

What you want is a Result.
28,372
Replies Up to Date in December at the World's P.O.

WORLD
Want Advertisers Have Received
28,372
Replies Up to Date in December at the World's P.O.

WORLD
Want Advertisers Have Received
28,372
Replies Up to Date in December at the World's P.O.

WORLD
Want Advertisers Have Received
28,372
Replies Up to Date in December at the World's P.O.

WORLD
Want Advertisers Have Received
28,372
Replies Up to Date in December at the World's P.O.

WORLD
Want Advertisers Have Received
28,372
Replies Up to Date in December at the World's P.O.

PRICE ONE CENT.

NEW YORK, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 21, 1894.

PRICE ONE CENT.

LAST EDITION. MAKING FUN OF HALE.

Justice Divver's Accuser's Vain Attempts to Serve Subpoenas

He Plays Tag with Tekulsky and Grabs One of His Friends.

Col. Fellows Likely to Shirk the Responsibility.

The hearing of the charges against Police Justice Patrick Divver, which, thanks to the exertions of Lawyer Hale, of Brooklyn, has been dragging along in a farcical manner in the General Term of the Common Pleas Court, will in all probability conclude this afternoon.

Mr. Hale played his last card yesterday when he called upon Col. Fellows to "assist" him in his efforts to have Divver removed from the bench, but the indications are that the District-Attorney will do nothing of the kind.

Hale and Fellows will meet at 1 o'clock for the first time, and the interview promises to be warm for the Brooklyn lawyer. He is going to submit his "proofs," and on the nature of the latter depends entirely the action of the District-Attorney.

"If," said Assistant District-Attorney Unger, Col. Fellows's secretary, to-day "Lawyer Hale comes here simply with a bundle of newspaper clippings he will be told that they contain no proof, and that he has no case. Judging from the reports in the newspapers of the trial so far, Mr. Hale has nothing else, and the Colonel is not in humor to tolerate such nonsense. It is pretty hard on this office to be asked to step in at the last second, after a case has been run completely into the ground, and assume responsibility."

Beyond this Mr. Unger would not talk, but from another equally well-informed source, it is known that the District-Attorney has been worked up to a boiling point over Hale's mismanagement. He would, it is said, not only have been willing, but he was anxious to push the Divver charges, but he has been given the opportunity. He thinks now, that after the farce, nothing but defeat could come of his efforts in the present case, and he is not willing to bear the responsibility.

In every corner of the Second District, Divver's stronghold, the mention of Hale's name is greeted with laughter. Divver's friends say Hale brought the charges simply on newspaper articles, in order to get the \$1,000 reward which Dr. Parkhurst is said to have in his possession for the man who should break a Police Justice. He got five citizens to sign the charges; then began to look for evidence. He had subpoenas issued by the wholesale, and undertook the service of them himself, but all or nearly all eluded his vigilance.

Hale was particularly anxious to find Morris Tekulsky, who he thought the dealer could tell about his fight with Divver. He has brushed up against Tekulsky several times, and spoke repeatedly but was hoodwinked each time.

Hale's picture, particularly his beard, is well known in the Second District, and it was the beard that betrayed him yesterday and last evening when he again tried to serve Tekulsky.

The first attempt was in the forenoon, "Will" Krech, the lunchman, was whistling a popular ditty, and Tekulsky, who was coming down the street, was behind the counter reading a letter when Lawyer Hale's beard showed itself at the glass door in the New Chambers street side. Tekulsky was upstairs. Krech feared to shout a warning, but instead he dropped the whistling and warbled the last lines of this chorus:

And he walked around the door,
But they wouldn't let him in.
With the little bunch of whiskers on his chin.
The warning, however, was too late.
Lawyer Hale was in the store before Burrows could hide himself.

"Where's Tekulsky?" Mr. Hale asked.
"How the hell should I know," was the tart rejoinder. Then Burrows caught sight of several documents in his hand, and he looked like a man who had been served with a subpoena, and he changed his tune.

"Mr. Tekulsky left the store less than a minute ago," he said. "If you run you will catch him."
Hale at once made for the door, but, thinking a trick was about to be played on him as on former occasions, he turned, presumably to serve Burrows with a subpoena, but to his amazement the latter had disappeared.

OUR BLOOD-THIRSTY REFORMER.



"Let Me at Him! I Say, Let Me at Him!"

DOCK BOARD SHORT, DUNRAVEN WILLING, PALFREY PUGNACIOUS

Over \$17,000 Lost in Wharfage in Ten Years.

He Is Satisfied with the Concession of Two Months' Time.

But Referee Stein Didn't Score a Little Bit.

Commissioners of Accounts Present the Facts to the Mayor.

The Royal Yacht Squadron Must Decide Whether to Race.

