

Nellie Bly as a Salvation Army Girl—Sunday World.

LAST EDITION CORONERS SCORED.

The Grand Jury Submits Its Presentments to Judge Fitzgerald.

GRAVE CHARGES IN DETAIL.

Maladministration, Neglect and Unbusinesslike Methods.

RADICAL REMEDY FOR THE EVIL.

In the Jury's Opinion the Entire System Should Be Changed.

The Grand Jury this afternoon filed their presentments...

The work of the Grand Jury has been thorough...

The presentment was filed with Judge Fitzgerald...

It was headed to General Fitzgerald by Foreman Emanuel Bloomingdale.

Judge Fitzgerald told Mr. Bloomingdale that he would refer the presentment to the proper authorities.

COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS OF THE PEACE.

City and County of New York, September Term, 1893.

The Grand Jury present as follows: During the present term the Grand Jury in the discharge of its duties visited the House of Detention and found among the prisoners...

Witnesses who had been committed to the institution by one of the police judges on the charge of committing a crime of homicide committed on the day previous. These witnesses complained of the failure of the coroner to take action in the case.

The following day the Grand Jury inquired of the District Attorney as to the cause of this apparent neglect, and were informed by him that he had no official knowledge whatever of the coroner's return from the coroner's office nor from any of the police magistrates having been made to him up to that time. The Grand Jury thereupon deemed it their duty to inquire into what appeared to be a neglect on the part of the coroner in this case.

Investigation disclosed the following facts: On the 7th day of July a homicide occurred in New York City...

Charge of one of the coroners, who adjourned the inquest from time to time, and finally adjourned it until the coroner's inquest was completed by another coroner; that upon the inquest named the coroner's office and the methods of conducting the same were such that the coroner's office was in a state of confusion; that the stenographic transcript of the testimony did not consist of over half a page of type-written matter, and that the coroner's office was in a state of confusion; that upon the inquest named the coroner's office and the methods of conducting the same were such that the coroner's office was in a state of confusion.

When, however, the attention of the coroner's office was directed to the case by the grand jury, the coroner's office, were at once transmitted to the District Attorney's office.

Having ascertained that this case was but an instance of a long-continued practice in the coroner's office, the grand jury summoned before them a number of witnesses for the purpose of inquiring into the general conduct of the coroner's office and the methods of conducting the same.

These abuses are apparently the result of a long-continued lack of system and of the neglect of the coroner's office and those subordinate to them in the business of that office.

The law contemplates that all suspicious deaths should be promptly and thoroughly investigated by the coroner. The evidence before the grand jury, as taken from the records of the coroner's office shows that the coroner does not promptly investigate such deaths, but that their investigations are almost invariably delayed beyond all reasonable time.

The general laws of this State require that when an inquest is completed the testimony of witnesses examined before the coroner's jury must be reduced to writing by the coroner or his deputy, and in this county must be filed by him with the inquisition in the office of the clerk of the district court.

By a provision of the New York City Consolidation Act each of the coroners is required to file with the clerk of the Board of Coroners in all cases that may come before him an abstract of the testimony taken by him and a copy of the verdict rendered by the coroner's jury.

These mandatory provisions of the law have long been ignored by the coroner.

The annexed paper marked "exhibit" contains a list of the cases reported to the coroner's office since Jan. 1, 1893, together with the dates of the inquests and the time when the papers have been filed with the District Attorney and the name of the coroner having charge of each case.

This list was produced in evidence before the grand jury as a correct abstract from the records of the coroner's office.

"BIFF'S" WITNESSES

One of Them Admits He Has Been in the Defense's Employ.

Witness Steele Gets Caught on Cross-Examination.

Negative Testimony as to Ellison's Assault on Henriques.

It was "Biff" Ellison's turn to-day. The prosecution completed yesterday its story of the disgraced clubman's assault on Broker William Henriques.

It was expected that the defense would be sensational. Therefore the largest crowd of the week clamored for admission to the courtroom when Recorder Smyth took his seat on the bench this morning.

