---SEYMOUR PARK.

This Beautiful Suburban Property, Belonging to Dr. Miller, will be Put on the Market this Week.

Seymour Park consists of about four hundred and eighty acres of woodland and lawn, situated on a high eminence, commanding a magnificent view of Omaha and surrounding country. The entire property is covered with thousands of beautiful forest trees, consisting of oak, hickory, walnut, ash, maple, box elder, catalpa, black cherry and other varieties.

Dr. Miller, the owner of Seymour Park. is now building a magnificent stone mansion at this place and is making arrangements to put in an extensive system of water works, supplying the purest kind of water to all those who build at the Park.

The Park will be lighted by Electric Lights and a perfect system of sewerage put in. The elaborate system of sewerage, electric lights and waterwork contem-

plated, added to the already perfect nature of the ground for Homes, will make Seymour Park the finest suburban residence place in the west. SUBURBAN TRAINS now running at regular intervals afford quick and easy transit between Seymour Park and the business center of Omaha.

Lots in this beautiful addition, with 100 foot frontage, on broad avenues, will be sold at prices ranging from \$300 to \$500, or at three to five dollars per front foot. We will be pleased to show this property at any time, and cordially invite all those seeking a home to call at our office and make arrangements to go out with us Wednesday or Saturday of this week, to see SEYMOUR PARK.

Room 40, Barker Block

HOW HE VOTED EVERY TIME.

The Stories Started By the Democrats Utterly Refuted-Hard Facts Which Cannot Be Hidden By False Assertions.

What the Record Shows.

Washington, July 24 .- [Special to The ent librarian of the senate, began the work the journal of the senate and that of the senate committee on foreign relations, and made a compilation embracing every vote cast by General Harrison from the first to the last day while he was a member of the senate, both on the floor of the senate chamber and in the room of the committee on foreign relations, which bore directly or indirectly on legislation affecting directly or indirectly Chinese immigration. After every page and paragraph of the senate journal had been gone over carefully and every vote and act of General Harrison noted, the compilation was compared by Captain McKee and Harry Smith, late journal clerk of the house, to see that the data was absolutely correct in every detail. That the complete and authenticated record of General Harrison on this subject may be placed in convenient and compre-hensive form for the ready reference of any

On December, 1881, Senator Miller, of Cali-fornia, introduced senate bill No. 71, "to en-force treaty stipulations relating to Chinese." This bill was referred to the senate com-mittee on foreign relations, which was composed of the following senators: Messrs Windom, Edmunds. Miller, Ferry, Lapham, Johnston (Va.), Morgan, Hill (Ga.), and Bendleten

one interested it is here given in full.

fornia, reported back the bill with an amend ment in the nature of a substitute, and gave notice that he would endeavor to have the bill considered on February, 1882. On February 24, 1882, the bill was taken up on motion of Mr. Miller. Mr. Bayard of

Delaware antagonized the the consideration with the tariff commission bill. The ques-tion of consideration was decided in favor of the Chinese bill by a yea and nay vote of yeas, 35; nays, 16, Mr. Harrison voting yes, to consider the Chinese bill.

On February 28, 1882, the senate proceeded to the consideration of this bill. Mr. Grover of Oregon offered an amendment, as follows. "The words "Chinese laborers," wherever used in this act, shall be construed to mean both skilled and unskilled laborers, and Chinese employed in mining." The amendment was laid on the table.

On March 3, 1882, the senate again resumed consideration of the bill. Senators Farley, Maxey, Saulsbury, Garland, Ingalis, Barnard and Milier of California discussed the bill. Mr. Invatls offered an amendment to the committee's amendment relating to the removal of those unlawfully entering. (Record, 13, pt. 2, p. 1,581 to 1,591. March 6, 1882, consideration was resumed, the question being the amendment offered by

Mr. Ingalls. Senators Slater, Cameron of Wisconsin, George, Brown and Teller occupied the day in discussion of the biff. (Record, vol. 13, pt. 2, p. 1634 to 1646.)

March 7, 1883. the senate again resumed

consideration, the question being the amend-ment proposed by Mr. Ingalis, relating to the time limit of twenty years. Senator Dawes spoke in opposition to the bill. He was frequently interrupted by Senators Miller, Teller, Farley, Jones of Nevada and Slater, Mr. Edmunds spoke in favor of the amendment. The day was occupied without coming to a vote. (Record, vol. 15, pt. 2, p. 1,667 to 1,658.)

March 3, 1883, senate resumed consideration the largella amendment woulder.

eration, the Ingalls amendment pending.
Mr. Platt spoke in opposition to the bill. A
yea and nay vote was taken on the Ingalls
amendment, which was rejected by a tie
vote. Mr. Harrison was absent, engaged in the investigation of a case in the committee on military affairs. He was paired with Mr Maxey on all political questions. Mr. Maxey declares that this case was accepted. Mr. Maxey made the statement to show why Mr. Harrison was absent. Mr. Ingalls' second amendment was then considered, amended and adopted. The amendment related to the time of giving

ment: "That this bill shall not apply to any skilled laborer who shall establish that he comes to this country without any contract by which his labor is the property of any per-son other than himself." After disposing of several minor amendments a yea and may yote was ordered on Mr. Hoar's amendment which was rejected by a vote of 27 to 17, Mr. Harrison voting with the yeas. The vote in detail was as follows.

detail was as follows: Yeas-Aldrich, Allison, Brown, Conger

Yeas—Aldrich, Allison, Brown, Conger, Davis (III.), Dawes, Edmunds, Frye, Hate, Harrison, Hoar, Ingails, McDill, McMillan, Mahone, Mitchell, Morrill—17.

