NEW ROLE FOR BURGLARS.

A Lady Bound, Gagged and Robbed in Her Own Residence.

HOW THE VILLAINS WERE DISGUISED

Deliberately Planning to Cut the Throat of Their Helpless Victim.

A Chicago despatch says: One of the most daring robberies ever perpetrated in this city took place early yesterday afternoon at No. 50 Eldridge court, the residence of Thomas Smith, head draughtsman at the Dearborn foundry. Mr. Smith receives a liberal salary, and, while renting a box in the vaults of the Union Safety and Deposit Company, it has been his habit for some time to trust a considerable portion of his earnings with his wife. Mrs. Smith is a stout lady, about 26 years old. When her husband went to his place of business after dinner yesterday she was left alone in their rooms, which include all the apartments on the first floor. A ring at the bell called Mrs. Smith to the front door. Two men dressed as mechanics were standing there. They introduced themselves as plumbers sent by the landlord. Mrs. Smith, unsuspicious, led the way to the kitchen, when the audacious crime took place. The details of the robbery, as given by Mrs. Smith, form a thrilling narrative.

The lady this morning, with her brown hair neatly tied up in a roll, and wearing a handsome wrapper, leaned back in one of her own easy chairs and told the reporter her story. Her head was bandaged where one of the robbers had struck her, and she seemed to be suffering pain.

"It frightens me almost to death," began Mrs. Smith, "every time I think of the occurrence. Just after my husband had lunched and left the house two men, who by their dress appeared to be plumbers, called and said that the agent for the Newberry estate had sent them to repair the water pipes. As the pipes had needed repairing for some time I suspected nothing and led the way into the kitchen. When I stooped down to open the door under the sink one of the men, who could not have been more than 18 years old, struck me a heavy blow behind the left ear.

GRAPPLING WITH HER FOE.

"I turned and grappled with him and in the struggle pulled off his ring. Then the large fellow, who was about 20 years old and powerfully built, grabbed me by the throat and, tearing open the bosom of my dress, took out my pocketbook, containing exactly $1,030. He drew a revolver and knife and said: 'If you scream I'll kill you.' He then threw me down on the floor and, placing his knees on my chest, placed a towel over my mouth and tied my hands and feet with clothes lines. They then dragged me by my hair to the back parlor and tied me to the bed.

"Suddenly the doorbell rang, and one of the fellows coolly answered the summons. Mr. Timothy and wife, friends of ours, as I have since learned, had stopped to make a friendly call. While one of the robbers held me on the floor, with his hands pressed over my mouth to prevent me uttering a sound, the other informed the callers that I was ill and unable to see any visitors. Then he closed and locked the door.

CONSULTING ABOUT KILLING HER.

"They then looked through the closets, and the big fellow said to the young man:

"'What shall we do with her?'

"'Cut her throat; that's the thing to do,' said the other. 'Then she'll never squeal.'

"'I don't want to kill a woman in cold blood,' rejoined the first speaker.

"'You needn't do it in cold blood,' answered the other. 'Just set fire to the house, and let her burn up.'

"The man who spoke last seized a kerosene can, as if to execute his terrible threat. The can, however, proved to be empty, and he cast it from him with an oath. Then the smaller man said:

"'I'm in favor of placing her in the bath tub and drowning her.'

"I begged hard for my life and they finally concluded to let me live.

AFTER THE ROBBERS LEFT.

"The large man left the house first and the young fellow remained a while to watch. About half an hour after the ruffians had departed I succeeded in untying the cords that bound my hands. After releasing my feet from the bedposts I dragged myself to the front door and called to a milkman who was passing at the time. He cut the cords from my limbs, and I do believe they used two rolls of clothes line to bind me."

Mrs. Smith's husband was seen at the Dearborn foundry. "I suspect the parties who put up the job," he said, "but I don't want to do any one an injustice and will not say anything about it now. The detectives are working quietly on the case, and in two or three days will probably gather enough evidence to warrant an arrest, but I cannot understand how the robbers ascertained that the money was secreted in my wife's bosom."

The police were promptly notified of the robbery, but up to this evening they have obtained no clue that would lead to the detection of the perpetrators.

TWO MILES OF a LAND SLIDE.

A Mountain Stripped of a Huge Forest —A Farmer Badly Hurt.