"I'll Referee Anything That Comes Along," He Said.

Shortage Would Be Larger if There Were Means to Show It.

May Possibly Reverse Its Opinion Regarding the Deed of Gift.

Lively Scenes in the Suit Over Mrs. Palfrey's Tailor's Bill.

LONDON, Dec. 21.—In an interview this morning Lord Dunraven's secretary said that his conditions having been virtually agreed to by the New York Yacht Club, it now remains for the Royal Yacht Squadron to express its sanction or disapproval of the terms.

The St. James's Gazette, commenting upon the situation, says that a race for the cup is now practically assured.

In this city there is much talk of the probability of the Royal Yacht Squadron receding from the position it has taken regarding the race, and the cup under the deed of gift, should its challenger win the trophy.

Lord Dunraven's satisfaction with the concession of time granted by the cable message of yesterday is taken as an indication that, so far as he is personally concerned, there is no obstacle to a race.

However, Lord Wolverton, Lord Londale and Mr. McCalmont, members of the Valkyrie syndicate, are bitterly opposed to the deed of gift, as stated in "The Evening World," exclusively yesterday.

Should the Royal Yacht Squadron reverse its decision, it will be a backdown completely from the present declared attitude of that organization.

A meeting of the Royal Yacht Squadron may be held sooner than Jan. 25, as at first announced.

RODE ON A BONFIRE.

Street Urchins Set a Truck-Load of Paper on Fire While in Motion. People in the vicinity of Bleecker and Mulberry streets witnessed the rare spectacle of a bonfire on wheels at noon to-day. The bonfire belonged to Michael Hanley, a junkman at 133 Baxter street, but he didn't know it at all, and he was sorry he owned it before the party was half-finished.

Hanley's boys waste paper from the Sixth avenue firm. This morning he has thirty sacks, or 3,361 pounds, on his newly painted truck and started downtown. All went well until he struck Third street, where a crowd of boys tried to climb on board.

Hanley drove them off, but they followed, he says, and threw firecrackers at his head. None took effect, however, and just as Hanley left Broadway, on Bleecker street, one of the youngsters touched a match to a streamer of paper that fluttered from one of the sacks.

The ignited his horse, and with his hands turned to the windows and yelling like mad, Hanley hadn't expected this ovation and couldn't account for it until he turned his head, and he was horrified to see his property fast going up in flames and smoke.

He unbridled his horse, and with his hands turned to the windows and yelling like mad, Hanley hadn't expected this ovation and couldn't account for it until he turned his head, and he was horrified to see his property fast going up in flames and smoke.

LAST EDITION. NOW SCHMITTBERGER!

The Captain Takes the Stand and It Is Said He Will Confess Everything.

DID NOT BUY APPOINTMENT.

He Knows of Payments Having Been Made for Promotions.

Police Capt. Max Schmittberger was placed on the Lexow witness stand shortly after noon to-day. Before he began his testimony he was assured of the protection of the Committee if he would tell all he knew about police corruption.

All other witnesses were excused until next Wednesday, and it was evident that Schmittberger would be on the stand all day.

missioner McClave's confidential man. When prompted by Mr. Goff, he said he had heard of Kelly, the shoemaker, of Eighth avenue; Meyers, the tailor, near the Metropolitan Hotel, and Alderman Parks, but he had no positive knowledge of these men.

The new men, the witness said, were not so ready to obey orders, showed some independence and uprightness and seemed to think they could always rely on their political pull and had a right to do what they pleased because they had paid for their positions.

Q. In other words, when charges are brought against them, they rely on their pull more than on their honesty?
A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you know the man who served lit A. to, sir?
A. Yes, sir; but I would not say it was him. Goff's name forged to a subpoena.

Mr. Goff then read from the subpoena, showing that it was made from one of the blanks used in the Common Pleas Court, and directed Rehnert to appear before the Lexow Committee to testify with reference to the case of Officer John Gowan. It was signed with the name of Goff.

Q. Did you know the man who served lit A. to, sir?
A. Yes, sir; but I would not say it was him. Goff's name forged to a subpoena.

Mr. Goff added that he had received numerous letters asking him to call the court, that he had been abused for failing to do so.

"Some people seem to think this Committee is a vehicle for the satisfaction of private malice," said he, "but we have tried to avoid any such complication.

Many of their communications have proved to be without foundation. We will not put any one on the stand simply to smirch his private character, if his public record is bad, then his private character may be attacked, too."

Ex-Ward Man Shalvey Called.
Mr. Goff then called ex-Ward Man Edward Shalvey as the next witness.

Mr. Goff—Have you any title deeds to your property? A. Yes, sir.
Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

on his defense? A. That's about it.
Mr. Goff asked for an adjournment, and recess was taken at this point till 2:15 P. M.