Nays—Bayard, Beck, Call, Cockrell, Coke, Fair, Farley, Garland, George, Hampton, Harris, Jackson, Jones, Jones (Nev.), Maxey, Miller (Cal.), Miller (N. Y.), Morgan, Plunab, Pugh, Ranson, Saunders, Slater, Teller, Vance, Vest, Walker. Absent, 32.

After several amendments Mr. Hoar again moved an amendment providing that "any laborer who shall receive a certificate from the United States consul at the port where he shall embark, that he is a citizen coming to this country at his own he shall embark, that he is a citi coming to this country at his c expense and at his own i will, and has established such fact to will, and has established such fact to the satisfaction of such vensul, shall not be affected by this bill." The amendment was rejected by yea and nay vote of 24 to 19, Mr. Harrison voting yea. Yeas—Aldrich, Allison, Brown, Conger, Davis (III.), Dawes, Fry, Hale, Harrison, Hoar, Ingalis, Jackson, McDill, McMillan, Mahone, Mitchell, Morrill, Plumb, Saunders—19. Nays—Bayard, Reck, Cail, Cockroll, Coke, Pair, Farley, George, Groome, Hampton, Harris, Jonas, Jones, (Nov.), Maxcy, Miller (Cal.), Miller (N. Y.), Morgan, Pugh, Ransom, Blater, Teller, Vance, Vest, Walker—24, Absent, 53. (Record, vol. 15, pt. 2, p. 1, 703 to 1,717).

HARRISON'S CHINESE RECORD ing, and relating to naturalization. Mr. Hawley opposed the bill, occupying several hours. By a yea and nay vote Farley's amendment was adopted; Mr. Harrisson absent. Mr. Grover's amendment relating to laborers was adopted by yea and nay vote; Mr. Harrisson absent. A yea and nay vote was also taken on the ton years' limit amend, ment of Mr. Ingalls, which was decided in was also taken on the ten years limit amend-ment of Mr. Ingalls, which was decided in the negative; Mr. Harrisson absent. Mr. Maxey said on this particular amendment: "I am paired with the senator from Indiana (Mr. Harrisson) who is necessarily absent. I should vote may if he were here, and the

senator (Mr. Harrison) would vote yea."
The amendments of the committee were then concurred in and the bill put upon its passage, the yeas and mays being ordered. The bill was passed—Yeas, 23. Nays—15. Mr. Harrison absent. Sénator Maxey, when his name was called, said: "I was paired with the senator from Indiana (Mr. Harrison) Washington, July 24.—[Special to The Bee, |—Several days ago, upon the request of some of the leading republican senators and members of the national republican committee, Captain Thomas H. McKee, assisted investigating the senate, began the work of investigating the senatorial record of General Harrison in relation to the Chinese question. He made a careful examination of the journal of the senate and that of the senator from Indiana (Mr. Harrison) on the ten years' amendment. In the note which he wrote me he said that if that amendment should be voted down he would vote against the bill. I am inclined to think that under that statement he would regard it as a pair upon the bill, because the amendment for the point of the senator from Indiana (Mr. Harrison) on the ten years' amendment. In the note which he wrote me he said that if that a mendment should be voted down he would vote against the bill. I am inclined to think that under that statement he would regard it as a pair upon the bill, because the amendment that a mendment should be voted down he would vote against the bill. I am inclined to think that under that statement he would regard it as a pair upon the bill, because the amendment was voted down, and therefore I shall decline to vote. I should vote for the bill, and he, from the statement made to me, would vote against the bill.

vote against it." Mr. Hawley made the following statement: "I desire to make a statement in regard to three absent senators. I did not get here in time, or I should have done so in the morning hour. Messrs. Sewell, Harrison and Hampton are necessarily absent, in an investigation at the soldiers' home, and left a note at my desk which I did not get in season, asking permission of the senate to be so absent." So that Senator Harrison's absence is explained by Senator Hawley. (Rec-

sence is explained by Senator Hawley. (Record, vol. 13, pt. 2, p. 1, 738 to 551, to 2,503.)

April 4, 1832, the president's veto message, accompanying this bill, was presented to the senate. The veto was based upon the repudiation of treaty obligations. The message and bill were laid on the table.—(Record, vol. 13, pt. 5, p. 2, 551 to 2,563.)

