paul, Minneapolis and Duluth.

They are Leonard A. Larson, who, according to the city directory, is a clerk living at 233 East Thirteenth street; H. E. Huntington, who is the city passenger agent of the Soo-Pacific, and Frank Jones, who is a clerk in the freight department of the Soo-Pacific.

W. W. Walker, one of the Duluthians, is an extra-traveling passenger agent of the same system; the other incorporators are Charles P. Eckels, Charles Litzke and George C. Hamilton, all of them clerks in the office of the Soo.

That the gentlemen are daring projectors is apparent from the fact that, whereas almost every railroad incorporation organizes for a term of 99 years, the new company starts bravely out to last 1,000 years to know the reason why. It is reasonable to suppose that when a party of less than a dozen passenger agents, freight house clerks, etc., start out to build a \$3,000,000 line of railroad, they know the reason why.

That the gentlemen are daring projectors is apparent from the fact that, whereas almost every railroad incorporation organizes for a term of 99 years, the new company starts bravely out to last 1,000 years to know the reason why.

That the gentlemen are daring projectors is apparent from the fact that, whereas almost every railroad incorporation organizes for a term of 99 years, the new company starts bravely out to last 1,000 years to know the reason why.

That the gentlemen are daring projectors is apparent from the fact that, whereas almost every railroad incorporation organizes for a term of 99 years, the new company starts bravely out to last 1,000 years to know the reason why.

That the gentlemen are daring projectors is apparent from the fact that, whereas almost every railroad incorporation organizes for a term of 99 years, the new company starts bravely out to last 1,000 years to know the reason why.

That the gentlemen are daring projectors is apparent from the fact that, whereas almost every railroad incorporation organizes for a term of 99 years, the new company starts bravely out to last 1,000 years to know the reason why.

That the gentlemen are daring projectors is apparent from the fact that, whereas almost every railroad incorporation organizes for a term of 99 years, the new company starts bravely out to last 1,000 years to know the reason why.

That the gentlemen are daring projectors is apparent from the fact that, whereas almost every railroad incorporation organizes for a term of 99 years, the new company starts bravely out to last 1,000 years to know the reason why.

That the gentlemen are daring projectors is apparent from the fact that, whereas almost every railroad incorporation organizes for a term of 99 years, the new company starts bravely out to last 1,000 years to know the reason why.

That the gentlemen are daring projectors is apparent from the fact that, whereas almost every railroad incorporation organizes for a term of 99 years, the new company starts bravely out to last 1,000 years to know the reason why.

That the gentlemen are daring projectors is apparent from the fact that, whereas almost every railroad incorporation organizes for a term of 99 years, the new company starts bravely out to last 1,000 years to know the reason why.

That the gentlemen are daring projectors is apparent from the fact that, whereas almost every railroad incorporation organizes for a term of 99 years, the new company starts bravely out to last 1,000 years to know the reason why.

That the gentlemen are daring projectors is apparent from the fact that, whereas almost every railroad incorporation organizes for a term of 99 years, the new company starts bravely out to last 1,000 years to know the reason why.

That the gentlemen are daring projectors is apparent from the fact that, whereas almost every railroad incorporation organizes for a term of 99 years, the new company starts bravely out to last 1,000 years to know the reason why.

That the gentlemen are daring projectors is apparent from the fact that, whereas almost every railroad incorporation organizes for a term of 99 years, the new company starts bravely out to last 1,000 years to know the reason why.

That the gentlemen are daring projectors is apparent from the fact that, whereas almost every railroad incorporation organizes for a term of 99 years, the new company starts bravely out to last 1,000 years to know the reason why.

That the gentlemen are daring projectors is apparent from the fact that, whereas almost every railroad incorporation organizes for a term of 99 years, the new company starts bravely out to last 1,000 years to know the reason why.

That the gentlemen are daring projectors is apparent from the fact that, whereas almost every railroad incorporation organizes for a term of 99 years, the new company starts bravely out to last 1,000 years to know the reason why.

That the gentlemen are daring projectors is apparent from the fact that, whereas almost every railroad incorporation organizes for a term of 99 years, the new company starts bravely out to last 1,000 years to know the reason why.

That the gentlemen are daring projectors is apparent from the fact that, whereas almost every railroad incorporation organizes for a term of 99 years, the new company starts bravely out to last 1,000 years to know the reason why.

That the gentlemen are daring projectors is apparent from the fact that, whereas almost every railroad incorporation organizes for a term of 99 years, the new company starts bravely out to last 1,000 years to know the reason why.

That the gentlemen are daring projectors is apparent from the fact that, whereas almost every railroad incorporation organizes for a term of 99 years, the new company starts bravely out to last 1,000 years to know the reason why.

That the gentlemen are daring projectors is apparent from the fact that, whereas almost every railroad incorporation organizes for a term of 99 years, the new company starts bravely out to last 1,000 years to know the reason why.

That the gentlemen are daring projectors is apparent from the fact that, whereas almost every railroad incorporation organizes for a term of 99 years, the new company starts bravely out to last 1,000 years to know the reason why.

That the gentlemen are daring projectors is apparent from the fact that, whereas almost every railroad incorporation organizes for a term of 99 years, the new company starts bravely out to last 1,000 years to know the reason why.

SAVORS OF THE SOO

ITS PASSENGER AGENTS AND OFFICE CLERKS ORGANIZE A NEW COMPANY.

HAS THREE MILLION DOLLARS.

IT WILL BE KNOWN AS THE DULUTH, SUPERIOR & WESTERN.

FROM DULUTH TO ANYWHERE

In the Red River Valley, Seems to Be the Road's Prospective Itinerary.

Three million dollars is the amount of capital stock accredited to the Duluth, Superior & Western Railroad company, which filed articles of incorporation in the office of the secretary of state yesterday, and, as it proceeded through its attorneys, Munn, Boyesen & Thygeson, to deposit the necessary fee of \$1,525 for filing the articles, it is safe to assume that it knows or thinks it knows where the money is coming from, in spite of the fact that none of the incorporators are known to the general public as bloated bondholders, or even railroad magnates.

The articles state the purpose of the road to be the construction of a line westerly and northwesterly from Duluth, or some point in its vicinity, to some point on the boundary of Minnesota, in the northwestern corner of the state, either on the Red River of the North or on the northern boundary between the river and Lake of the Woods, or to both of these points.

The project, it will be seen, is delightfully vague, but there seems to be reason to believe that the selection of this terminus will depend upon the location of the Canadian Pacific's new branch between the international boundary. That road is evidently seeking an outlet direct to Duluth.

The personnel of the incorporators would indicate this. They are nine in number, three each from St. Paul, Minneapolis and Duluth.

They are Leonard A. Larson, who, according to the city directory, is a clerk living at 233 East Thirteenth street; H. E. Huntington, who is the city passenger agent of the Soo-Pacific, and Frank Jones, who is a clerk in the freight department of the Soo-Pacific.

W. W. Walker, one of the Duluthians, is an extra-traveling passenger agent of the same system; the other incorporators are Charles P. Eckels, Charles Litzke and George C. Hamilton, all of them clerks in the office of the Soo.