ELLISON MAKES A SUGGESTION. Ellison still holds his turbulent temper in control, chattered pleasantly enough with the hated newspaper men and smoked during the half hour between his arrival and escort to a sheriff's deputy from the Tombs and the appearance of the Recorder. He said he would go on the stand and defend himself from the charges which he had turned upon him.

Mr. O'Sullivan arose to make the opening address for the defense. He took Mr. Henriques by the collar and called to the stand, suffered a little more cross-examination from Mr. Brooke.

"Mr. Henriques, you heard the testimony of Hackman McMahon, yesterday. He said that you were in the room while he was taking you home, these words: 'I am a poor shot. I missed my man—or anything to that effect?'"

"I have no recollection of saying it," Mr. Brooke asked this question a dozen other ways, but the question was answered in the affirmative.

McMahon was recalled, and denied that Henriques said any such thing, or that he had ever told any one that he did.

Mr. O'Sullivan characterized the dragging of the name of McMahon into the Neame divorce affair, the simple assault to which Ellison pleaded guilty, as an effort to "make up a case" against Ellison. He held that all this was extraneous to the case, and on the question of the guilt or innocence of Ellison of the charge of attacking Henriques he had no opinion.

He said his complaints to the "Daily News" were an appropriate gesture and "polite" of Mr. Neame on the witness stand.

"It is no part of my program to disgrace this woman any more than she has disgraced me," said Mr. O'Sullivan. "We did all in our power to keep her out of it and to protect her from any further publicity, but she was brought in in spite of us by the District Attorney."

"You know that the question of bail is not a part of the case. If you don't see your way out, you may go."

Mr. O'Sullivan set out to inform the jury that Ellison's bail had been fixed at \$5,000, a greater amount than is fixed in manaulaughter cases. The Recorder stopped him, saying gruffly:

"You know that the question of bail is not a part of the case. If you don't see your way out, you may go."

Mr. O'Sullivan set out to inform the jury that Ellison's bail had been fixed at \$5,000, a greater amount than is fixed in manaulaughter cases. The Recorder stopped him, saying gruffly:

"You know that the question of bail is not a part of the case. If you don't see your way out, you may go."

Mr. O'Sullivan set out to inform the jury that Ellison's bail had been fixed at \$5,000, a greater amount than is fixed in manaulaughter cases. The Recorder stopped him, saying gruffly:

"You know that the question of bail is not a part of the case. If you don't see your way out, you may go."

Mr. O'Sullivan set out to inform the jury that Ellison's bail had been fixed at \$5,000, a greater amount than is fixed in manaulaughter cases. The Recorder stopped him, saying gruffly:

"You know that the question of bail is not a part of the case. If you don't see your way out, you may go."

Mr. O'Sullivan set out to inform the jury that Ellison's bail had been fixed at \$5,000, a greater amount than is fixed in manaulaughter cases. The Recorder stopped him, saying gruffly:

"You know that the question of bail is not a part of the case. If you don't see your way out, you may go."

Mr. O'Sullivan set out to inform the jury that Ellison's bail had been fixed at \$5,000, a greater amount than is fixed in manaulaughter cases. The Recorder stopped him, saying gruffly:

"You know that the question of bail is not a part of the case. If you don't see your way out, you may go."

Mr. O'Sullivan set out to inform the jury that Ellison's bail had been fixed at \$5,000, a greater amount than is fixed in manaulaughter cases. The Recorder stopped him, saying gruffly:

"You know that the question of bail is not a part of the case. If you don't see your way out, you may go."

Mr. O'Sullivan set out to inform the jury that Ellison's bail had been fixed at \$5,000, a greater amount than is fixed in manaulaughter cases. The Recorder stopped him, saying gruffly:

"You know that the question of bail is not a part of the case. If you don't see your way out, you may go."

Mr. O'Sullivan set out to inform the jury that Ellison's bail had been fixed at \$5,000, a greater amount than is fixed in manaulaughter cases. The Recorder stopped him, saying gruffly:

"You know that the question of bail is not a part of the case. If you don't see your way out, you may go."

Mr. O'Sullivan set out to inform the jury that Ellison's bail had been fixed at \$5,000, a greater amount than is fixed in manaulaughter cases. The Recorder stopped him, saying gruffly:

"You know that the question of bail is not a part of the case. If you don't see your way out, you may go."