On April 5, 1882, Senator Farley moved to take up senate bill 171, returned by the president with his objections. Motion agreed to. Mr. Sherman submitted again the motion to

Mr. Sherman submitted again the motion to refer it to the committee on foreign relations, which motion caused considerable debate which motion caused considerable debate upon the point of order raised by Mr. Morgan, of Alabama; and the leading questions involved in the bill were freely discussed. The yeas and nays being ordered on Mr. Sherman's motion, the senate refused to refer—nays 32, yeas 18; Mr. Harrison voted yea. The question of the passage of the bill over the veto upon which the yeas and nays were taken, resulted in 29 yeas, 21 mays, Mr. Har-rison voting nay. The bill did not pass, two-thirds not voting in the affirmative.—(Record, vol. 13, pt. 3, p. 2, 607 to 2,617.)

The position of the president as set forth in his veto rests upon treaty obligations. His objections to the bill were in harmony with the position taken by most of the re-publican senators (excepting those from the Pacific states), as shown throughout the debate. Senator Harrison undoubtedly acted in good fauth in opposing this bill from the point of treaty obligations. Senator Bayard, the present secretary of state, declared in this debate on April 5, that the Burlingame treaty was a humbug; it began and ended in it (page 2, 616), and it is presumed that be lieving as he did he had a right to disregard it. His argument would imply at least a disregard for the treaty, while the republi-cans on the other hand felt bound by its obli-

On April 18, 1882, House Bill 5,804 was received in the senate and referred to the com-mittee on foreign relations. April 19, 1882, Mr. Miller (California), reported this bill with amendmen Mr. Miller said: ents. In making the report

"I wish to say that the report is that of a majority of the committee, and is not a unanimous report, the chairman of the committee having reserved the right to support or op-pose amendments which may be offered."

April 21, 1882, Senator Miller (California) attempted to fix a day for consideration of

April 25, 1882, on motion of Mr. Miller (Cal-ifornia), the consideration of the bill was proceeded with. Mr. Morgan gave notice that the bill in its present. form Ald active that the bill in its present form did not re-ceive the sanction of the whole committee; there were at least three members of the committee who were opposed to it in its present form, as amended. (But he did not name them). The committee amendments were agreed to without calling the yeas and nays until the section providing for Chinese citizenship was reached, this being section 14. The yeas and nays were ordered on striking out this section, and the amendment was rejected—32 nays, 26 yeas; Mr. Harrison voted yea. The next amendment was to strike out the fifteenth section, which reads as follows: "That the words Chinese there were at least three members of the reads as follows: "That the words 'Chinese laborers,' wherever used in this act, shall be construed to mean both skilled and unskilled laborers, and Chinese employed in mining." The yeas and nays were ordered on this amendment. The yeas were ordered of this amendment. The yeas were 29, the nays were 28. The amendment was agreed to. It was stricken out. Mr. Harrison voted yea. Mr. Farley then gave notice than when the bill came into the senate from the committee of the whole he would renew his motion.

The bill was then reported to the senate as amended and the reserved amendments, to gether with the bill, were ordered printed.

Senator Morgan addressed the senate at

great length in favor of the bill..—(Record, Vol. 13, pt. 4, p. 3,262 to 3,271.) April 26, 1882, the senate resumed consideration of the bill, the question being on con-curring in the amendment as in committee of the whole, striking out the fifteenth section. After considerable debate Mr. Edmunds offered an amendment to the pending fif teenth section, making the section read:
"The words 'Chinese laborers' wherever used in this act shall be construed to include person who are usually engaged in man-ual labor." After debate the senate ad-journed without action.—(Record, Vol. 13, pt.

4, p. 3,308 to 3,312.) April 17, 1882, the senate resumed consid eration, with the Edmunds amendment pending. Mr. Edmunds withdrew his amendment, stating that he was under a misapprehension when he offered it. At this point of the proceedings the senate found itself very much embarrassed upon examination of the condition of the amended bill. The skilled labor section was stricken out, while the fourteenth section was retained. labor section was stricken out, while the fourteenth section was retained. Under this amendment the drift of the debate was generally settling down to the definition of Cninese laborers as used in the treaty and in the bill under consideration. Mr. Grover contended that the president was satisfied with or approved that portion of the bill contained in the tenth section, and read the fellowing clause from the president's message:

"As to the class of persons to be affected the Americans inserted in their draft a provision that the words 'Chinese laborers' signify all immigration other then that for 'teaching, traile, travel, study and curiosity.'

to include artisans in the class of laborers whose immigration might be forbidden. The Americans replied that they could not con-sent that artisans should be excluded from the class of Chinese laborers, for it is in this very competition of skilled labor in the cities where the Chinese labor it imigration concentrates, which has caused the embarrassment and popular discontent. In the subsequent negotiations this defluition dropped out, and does not appear in the treaty. Article 2 of the treaty confers the rights, privileges, im-munities and exemptions which are accorded to citizens and subjects of the most favored nation upon Chinese subjects proceeding to the United States as teachers, students, merchants, or from curiosity. The American commissioners report that the Chinese gov-ernment claimed that in this article they did, by exclusion, provide that nobody should be entitled to claim the benefit of the general provisions of the Buringame treaty those who might go to the United States in those capacities or for those purposes. I ac-cept this as the definition of the word 'labor-ers' as used in the treaty."