A Littleton, N. H., despatch says: There was a great land slide on Cherry Mountain near Jefferson depot this morning at a place known as Owl's Head. The mountain was stripped of a forest two miles long and 15 rods wide. This debris extended half a mile from the base of the mountain, smashing the barn of Oscar Stanley, killing cattle and breaking both of Stanley's legs. He was milking at the time. The slide was caused by heavy rains and was probably equal to the Willey slide, except that no lives were lost so far as known.

"O Harry! What a beautiful birthday present! I am glad to know that you didn't forget me. Pure gold, isn't it?" Harry (her betrothed): "Yes, darling." "And the ease is just superb. It isn't a charm nor an ear-ring, for you would have bought me a pair. I never saw anything like it. What is it, Harry?" "It's a thimble."

BLIND TOM'S LUNACY.

His Mother Failing in Her Attempt to Take Him from General Bethune's Custody.

An Alexandria, Va., despatch says: In the United States Circuit Court this morning the case of Blind Tom, which was brought into court yesterday on a writ of *habeas corpus* sued out by his mother, came up. The Judge decided that Gen. Bethune became a resident of Virginia in 1870, and that Tom, being then in Bethune's possession under a contract, also became a resident, and that the court of Fauquier had jurisdiction. The Judge, in delivering his opinion, said: "I have nothing to do with the question of his lunacy. My only inquiry is whether Tom is held as a slave. I do not see how the petitioner in this case, his mother, after her contract in 1865, and her acquiescence for fifteen years in the action of the Fauquier Court in committing Tom to Bethune, can now insist that he is held as a slave. Evidently he is not held as a slave. I therefore have no right or jurisdiction to remove him from his present custody, and feel bound in the interest of humanity, to remand him to the custody in which he was born, in which he has lived all his life, and in which he is anxious to remain."

In the trial of the case, in order to allow the court to form an opinion as to the mental condition of Tom, several questions were propounded to him by the court, to all of which he gave fairly intelligible answers, but would invariably say that he wanted to stay with Gen. Bethune and go back to Warrenton.

AFTER THREE YEARS.

Another Case of Burglary Against "Clutch" Donohue—Working up Evidence.

A Welland despatch says: John Donohue, better known among his fraternity as "Clutch," was to-day put on trial for a larceny of three years' standing. The case was worked up by Government Detective Joseph Rogers, who has already been instrumental in bringing this notorious burglar to justice on several different cases. Donohue was charged with having burglarized Amyot Bros.' store at Quebec in February, 1882, stealing therefrom goods to the value of $500, in the shape of jewellery, fancy goods, etc. Some of these goods were found in the store of Rainor, crooked Buffalo store-keeper, whose notoriety as a fence has already been fully established in connection with the Galt jewellery and Peterboro' post-office robberies. Donohue, who is better known to his pals and the public as "Clutch," pleaded not guilty, and was remanded for eight days. This makes the fourth case for which he has to stand his trial, the others being: (1) Stealing $5,000 worth of jewellery from Trotter, of Galt; (2) stealing $2,000 (in money and stamps) from the Peterboro' post-office; and (3) stealing $800 worth of pipes, etc., from Goldstein Brothers, Quebec.

A WHOLESALE POISONER

Murdered His Relations in the Interest of Science.

A Paris cable says: Pel, the poisoner, who was sentenced on the 13th ult. to the guillotine, has another chance for his life, as the Court of Cassation has ordered a new trial. The trial of Pel was the sensation of the season. He was a watchmaker by trade, and dabbled in science and was constantly experimenting in toxicology. Evidence went to show that he murdered his mother and two servant girls for the purpose of testing his poisons, and, having satisfied himself of the virtue of his drugs, he murdered his two wives for the sake of their dowries and his mistress because she would not give him some money she possessed in Credit Foncier bonds. The evidence was entirely circumstantial. The women died in his house. He accounted for their deaths by natural causes. Their remains were never found, and it was charged at the trial, but not satisfactorily established, that he reduced the bodies of his victims to ashes in a small stove. There is scarcely any moral doubt as to Pel's guilt, but there is enough legal difficulty to authorize a new trial.

A WILD RIDE.

Peculiar Accident to a Wabash Express Train.