ARE THESE MEN ALSO TO BE ARRESTED?

The Police in Washington yesterday arrested a man who "Wanted the Presidential Chair."



The Police in Washington yesterday arrested a man who "Wanted the Presidential Chair."

GOT BOGUS EVIDENCE RECEIVER FOR THE SOLOMONS.

Necktie Firm to Be Dissolved—Barrister Hearing Postponed.

Judge McAdams, in Superior Court, this morning granted the application of Harry Solomon for a receiver to wind up the affairs of the Solomon necktie firm of which David J. Solomon has a two-third interest.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

RECEIVER FOR THE SOLOMONS.

Necktie Firm to Be Dissolved—Barrister Hearing Postponed.

Judge McAdams, in Superior Court, this morning granted the application of Harry Solomon for a receiver to wind up the affairs of the Solomon necktie firm of which David J. Solomon has a two-third interest.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

Attorney Haite, representing David J. Solomon, did not oppose the dissolution of the firm, but thought the matter should be referred to a receiver. Judge McAdams decided, however, that he would grant the application.

LAST EDITION DOCK BOARD DEFEAT.

The \$11,000,000 Plans Beaten by the Comptroller's Vote.

A Tilt Between Mayor Gilroy and Mr. Myers.

Riverside Park Water Front Saved for the Time Being.

A crowd of citizens filled the Mayor's office this morning to protest against a number of things the Dock Board threatened to do.

The property owners in the neighborhood of Riverside Park have been battling against speculators and others, who wanted to use the Riverside Park water front for commercial purposes.

The Dock Board's scheme includes the construction of new wharves and docks between Charles and West Twenty-third street, at an estimated cost of over \$11,000,000, and a proposition to place the water front from Seventy-second to One Hundredth street, along Riverside Park, under the jurisdiction of the Dock Department.

The property owners in the neighborhood of Riverside Park have been battling against speculators and others, who wanted to use the Riverside Park water front for commercial purposes.

The Dock Board's scheme includes the construction of new wharves and docks between Charles and West Twenty-third street, at an estimated cost of over \$11,000,000, and a proposition to place the water front from Seventy-second to One Hundredth street, along Riverside Park, under the jurisdiction of the Dock Department.

The property owners in the neighborhood of Riverside Park have been battling against speculators and others, who wanted to use the Riverside Park water front for commercial purposes.

The Dock Board's scheme includes the construction of new wharves and docks between Charles and West Twenty-third street, at an estimated cost of over \$11,000,000, and a proposition to place the water front from Seventy-second to One Hundredth street, along Riverside Park, under the jurisdiction of the Dock Department.

The property owners in the neighborhood of Riverside Park have been battling against speculators and others, who wanted to use the Riverside Park water front for commercial purposes.

The Dock Board's scheme includes the construction of new wharves and docks between Charles and West Twenty-third street, at an estimated cost of over \$11,000,000, and a proposition to place the water front from Seventy-second to One Hundredth street, along Riverside Park, under the jurisdiction of the Dock Department.

The property owners in the neighborhood of Riverside Park have been battling against speculators and others, who wanted to use the Riverside Park water front for commercial purposes.

The Dock Board's scheme includes the construction of new wharves and docks between Charles and West Twenty-third street, at an estimated cost of over \$11,000,000, and a proposition to place the water front from Seventy-second to One Hundredth street, along Riverside Park, under the jurisdiction of the Dock Department.

The property owners in the neighborhood of Riverside Park have been battling against speculators and others, who wanted to use the Riverside Park water front for commercial purposes.

The Dock Board's scheme includes the construction of new wharves and docks between Charles and West Twenty-third street, at an estimated cost of over \$11,000,000, and a proposition to place the water front from Seventy-second to One Hundredth street, along Riverside Park, under the jurisdiction of the Dock Department.

The property owners in the neighborhood of Riverside Park have been battling against speculators and others, who wanted to use the Riverside Park water front for commercial purposes.

The Dock Board's scheme includes the construction of new wharves and docks between Charles and West Twenty-third street, at an estimated cost of over \$11,000,000, and a proposition to place the water front from Seventy-second to One Hundredth street, along Riverside Park, under the jurisdiction of the Dock Department.