Mr. Harrison said: "I only want to make

a suggestion. In the treaty the word 'laborers' is used. I take it that it is not in the power of congress to enlarge the meaning of that word. Whatever it meant in the treaty it would mean the same thing as used in the law. We cannot make it mean more than that; therefore why not let it stand in the law as in the treaty, and let the use of that

word include what it will."

Mr. Grover objected to the proposition of
Mr. Harrison for the reason he said, the Mr. Harrison for the reason he said, the word can be defined in different ways, and if it is left to be construed by those who administer the law, they will have to determine it either one way or the other. Mr. Harrison replied to this in the following:
"It is possible that the senate is right in saying that the word may be construed differently; but can we enlarge the meaning of it as it is used in the treaty." That is the it as it is used in the treaty? That is the question I present. If we use the same word in the law that is used in the treaty we are

going as far as we can go, for we cannot en large the word as it is used in the treaty." Mr. Grover proposed to put a legislative interpretation upon it and Mr. Miller (Cal.) remarked: "We start out with the presumption that congress will not legislate to vio-late a treaty, so that in fact it is probable that the words of the treaty would govern unless there was a plain intent manifest that congress intended to violate the treaty or legislate in conflict with it. If any one can show a good reason or apprehension that skilled labor so-called would come into this country under this bill unless this section were adopted, I should certainly desire to have it adopted."

Mr. Grover read an extract from the Daily which discussed the amendment made by the senate committee, criticising the effect of leaving out the provision of the fifteen th

Mr. Harrison replied to Mr. Grover as follows: "Will the senator from Oregon allow me to make a suggestion to him! He read an article from a paper to the effect that the word 'laborers' as used in the treaty or as used in the law may be limited by meaning applied to those who are unskilled. If the court should so decide, giving that meaning to the word 'laborers' as used in the treaty, would the senator from Oregon be in favor of going beyond what we are authorized to do by our treaty!"

Mr. Grover answered: "The commis sioners on the part of the United States, who negotiated this treaty, are unanimous in their expression that this clause is properly in the bill." To which Mr. Harrison re

once trying, when the lawyer who drew the will was on the other side. There was a great deal of controversy about the meaning and he undertook to settle it by saying that he wrote the will and knew what it meant. It seems to me that is a parallel case with our commissioners undertaking to say what

Mr. Grover again answered: "The president of the United States, after considering the protest of the Chinese ambassador and reading what the American commissioner said, decided that this clause was correctly in the bill. If any court should decide that there is a conflict between the law and the treaty, I think the treaty will go to the wall." Mr. Harrison-"That does not answer my question. Is the senator from Oregon in favor of driving the treaty to the wall by

favor of driving the treaty to the wan by legislation here!"

Mr. Grover: "I think I have answered that sufficiently in stating that the commissioners and the president have given their construction of the treaty. That is the American view of it, and I follow that." Mr. Harrison: "That does not answer the question at all. The question I asked the senator is whether, if the theaty and the law in the section to which he has referred are in conflict, he still believes in passing the law and driving the treaty to the wall: or, in other words, trampling upon our treaty

obligations." This branch of the debate closed by Mr. Grover declaring that he would stand by the

authorities he had cited, and the bill, after the debate, went over for the day. (Record, vol. 18, pt. 4, p. 1,351 to 1,369.)

April 28, 1882, the senate again resumed consideration, the pending question being concurrence in striking out the fifteenth secstricken out. Senator Edmunds, in reply t remarks of Senator Call, gave some exam-ples of questions of opinion in describing crimes, stating that more mischief had been done everywhere in civilized countries by indertaking to make over-definition in law about crimes than there is in using general

After further debate a yea and nay vote was ordered on concurring with the commit-tee of the whole in striking from the bill the fifteenth section. The year were 20 and the nays 25; so that the amendment was non-concurred in. Mr. Harrison voted yea, in

Mr. Edinands then moved to amend the fif-teenth section by striking out all the words after "that" and inserting: "The words 'Chinese laborers,' wherever used in this act, shall be construed to mean persons usually engaged in manual labor."

The yeas and nays were taken, which re-sulted in 17 yeas, 25 nays, and the amend-ment was rejected. Mr. Harrison voted for the amendment.

the amendment.

Mr. Edmunds again moved to amend the fourteenth section as follows: "Nothing in this act shall be construed to change the existing naturalization laws, so as to admit Chinese persons to citizenship."

The amendment was rejected by a yea and nay vote—yeas 16. nays 25, Mr. Harrison voting yea, in favor of the amendment.

The bill was placed upon its bassage, receiving 33 yeas and 15 nays, Mr. Harrison voting nay. So the bill passed.