A Wabash (Ind.) despatch says: An engine pulling the east-bound express on the Wabash line broke a side rod one mile west of here last night, and a section of the rod knocked a hole in the boiler, from which steam escaped in such quantities as to render it impossible for the engineer to stop. In this condition the train passed through the city at a speed of 45 miles per hour, the engineer and firemen going to the baggage car, leaving the engine with no one in charge. A mile east of Wabash the steam became exhausted and the train stopped. The engine is badly wrecked. No person was injured. Old trainmen aboard say it was the wildest ride they ever took.

Fearful Work of a Mad Dog.

An Anna (Ill.) despatch says: John G. Tygett, a wealthy farmer and blooded stock man, living near this place, owned a fine bulldog, which went mad yesterday and ran snapping and biting about the house, and, dashing into the dooryard, encountered a bevy of little girls playing, and in an instant had bitten three of them upon the hands, face and limbs. They were all children of Tygett. The animal then made his way into an adjacent field, where he bit twenty or thirty head of thoroughbred cattle, finally escaping into the timber. A posse of men hunted the animal down after a chase, shooting him dead, but not until he had shown fight, attempting to bite several farmers. A number of cattle died this morning in great agony of hydrophobia, and it is probable the entire herd will succumb to the dreadful disease. Thus far the children have not suffered from their wounds, and this morning Tygett sent to Anna for a madstone. It is feared several other dogs were bitten. Tygett loses $10,000 worth of cattle.

Mr. George Errington, M.P. for Longford, who has represented for some years the anti-Parnell party at the Vatican, has been created a baronet. He has had many relatives in high position in the Roman Catholic Church, two having been bishops. He was left recently a large fortune. He is a bachelor.

DUBLIN CASTLE.

The "Times" Admits the Possibility of Its Destruction.

IT WAS DOOMED LONG AGO.

The proposal to abolish Dublin Castle serves very well as a popular cry, but without interpretation it is vague and almost unmeaning. To the National party it means nothing less than Grattan's Parliament and virtual, if not actual, independence. To an Englishman, however, whether Tory or Radical, it probably means nothing more than a radical change in the system of local government. This change would probably be embodied in two substantive measures—the abolition of the Lord-Lieutenancy and a large decentralization of the local executive. We have no objection in principle to either of these measures, but we do protest against the denunciation of Dublin Castle as a nest of sinecurists and a stronghold of aliens. The permanent officials who serve the State with loyalty and public spirit in Dublin Castle are, with hardly an exception, Irish in birth and Irish in feeling. It is not their fault if the system of government in which they are employed is open to criticism and ripe for reform, and it is certainly not the part of a statesman to impair the credit and weaken the authority of the Executive in such a country as Ireland. But the expediency of retaining the Lord-Lieutenancy, and the wisdom of reorganizing local government in Ireland, are perfectly fair and legitimate subjects for discussion. As for the Lord-Lieutenancy, there is, as we have long thought and said, very little to be said in favor of its retention. What is wanted in Ireland is not vice-royalty, with its sham pageantry and make-believe ceremonial, but royalty. The late visit of the Prince of Wales to Ireland was a signal illustration of the vast difference between the two, and the promise of His Royal Highness to return was a happy omen for the future of Ireland. The question of the vice-royalty is, moreover, no new one. Parliament emphatically pronounced its judgment upon it five-and-thirty years ago. Mr. Howorth is quite mistaken in thinking that the political friends of Sir Charles Dilke have been the special patrons of vice-royalty. In 1850 a Bill for the abolition of the Lord-Lieutenancy was introduced by the Government of Lord John Russell, and its second reading was carried, after a prolonged and animated debate, by 295 votes to 70.