The property owners in the neighborhood of Riverside Park have been battling against speculators and others, who wanted to use the Riverside Park water front for commercial purposes.

The Dock Board's scheme includes the construction of new wharves and docks between Charles and West Twenty-third street, at an estimated cost of over \$11,000,000, and a proposition to place the water front from Seventy-second to One Hundredth street, along Riverside Park, under the jurisdiction of the Dock Department.

The property owners in the neighborhood of Riverside Park have been battling against speculators and others, who wanted to use the Riverside Park water front for commercial purposes.

The Dock Board's scheme includes the construction of new wharves and docks between Charles and West Twenty-third street, at an estimated cost of over \$11,000,000, and a proposition to place the water front from Seventy-second to One Hundredth street, along Riverside Park, under the jurisdiction of the Dock Department.

The property owners in the neighborhood of Riverside Park have been battling against speculators and others, who wanted to use the Riverside Park water front for commercial purposes.

The Dock Board's scheme includes the construction of new wharves and docks between Charles and West Twenty-third street, at an estimated cost of over \$11,000,000, and a proposition to place the water front from Seventy-second to One Hundredth street, along Riverside Park, under the jurisdiction of the Dock Department.

The property owners in the neighborhood of Riverside Park have been battling against speculators and others, who wanted to use the Riverside Park water front for commercial purposes.

The Dock Board's scheme includes the construction of new wharves and docks between Charles and West Twenty-third street, at an estimated cost of over \$11,000,000, and a proposition to place the water front from Seventy-second to One Hundredth street, along Riverside Park, under the jurisdiction of the Dock Department.

The property owners in the neighborhood of Riverside Park have been battling against speculators and others, who wanted to use the Riverside Park water front for commercial purposes.

The Dock Board's scheme includes the construction of new wharves and docks between Charles and West Twenty-third street, at an estimated cost of over \$11,000,000, and a proposition to place the water front from Seventy-second to One Hundredth street, along Riverside Park, under the jurisdiction of the Dock Department.

The property owners in the neighborhood of Riverside Park have been battling against speculators and others, who wanted to use the Riverside Park water front for commercial purposes.

The Dock Board's scheme includes the construction of new wharves and docks between Charles and West Twenty-third street, at an estimated cost of over \$11,000,000, and a proposition to place the water front from Seventy-second to One Hundredth street, along Riverside Park, under the jurisdiction of the Dock Department.

The property owners in the neighborhood of Riverside Park have been battling against speculators and others, who wanted to use the Riverside Park water front for commercial purposes.

The Dock Board's scheme includes the construction of new wharves and docks between Charles and West Twenty-third street, at an estimated cost of over \$11,000,000, and a proposition to place the water front from Seventy-second to One Hundredth street, along Riverside Park, under the jurisdiction of the Dock Department.

The property owners in the neighborhood of Riverside Park have been battling against speculators and others, who wanted to use the Riverside Park water front for commercial purposes.

The Dock Board's scheme includes the construction of new wharves and docks between Charles and West Twenty-third street, at an estimated cost of over \$11,000,000, and a proposition to place the water front from Seventy-second to One Hundredth street, along Riverside Park, under the jurisdiction of the Dock Department.

The property owners in the neighborhood of Riverside Park have been battling against speculators and others, who wanted to use the Riverside Park water front for commercial purposes.

The Dock Board's scheme includes the construction of new wharves and docks between Charles and West Twenty-third street, at an estimated cost of over \$11,000,000, and a proposition to place the water front from Seventy-second to One Hundredth street, along Riverside Park, under the jurisdiction of the Dock Department.

The property owners in the neighborhood of Riverside Park have been battling against speculators and others, who wanted to use the Riverside Park water front for commercial purposes.

The Dock Board's scheme includes the construction of new wharves and docks between Charles and West Twenty-third street, at an estimated cost of over \$11,000,000, and a proposition to place the water front from Seventy-second to One Hundredth street, along Riverside Park, under the jurisdiction of the Dock Department.

The property owners in the neighborhood of Riverside Park have been battling against speculators and others, who wanted to use the Riverside Park water front for commercial purposes.