A review of this remarkable debate discloses but one prominent feature of opposition from the republican minority to the

passage of the bill, namely, its disregard for passage of the oil, namely, its disregard for conflict with existing treaty obligations— (Record. Vol. 13, pt. 4, p. 3,404 to 3,712.) On July 3, 1884, Mr. Miller (Cal.) moved to take from the table for consideration house bill 1,798, and the motion was agreed to. After rejecting the amendment pro-posed by Mr. Platt the yeas and nays were

ordered on the passage of the bill. Yeas were 43, mays were 12. So the bill was passed. Mr. Harrison is reported as ab-On May 26, 1886, Mr. Sherman, with the consent of Mr. Delph, of Oregon, called up for consideration senate bill 1,591, which was debated at some length and amended.—(Rec-

ord, vol. 17, pt. 5, p. 4,958 to 4,962.)
It was again considered on June 1. The amendments of the committee were agreed to, and the bill was passed with a yea and nay vote,—(Record, vol. 17, pt. 5, p. 5,109 to

"The conclusion of any careful student of "that the first Chinese bill was opposed be-cause it was in conflict with existing treaty obligations. The second and third bills were passed without conflict, because they were in harmony with treaty obligations. Senator Harrison's record on these bills cer-tainly is on the side of law, order and na-tional honor. I think the people might, with great reason, trust him with the exe-cution of treaty obligations in preference to some who have declared openly in national counsel that a great treaty bearing the seal and obligation of this nation with that of other powers is a humbug."

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT. Hanging Said to Produce Death

Quicker Than Electricity. Globe-Democrat: At a recent meeting of the Medico-Legal society, of New York, Dr. William A. Hammond, the eminent specialist and physiologist, discussed the subject of capital punishment by hanging and electricity. He and several of his colleagues were of the opinion that hanging was the more painless and certain of the two methods of inflicting legal death. As New York has changed its laws, substituting electricity for the classic rope, the subject was one of great interest from a

medico-legal point of view. For interest of science and the eu-thanasia of would-be murderers in general, several well-known surgeons determined to perform a series of experiments on living animals to decide the estion, and their results, which are about to be published in a well-known scientific journal, are considered of special importance. The experimenters were Dr. B. Curtis, Dr. George Brown Phelps and H. S. Lewis. They were assisted by three medical students.

There programme was: 1. Time required to produce death by 2. Time required to produce death by

electricity. Post-mortem appearances.
 Resuscitation after death by either

method. The experiments were chiefly carried on at the Carnegie laboratory. Boys were employed to obtain the unfortu-

nate canines, and all collision with the society for the prevention or cruelty to animals was carefully avoided by

ecrecy. The room, or laboratory, in which the experiments were made was at the rear of the building on the fifth floor. A powerful electric dynamo was obained and a gibbet of the most approved pattern erected. Room was also provided for the dogs who should be resuscitated after apparent death by either means. The animals were se-curely muzzled before the experiments were attempted, but this did not prevent their howling. The details of each experiment will be published by the experimenters. The results were greatly in favor of hanging. Out of 100 dogs, fifty were hung and fifty submitted to the electric discharge. Of those hung twenty were dead in less than five minutes, and from post-mortem examination it was apparent that they died almost instantly. Five out of the fifty were resuscitated and are alive, but they were all small. It was found that the heavier the animal the quicker the result of death was obtained, and where a weight was added to the dog's weight, death seemed to take place instantaneously. the fifty submitted to the electric discharge of the strength and in the manner prescribed by the state law for the death of criminals, instant death was produced in only five experiments. It required on the average ten minutes to kill, and in eighteen instances the animal was easily resuscitated. In seven he came to without the slightest treatment within two hours after apparent death. The prescribed discharge entirely faifed to produce death in three instances, and one of these three dogs came to after double the strength of electric discharge had been given. From the post mortem appearance of the brain and nerve centers, and from

other things observed, the experimenter concluded the electric discharge caused the intensest agony, especially when not strong enough to kill at once, while in the case of hanging the evidence pointed to immediate paralysis of the nerve centers and a painless death. Such are the chief results of their investigations.

Randall Leaves Washington

WASHINGTON, July 28.-Randall and his family left Washington this morning for their country home at Wayne Station, Pa. Randall was taken to the station in a closed carriage, the blinds of which were closely drawn. While the patient was feeble this morning, owing to the unusual exertions consequent on his removal, his family is well pleased with the continued improvement of his continued improvement of his continued improvement of his continued. ment of his condition.

At an officers' meeting held last Friday night much business of importance was transacted, and the proposition to properly colebrate the anniversary of the uniform rank, on August 28, was favorably discussed, and a committee was appointed to prepare a programme, who will report at an early date.

LAW'S EXTREME PENALTY.

The Two Men Who Paid It in Cmaha.

THE HISTORY OF THEIR CRIMES.

A Victim Wrapped in Chains and Sunk in the River-The Horrible Coolness of Ottawa Baker's Crime.

Legal Executions in Omaha. Innumerable murders have been committed

n Omaha, but only two murderers have paid the penalty of their crimes upon the gallows. The first legal execution in the city, as well as the first in the state, was that of Judge Cyrus Tator, on August 23, 1803, for the murder of his partner, Isaac H. Neff. About June 17, 1863, the Missouri river,

ever treacherous, receded during the night, leaving upon its bank the body of a man wrapped round and round with heavy log chains. The man had evidently been dead but a few days, and the marks of some snarp instrument upon his head showed plainly that he had been murdered and his body thrown into the water with the expectation that it would be forever hidden from sight. The corpse was recognized as that of Neff, who in company with Tator had been camping near Sulphur Springs. Tator was nowhere to be found, and his sudden disappearance at once turned suspicion upon him. It was learned that he had purchased groceries in considerable quantity a few days previous and had started across country. Sheriff Thomas L. Sutton immedidiately followed in pursuit, and after several days overhauled him near Columbus, finding in his possession a team and wagon which had belonged to Neff. The sheriff returned to Omaha with his prisoner, and district court being then in session with Chief Justice Kellogg presiding, a special grand jury was at once called, and Tator indicted for the murder of Neff.