MR. GLADSTONE AND SIR ROBERT PEEL

—who supported the measure in a speech delivered within a few weeks of his death—voted in the majority on that occasion, but among the minority are to be found the names of Mr. Disraeli and the present Postmaster-General. Lord John Russell showed, in his speech in introducing the measure, that the extinction of the vice-royalty had been distinctly contemplated by George III. within a few years of the Union as a measure which it might in the future be proper to adopt. The Lord-Lieutenant, the same statesman argued with unanswerable force, was placed in a most anomalous position; he was asked for everything, applied to for everything, and blamed for everything without having the power belonging to his situation; he had the responsibility, but not the freedom of action of a Minister of the Crown; he was an object of jealousy, resentment and obloquy in different parts of Ireland. The Lord Lieutenancy attempts to combine

THE SHADOW OF ROYALTY

with the substance of Government. The main argument against the change is that used by the Duke of Wellington in a debate which took place in the same session in the House of Lords. He strongly opposed the abolition of the vice-royalty, on the ground that, Ireland being frequently the scene of important military operations, it was necessary for the military authorities to be able to confer with a civil authority of great dignity and unimpeachable loyalty. He could not, he said, as Commander-in-Chief, be expected to confer with such a man as Mr. O'Connell, if he happened to be Lord Mayor of London. The Duke's authority seems to have been irresistible for the Bill was abandoned after the second reading and was not again introduced. Of course, if the Lord Lieutenancy were abolished, its executive authority would have to be exercised by a responsible Minister of State, and in some such manner the objection raised by the Duke of Wellington could be overcome. However this may be, the fact remains that the House of Commons was perfectly willing more than a generation ago to extinguish the Lord-Lieutenancy, and we cannot pretend to think that the arguments in favor of its retention have increased in cogency since that time.

Colombian Revolution.

A Washington despatch says: The Colombian Minister received a telegram to-day from Bogota announcing that the rebels of Barranquilla, persisting in their determination to ascend the Magdelena river, had been completely routed at Calamar. Their fleet of sixteen vessels suffered considerable damage through the explosion of one laden with ammunition. Almost all the revolutionary leaders are supposed to be killed or seriously wounded. It is believed the explosion of the vessel was caused by a shot fired by the Government troops. News of the final subjection of the rebels is expected at any moment.

Sad Event in Lord Monck's Residence.

An extraordinary case of poisoning by laudanum occurred at the residence of Viscount Monk, at Bray, Ireland, on Saturday week. The victim in the case is the Hon. Mrs. Blake, sister of Lord Cloncurry, who was on a visit to Viscount Monck. This lady took an overdose of laudanum, and was found in an insensible condition by one of the servants. The alarm was immediately given, and Dr. Darby, of Bray, was summoned, but all his efforts to save her life proved unavailing.

Experiments by means of photographic plates in the Mediterranean show that in the middle of a sunny day in March the rays of the sun are unable to penetrate the water of that sea to a depth much beyond 150 fathoms. In September the distance is reduced. The depression at this depth on the photographic plate is not equal to that made by starlight.

ASIATIC CHOLERA.

Its Varying Symptoms—Who Are Most Liable to Attack—How Transmitted.

United States Consul Frank H. Mason, of Marseilles, has sent to the Department of State the following concerning Asiatic cholera, derived from studies of the epidemic of 1884 and preceding years in Marseilles. In presence of epidemic cholera the question of subsistence becomes one of vital importance. No amount of cleansing and dosing with medicine can eradicate the cholera from the community which is badly fed. Mr. Mason says:

It was found necessary at Marseilles to prohibit the entry and sale of melons, cucumbers and of summer fruits, and to open in various places in the city soup kitchens where the poor could be supplied with properly cooked food. The code of instructions issued by the health authorities for the guidance of all classes embodied the following: Avoid all excess, whether of eating or drinking; drink as little as possible of anything between meals; avoid the use of raw fruits and vegetables; drink mineral or boiled water mixed with a small proportion of wine; avoid exposure to the chill air of morning or evening; wear a wide belt or girdle of flannel; beef and mutton are the best meats in time of cholera, and fresh fish should be used with extreme caution; all stale fruits and vegetables should be rigidly prohibited. Any sudden change of temperature, particularly the cooling of the body after violent exercise or exposure to heat, should be carefully avoided; accordingly woollen clothing for every part of the body is preferable to cotton or linen. While the strictest personal cleanliness is essential, it is not considered advisable for any except persons in full physical vigor and accustomed to regular cold baths to continue them in presence of cholera. Daily tepid baths, taken with careful reference to hours of meals, are advised. Such baths should always be followed by vigorous rubbing of the skin and the usual measures to restore vigorous and healthy circulation.