After the adjournment, it was stated upon the authority of one of the Committee's counsel that Capt. Schmittberger had made a clean breast of his connection with the blackmailing system of the Police Department, and that he would tell everything before he left the witness-stand this evening.

That was the reason why Mr. Goff had dismissed all other witnesses, for he knew just what was coming.

"Schmittberger will tell everything from A. to Z." it was stated, "and he knows as much about it as anybody on the police force."

The witness began his testimony by stating that he joined the police force Jan. 25, 1874, at the age of twenty-two. Previously he had been in the confectionery business, and had been married.

Q. Did you ever hear of a patrolman giving up anything to a sergeant to be put on a good post?
A. Yes, sir; I have heard of that, but I never saw it myself.
Q. Do you think the class of men appointed for the last ten years are any improvement upon those for the ten years previous?
A. I do not think they are as good a class of men. They are not so competent, or efficient, or intelligent, and they do not make such able officers. They are more political than policemen.
The witness had heard that latterly all men appointed to the force had to pay for their appointments.
Q. Can you tell us where this money goes?
A. I do not know.
Q. Never mind that now. You have heard of gentlemen who get this money and negotiate with the Commissioner?
A. Yes, sir; frequently.
The only name he could recollect, he said, was Charlie Grant, ex-Com-



CAPT. MAX SCHMITTBERGER.

who furnished conclusive evidence of the payment of this money to the Captain, the question of how his proposed confession would affect this criminal prosecution, in view of the assurance of the Committee, was eagerly canvassed during the recess.

The protection of the Committee, according to Senator Lexow's statement, was absolutely guaranteed to the witness if he would tell the truth. This seemed to settle the question in the minds of most people.

Schmittberger was appointed Captain by Commissioner McClave.

Adolph Rehnert was the first witness of the day. He identified the subpoena with which he was served last night.

Q. Did you know the man who served lit A. to, sir?
A. Yes, sir; but I would not say it was him. Goff's name forged to a subpoena.

Mr. Goff then read from the subpoena, showing that it was made from one of the blanks used in the Common Pleas Court, and directed Rehnert to appear before the Lexow Committee to testify with reference to the case of Officer John Gowan. It was signed with the name of Goff.

LAST EDITION. CARLISLE WEAKENS.

He Decides to Withdraw the Currency Bill Pending in the House.

HAS A NEW MEASURE READY.

It Will Be Introduced By Chairman Springer To-Day or To-Morrow.

SAID TO DIFFER RADICALLY.

Secretary and Banking Committee Agree on This Plan After a Caucus.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 21.—The Carlisle currency bill now before the House will be withdrawn and a substitute presented. This decision was reached after a caucus of the Democratic members of the Banking and Currency Committee quietly held last night, followed by a conference between Secretary Carlisle and Chairman Springer to-day.

The substitute has already been drawn and will be offered by Mr. Springer to-day or to-morrow, certainly before the holiday recess, as the desire of all concerned is to get it before the country prior to the adjournment. It differs very materially from the original Carlisle bill.

The caucus of the Banking and Currency Committee Democrats was held in the committee-room last night, the following members being present: Springer, Cox, Culberson, Sperry, Warner, Cobb, and the Secretary. The Secretary, Mr. Carlisle, was not present.

The needed amendments were formulated, and when the caucus adjourned, the bill should be more than amended. It was arranged that Mr. Springer should see Secretary Carlisle to-day and submit the contemplated changes.

Two very important features of the new plan would be to frame a new measure in the nature of a substitute instead of mutilating the original bill with many amendments which went to the very heart of the bill.

The original bill contemplated that all the notes of banks in which they had no concern would be taken care of by the original bill. Besides these two main changes, there are many lesser ones, which were summarized an amendment yesterday, but which will be incorporated as a part of the substitute.

It is asserted that Commissioner Martin may be accused by Capt. Schmittberger.

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—



POLICEMAN SHALVEY.

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

LAST EDITION. THE WHOLE SECRET OUT.

Schmittberger's Counsel, How, Admits that the Captain Will Tell.

Lawyer William F. Howe said this afternoon to an "Evening World" reporter:

"Capt. Schmittberger had a conference with ex-Sherrogate Rollins and myself this morning. He told us he had an offer from the Lexow Committee to go upon the stand and tell everything he knows and he asked our advice."

"We told him that we would not advise to testify and he was convicted he would blame us, and again he might blame us if we did tell him to testify. We then left the matter to him, and he decided to accept the Lexow offer."

It is asserted that Commissioner Martin may be accused by Capt. Schmittberger.

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—

Q. How many? A. I own three lots to property in Westchester. I own three lots to property at 183 Monroe street.
Q. How much did you give for lit A. Four hundred dollars.
Q. Any bank accounts? A. Yes, sir; four—