Tator having no funds, Messrs. Little nd Poppleton were appointed to defend him, which they did in a very able manner indeed, the state being represented by Charles H. Brown and Judge Lake. Popular prejudices were so aroused that 200 men were examined before a suitable jury was empanelled. The trial jasted about a fortnight and the case was given to the jury, who, after two hours' deliber-ation, returned a verdict of "guilty in the first degree." The defendant's able attorneys were unsuccessful in their several motions for new trial and on July 10 Judge Kellogg passed the death sentence, fixing the day of execution for August 21, but Governor Saunders extended his time to August 28. Cyrus Tator was a man of much more than ordinary ability, being a lawyer by profession, a brilliant conversationalist, and a man of learning. He had held the position of pro-

learning. He had held the position of pro-bate judge for two terms in Lykins county, Kansas, where he was elected to the state legislature, but apparently he cared little for public honors and lett for Pikes Peak with out taking his seat. His career in Colorado, however, must have been decidedly unsavory, as while he was incarcerated in this city after his trial, a burly man with unkempt hair and weather-beaten visage—a typical mountaineer—came to the door of his cell. When Tator saw him he gave a start of rec-ognition, as with a face livid with rage, the man burst out in a torrent of abuse, declaring Tator to be a thief, a tiar and a scoundrel, and expressing pleasure that he was to be hung. Beneath the storm of invectives, Tator cowered in his cell.

During his peregrinations in Colorado he formed the acquaintance of Neff, with whom he came to Omaha in June of 1863. His rea-son for murdering Neff Tator never di-

"It has always been a mystery to me," said one of the lawyers connected with the case, in a recent conversation, "that a man of Tator's attainments should commit a crime by which so much might be lost and so little

The day of execution was one of the most memorable days in the history of Omaha. Company C, Seventh Iowa cavalry, comprising forty men, formed a hollow square around the buggy containing Sheriff Sutton, Constable Riley and the conaround Sutton, demned, constable Riley and the escorting them from the escorting them from the escorted near Sulphur Springs. The way was thronged with people

on foot and horseback and in vehicles of every description.

Hon, Byron Reed has in his possession a copy of the Daily Nebraskan, issued the next day, which contains a verbatim report of Tator's sneech upon the gallows, thereby badly scooping its contemporary, the Republican. In this speech, he says that he is not affected to the contemporary of the result of the contemporary. afraid to die, and professes his innocence of the crime imputed to him, but refuses to state who is the guilty party. During the delivery he was perfectly collected, his elo-quence drawing tears of sympathy from many in the vast assemblage, who accepted as true his intimation that he preferred to die rather than betray the real criminal. But there can be little doubt that he was the real murderer, as it is said that a gentleman closely connected with the trial years afterward made the statement that Tator had confessed his guilt and asked advice as to which way he should plead. His counsel was that he should plead "not guilty," as by so doing greater sympathy would be aroused, not only for himself but for his family. Rev. Mr. Lemon acted as Tator's spiritua adviser. Sheriff Sutton placed the noose around his neck, Constable Riley adjusted the black cap, sprang the trap, and the victim of the first legal execution in Omaha was

On the night of November 21, 1866, Woolsey

D. Higgins, a clerk in Will R. King's store, on the corner of Twelfth and Farnam streets was cruelly murdered by his room-mate, Ottawa H. Baker, who worked as porter in the same store. The murder of Higgins has probably never been excelled for cool deliberation. Mr. H. Livesey, who was personally acquainted with Higgins, speaks of him as a young man of most excellent character. He was of obliging disposition, always affable and pleasant in manner and a universal favorite. On the other hand, from all that can be learned, Baker was a verit-able "tough," and probably the only emi-nently proper act of his life was when he drow

his last breath upon the gailows. He him-self acknowledged to Father Egan, in a writ-ten confession, dated January 28, 1868, nearly two years after the murder, that he had stolen a number of articles, had fired one building to prevent a man from moving in, and was the incendiary who burned the block on Farnam from Thirteenth street to Samuel Burns' building.
The object of the murder was robbery,
Higgins having deposited about \$1,500 in the