Mr. Mason says that the actual dangers of a cholera epidemic are enormously increased and complicated by the terror and demoralization which the presence of the dreaded malady invariably inspires. "Simple fear, of course, does not produce cholera," he adds, "but it often checks and deranges the vital functions to a degree which may weaken the patient and greatly increase his susceptibility to choleric influences. Beyond question, it is best for those who feel this terror, and for all others who can conveniently do so, to leave a city infected with cholera as quickly as possible after the epidemic is declared, and no one should return to an infected city unless in a condition of good health, particularly in respect to all the functions of nutrition."

Mr. Mason adds: "As a popular remedy for immediate use nothing has been found superior to chlorodyne, which is sold by most druggists."

How to Cook for the Sick.

"To make flour gruel properly," said Miss Parloa in commencing, "you use one quart of milk, three tablespoonfuls of flour, and a teaspoonful of salt. Pour all the milk except a cupful into a double boiler. Mix the flour with the milk you reserved and stir it into the boiling milk and let it cook 30 minutes, putting in the salt ten minutes before it is done. The longer milk cooks the more laxative it is. If you wish to make the gruel especially nutritious cook a half cupful of raisins cut in two in the milk during the entire time. This drink is very stimulating, and is often given in place of wine to patients. In Indian meal gruel the meal must always be well cooked, an hour or two being usually required. But it is better to use the very fine meal now in use rather than that milled by the old process, and always when needed quickly, put into boiling water at once. To make this gruel take one quart of boiling water, two tablespoonfuls of medium meal, one tablespoonful of salt; mix the meal, etc., with a half cup of cold water and pour into boiler. Stir while it is cooking and cook not less than thirty minutes. Always keep the saucepan covered."

Miss Parloa advised the nurses to not trust to guesswork at all—always measure out carefully. There were some born cooks who always came out right, but they were scarce. She then took up the subject of potatoes, saying that few people knew how to boil potatoes or bake them properly. Thirty minutes to boil and forty-five to bake was the rule. "Pare them if to boil," said she. "Put them in boiling water which shall just cover them. When done pour off every drop of water, put a towel over the kettle, for the cover on would spoil all."

The McLean Family.

Little Poplar seems to have been the only Indian who dared to avow his desire of taking the two older McLean girls to wife, and he made the proposition to Mr. McLean, but the Wood Crees stood out in their friendship, and Poplar had to subdue his wishes. Miss Amelia's life was several times threatened, owing to what she described as "my plain talk to them. I could not help telling them what I thought and trying to frighten them." After the Strange and Steele skirmishes, the squaws and the worst of the bucks demanded that the prisoners be killed, in revenge for their own dead; but again the Wood Crees, especially Menomin, quelled all such expressions, saying, "If you kill the prisoners, or try to do so, you must fight us and we'll kill you." Nothing was taken from the person of the prisoners (Miss Amelia says her watch is now her sole bit of jewellery, however), but all their household and personal effects not in their immediate possession were stolen or destroyed. McLean estimates his losses, including horses and cattle, at about $9,000. It is astonishing how well the girls stood the hardships of the journeys through swamp, thicket, stream and lake. Miss Kitty says: "I'd rather do that sort of thing than go to school;" and Miss Amelia avers that she reached a feeling of pride in her endurance, and shouldered her pack with as much of an "I'm used-to-it" air as the hardiest squaw among them.—*Fort Pitt Correspondence Pioneer Press.*

Montreal is out with two defalcations by clerks.

Glanders is prevalent among horses in the vicinity of Brantford.

A TEDIOUS COURTSHIP.

Twenty-two Years of Wooing and Engagement Ring Giving Wind up with a Breach of Promise Suit.