Higgins having deposited about \$1,500 in the safe that night after banking hours. Baker knew of this and laid his plans accordingly. Retiring early he feigned slumber until Higgins was fast asleep. Then stealthly arising he took up an axe and dealt his victim terrible blows upon the head, until satisfied that life was extinct. Then taking the keys from Higgins' pocket he opened the safe and withdraw the money. opened the safe and withdrew the money which he secreted under a sidewalk near by. He then scattered matches over the bed by. He then scattered matches over the bed, saturated several rags and boards with kerosene, and set the building on fire, thinking to obliterate all traces of the crime. In order to throw suspicion on unknown parties, he shot himself in the arm and ran down the street shricking "Fire! Thieves! Murder!" The old volunteer fire department promptly responded to the alarm, and the figures were responded to the alarm, and the flames were extinguished. Higgins's body was found unscorched, his life-blood having soaked the bed clothes and matches, so that they had failed to ignite. This might have been con-clusive evidence of Baker's guilt had he not

clusive evidence of Baker's guilt had he not been an expert liar, telling a very plausible story of the matches having fallen from the mantel. Dr. Peabody, who dressed the wound in his arm, testified that the shot which caused it could have been fired only by the party himself. Baker was arrested a few days afterward and came up for trial before Judge Lake. Hon. G. M. Doane was then district attorney, and Hon. John I. Redick appeared for the state, while judge, then Colonel Savage, Mr. Parks, Mr. Hopkins and Ben Sheiks represented the defendant. Owing to a disagreement in the jury, the case was not decided for nearly two years, at the expiration of which time two years, at the expiration of which time Baker wrote the confession above referred to. In this he disclosed the hiding-place of to. In this he disclosed the hiding-place of the money. Father Egan, Judge Savage and John Delaney proceeded to the spot and found there the \$1,500 entire, just as it had been placed on the night of the murder. The scaffolding was erected for Baker's execution in the ravine at about the place which is now the intersection of Twenty

seventh and Dodge, a spot which the papers of that day describe as a "quarter of a mile west of Capitol square." It was a place admirably adapted for a public execution, as the hills sloped gradually down from all directions, forming a natural ampitheater. A vast crowd assembled on these hills to witness the hanging, the number of women present being particularly noticeable. A gen-tieman who was an eye witness of the scene states that hundreds of them were there. Baker made no speech upon the scaffold. Sheriff Hoel and Deputy Sheriff Seymour Sheriff Hoel and Deputy Sheriff Seymour were the executioners and Father Egan ad ministered religious consolation. And thus on February 14, 1865—St. Valentine's day— nearly two years after the commission of his crime, Ottawa H. Baker, the second and last person to be legally hung in Omaha, re

ceived his just desorts.

A peculiarly touching incident connected with the murder of Higgins was the fate of his flance, Miss Lizzie Heard, a beautifu and accomplished young lady. The shock of his violent death and her great grief resulted in her decease six months after he was killed. Consequently Baker was virtually guilty of a double murder.

new trimmings have been introduced of

late, among them bands of leather four or five inches wide, laid round the skirt

Women's World of August: Several

and carried up the front of woolen gowns; they are borded with gold braid about an inch wide. Suede kid in bold Renaissance designs, intermixed with filigree gold bullion, the groundwork all cut away, when laid on the material makes a very handsome tramming More splendid and showy are the course woven gold Russian braids, embroidered with Turkish letters in a variety of shades and tones of the same color well combined on one piece of stuff. Al such trimming are chosen with a due regard to the shot and jarkiniere effects to be found in the stuffs of the year, which are called "chameleon glace," and any other name that may occur to the fertile brain of the manufacturer out they are always soft and lustrous in hue. Into the silks and metallic thread galons colored stones are introduced And thicker down the front with jewels than the sward with drops of dew, so thickly shone the gems," exactly de scribes the appearance of many of the embroidered breadths introduced into the fronts of gowns. Some of the galons are worked on crepe lisse, so the color of the dress shows through and thus deepens the effect of the many tints with which they are wrought Cream flannel in several widths i worked in the same manner, ready to be

applied to both tennis and tea gowns. Belts are always more worn with sum mer than with winter dresses, and some new kinds in leather show repousse de signs like fish-scales or fine ivory carying. Steel and oxidized chains round the waist confine the fulness of some makes of gowns; as, for example, a wool-en of the blotting paper tone, with wide stripes, the bodice and skirt all cut in one, the former made with a rounded yoke of short silk to match the material which is gathered over it in some six or seven lines, and again gathered in points at the back and front of the waist The skirt is hemmed round and allowed to fall over a plain petticoat, or it can be caught up to suit the wearer's figure One of these chain belts over the waistgathering is decidedly an addition. This style of dress is just one which could be applied to most of the requirements of life. Without the yoke it would serve for evening, and it is sufficiently loose and unrestraining to answer the purpose of a tea-gown, which, by the by, was a garment originally intended to be

worn without stays.

The idea of cutting all bedices on one plan has become long ago exploded. An endless variety is now made by the clever disposition of stripes.

The message boxes of THE BEE are proving a great convenience to the

CELESTIAL AGRICULTURE.

How the Chinese Farmer Raises and Handles His Crop.

WASHINGTON, July 26 .- | Special to THE BEE. |- Charles Denby, United States minister to China, has sent a communication to the department of state, under date of April 23, last, about agriculture in north China, which contains some observations which will be of special interest to the farmers of this country, if not to every reader. In the course

of his dispatch Mr. Denby says: "In threshing grain the Chinese spread it out on a smooth clay floor in the open air, there being such a threshing floor adjoining every farm house, and either by threshing with flails or by rolling a stone roller, drawn by a donkey, over it detach the grain. The chaff is removed by tossing the grain into the air in a slight breeze, the kernels of grain falling straight to the ground, the chaff and dust being blown aside.