In Dublin, last week, before Mr. Justice Lawson and a jury, the breach of promise action of McMahon vs. Coleman was heard. The plaintiff was Miss Cecilia McMahon, a milliner and furrier, residing in Gloucester street, and the defendant, Mr. William Coleman, a furniture dealer, of Liffey street. The damages claimed were £500. Defendant had filed pleas that the promise was made on the understanding that the marriage should only take place when he had sufficient means to marry, and he had not up to the present those necessary means. Counsel for plaintiff said his client had suffered a most grievous and substantial wrong. In 1863 the plaintiff was a young girl of 17 years, and the defendant was 32 or 33 years of age, and he asked her then to marry him, and was accepted From that time, over twenty years ago, up to a few months ago, he had treated her as his affianced wife, and introduced her to his friends, and he was introduced by her to her friends as her future husband. During the 22 years the engagement had lasted plaintiff had waited upon and supported her widowed mother by her own industry. The defendant had given her engagement rings, and had written her letters breathing affection and love. Defendant got plaintiff to postpone the wedding till her mother's death, on the ground that if he married while she was alive his mother would not leave him her property. This poor boy of 54 or 55 years of age did not like to marry until the old lady died. (Laughter.) That difficulty was now removed, because six months ago the old lady had been gathered to her fathers. A coolness arose between the plaintiff and defendant some time ago, and in April last the plaintiff wrote to the defendant asking him what were his intentions with regard to the engagement. To that letter no reply was received, and proceedings were taken. The jury found for plaintiff £100 damages.

Live Within Your Income.

(Monetary Times.

The vain clerk who thinks himself underpaid and down-trodden; the society clerk, who says he cannot live on his salary; the fast clerk, who gambles with cards or speculates in stocks in order to get money to indulge further bad habits. All these may read with advantage of a certain clerk in Raymond, Miss., Richard S. Drone, who, although he was a clerk all his life, was, according to a newspaper description, "a true and a good man in all his relations." Not only did he always live within his income, as many young men now-a-days pretend they cannot do, but "he left at his death $18,000 savings from his salary." Not finding it necessary to gamble nor to speculate in order to pay his way, he lived a decent, consistent life and was "an example, not only of economy, but of good feeling and helpfulness toward those around him." Out of the $18,000 of which he died possessed, his will bequeaths, says the Atlanta *Constitution*, $5,000 to the owners of the hotel where he boarded, $500 to two elderly widows, $200 each to his washerwomen, $200 to the cook at the hotel, $100 each to the servants who waited on him, $700 to his kinsmen, and smaller sums to others. "His debtors are released from all obligations except a sufficient amount to cover the bequests and funeral expenses, to be obtained upon a *pro rata* assessment and collection from the solvent debtors." Here is an example of economy and thrift for our young men. But indeed they do not need to look so far from home. The founders of one of the greatest wholesale houses in Montreal practised for years the closest economy, cooked their own food and did up their own rooms as young men. They worked too, longer hours than people of to-day work, and laid the beginning of a large fortune. Such self-denial and hard work are too strange for many a young man of the present generation; he cannot attain unto it. Yet some of the best men and greatest merchants have had just such training. And it helped to make them the successful men they were. To be prudent and saving does not mean to be niggardly. In the words of an old writer, "He that will burn his taper while the sun shines and he that will go to bed in the dark to save the expense of light, both are equally absurd." But the lesson which the present generation needs is that of economy.

The Safest Part of a Train.

The American railway conductor who, when asked what was the safest part of a car, replied, "That part which happens to be in the shop at the time of the accident," was a wit. But, leaving joking apart, it is not generally known—in fact, popular prejudice rather points the other way—that the last carriage in a railway train is the safest. There is no doubt that, if you are in the last carriage of a train, and especially at its rear, and another train runs into yours, you will probably not survive to tell the tale of how the accident happened. But in all other accidents you can conjure up as liable to occur, it is the safest. If there is a head collision, there is nothing back of you to add force to the blow. If the engine leaves the track, and collides with a bridge or any obstruction on a side track, it will not be your end. If the train is thrown down an embankment, there is nothing to land on top of you. Moreover, the rear part of a train is the most pleasant in travelling, for from it you can best observe the scenery, and this applies more particularly to American and some Continental, especially Swiss, railway cars, where, by turning in your seat, or stepping to the door, you can take it all in. It will, therefore, be conceded that the safest part of a train is in the last seat of the last carriage, although, speaking from our own experience, it is not the most comfortable, owing to the great amount of oscillation.

Rev. Edwin Hatch, D.D., whose Bampton lectures at Oxford created so much attention a few years ago, is shocked that Canon Liddon should deem Episcopacy a divine institution, and says in a recent article in the "Contemporary Review": "If I once accepted Canon Liddon's premises, the force of an irresistible logic would drive me from the Church of England to the Church of Rome, and not to the Church of Rome only, but to the straightest sect of ultramontanism."