"The two most characteristic features of Chinese agriculture are the use of manure and the systems of irrigation. Manure is and the systems of irrigation. Manure is gathered from all conceivable sources. In the cities the night-soil deposited on the sides of streets and alleys is gathered by men and boys in buckets and mixed with clay, dried in the sun and sold to farmers. On country roads boys, and often girls and women, are seen at places where large numbers of pack-horses, camels and mules pass, gathering into baskets the material which is afterwards, with such beneficial effects, spread upon their fields. Earth from the canals, rivers, and city streets is also carted away for the same purpose. Other substances are diligently collected, as hair from barber shops, exploded fire-crackers, and sweepings from the streets; lime and plaster from kitchens and old buildings, soot, bones, from kitchens and old buildings, soot, bones, fish and animal remains. The quantity of these fertilizers used and the importance the Chinese attach to them are proved by the number of people whose livelihood is gained

in their collection. "In irrigating his land the farmer uses many devices. Where running water is at hand he turns it to advantage by directing it over his fields in large channels, banked in with clay, and subdivided into smaller and smaller streamlets, until every part of the ground has been reached. If no running water is found, wells are dug and water drawn up by hand and poured into the ditches, which are subdivided into numerous smaller ones. Holes are dug in which rain-water accumulates, which is baled out when needed. The raising of this water is in most cases, especially in the vicinity of Peking, done very laboriously by hand. Windmills, of which there is not one around Peking (if anywhere in China), might be used for this purpose with great increase of efficiency and saving of human labor.
"Chinese agricultural implements are of the

rudest character. They are chiefly the plow, the hoc, the harrow, the rake and the stone roller. The plow is simply a broad blade fastened to a rough handle, guided by a man and drawn by teams of the most miscellaneous description; it cuts a furrow never more than six inches deep and frequently only two or three. The teams are made up of horses, donkeys, mules, bullocks and hu-man beings, it being not unusual to see a man or boy and any one or more of the animals above named drawing the same plow. Chinese farmers measure the depth of the furrows by the fingers, and frequently speak of plowing only two or three fingers. The reason of this seems to lie in the diffi-The reason of this seems to he in the dim-culty of making a deeper furrow with their plows, and not because they are unaware of the advantage of it. The hoe is a much more effective tool and it is with this that they

work between the furrows of grain after it as sprouted.
"Foreign agricultural implements, espec-"Foreign agricultural implement with good ially plows, might be introduced with good effect among the Chinese, except that the price would deter all but very few from buying them. A Chinese plow can be bought for ing them. A Chinese plow can be bought for the equivalent of two or three Mexican dollars, and smaller tools in proportion. There are no great stores devoted to the sale of agricultural implements with us, they being made by hand, either by a neighboring black-smith or by the farmer himself, as occasion

demands. demands.

"The principal crops in the vicinity of Peking, besides the fruits and vegetables, of which they are almost all that are found in western countries, are wheat, barley, buck-Indian corn, sesamum, hemp, rice, cotton and some tobacco.

"Both spring and autumn wheat are used exclusively for the manufacture of flour, being ground by mills worked by hand, horse or donkey power, or, rarely, by water power.

"Both upland and wet rice are grown in Both upland and wet rice are grown in the vicinity of Peking, the former producing the inferior grain. The subject of rice culture has always ranked with the manufacture of silk and the growth of tea as the three most characteristic pursuits of the population of China. They have been the themes of many books and treatises both by foreigners and natives. Chinese empirors and empresses have often interested them-selves in these pursuits, and have done all

and empresses have often interested them selves in these pursuits, and have done all they could to assist and encourage the people in foliowing them.

"A comparison of the yield of the fields of China with that of American farms would be interesting, if it could be accurately made. The difference between the styles of planting makes this difficult, if not impossible, the grain in America being sown broadcast or drilled, while in China all cereals are carefully planted in furrows, wide distances apart. The absence of any statistics as to the average product per acre, such as are found in the United States, make this comparison much more difficult, the products, as given above, being the yield of good land for a good year. It is probable, however, that, in proportion to the quantity of seed sown, the farmer of north China gots a larger return than the average return in America. This would be the natural result of his careful system of planting, harvesting and threshing, involving no loss whatever. The saving in America is effected by using drills instead of sowing broadcast is an index of the probably greater gain on the Chinese method. This is not to say, however, that the grain is sufficient to compensate for the great extra labor.

"The Chinese system of growing two crops on the same ground at the same time. While

"The Chinese system of growing two crops on the same ground at the same time, while advantageous in some respects, can not be regarded with approval. It is probable that a deterioration results in the quality of both, if not in the quantity of the yield.

"China is essentually a treeless country. Importations of wood come chiefly from the United States, the Spanish Islands, Hainan, and Formess. Were it not for the countless cometeries in China, trees would be rarely seen. These cometeries are planted with pines and cedars, and dot the landscame with agreeable affect."

Drink Malto, 25 cents a bottle.