PLOT TO PUMP AMORY.

SAY PAGE AND NASON.

Latter Confesses Concealed Stenographer Caught Him Right.

Although the testimony of W. H. Page, jr., and Daniel Nason yesterday at the hearing in the Amory-Vreeland libel suit before Magistrate Barlow clearly showed that Page knew Nason was representing himself to Amory as coming from Page, District Attorney Jerome let it be stricken from the record. It had not proved that President Vreeland of the Metropolitan had any connection with Page or Nason; in fact, their declaration was that they were acting in their own interests to find out what Amory was doing to Metropolitan.

While Mr. Page's replies did not directly contradict his testimony of last Thursday, when he swore that he had never requested Daniel Nason to call on Amory, the distinctions drawn were fine, and there was considerable speculation as to whether the District Attorney would conduct some further "little investigations on his own account" after this libel suit is disposed of. Amory and his lawyer, James W. Osborne, declared in vigorous terms that they intended to "fight this thing through to the bitter end." Mr. Jerome would not talk about Metropolitan yesterday, nor would he say anything about future developments from this case.

Last night Mr. Amory gave out a statement containing the complete history of his interviews with Nason from February 28, when Nason called him over the telephone to make an appointment, until March 30, when Nason made his final call at Amory's home. In this statement Mr. Amory made this point:

Mr. Nason stated in court to-day that he saw Mr. Page on February 27, the day before he first telephoned me. He further admitted that he was paid $50 in cash on March 5, the day before he first called upon me, and that on March 6 this sum of money was deposited in his bank account, although he admitted that he had never previously been paid any attorney fees by Mr. Page.

Accompanying his statement was a stenographic report of the "conversation overheard at the house of William N. Amory, No. 127 East Sixty-second-st., on Wednesday, March 18, 1893, between the hours of 8 and 10 p. m., and between W. N. Amory and 'Dan' Nason," in which, besides those parts which Mr. Jerome read in his examination of the witnesses, there occurred these remarks:

Amory—You say Page wants you to have a talk with me?

Nason—Yes, Page wants me to.

. . . . . .

Then there was some talk about Travers, which could not be caught clearly, but it sounded like this:

N: Travers can do you in this matter if he wants to—I mean, if he thinks there is any money in it. If Travers thought that it would be his duty to do anything, he would do it.

Then there was some more talk along these lines.

A.: You know d—— well, Dan, that if Billy Page comes to you on this matter, it must mean pretty serious business, does it not?

N.: It means business, of course, but you know d—— well it does not mean business with Travers.

A.: Well, leave Travers out of this whole thing.

N.: I can't do anything with the District Attorney's office.

A.: Leave that all out.

N.: I am the worst man to go there at all, just because I was a partner and a friend.

William A. Hazard, who was said to have received tips from Mr. Amory on the movements of Manhattan stock, and his family were among those booked on the Oceanic, which arrived here last night. Several rooms had been engaged for them. Just before the ship sailed the booking was cancelled. The ship's officers did not know the reason for Hazard's failure to sail. When the ship's mail was taken aboard at Quarantine it contained several letters and telegrams for him and members of his party. It was suggested that he had decided to remain abroad until the present hearings were over.

Of the evidence brought out yesterday, James W. Osborne said that it "established the bias of Page as a witness against Amory," and therefore should stand. Delancey Nicoll, however, moved to have it stricken from the record. As the case had been reopened, he said he would call Talbot J. Taylor to-day to find how the Hertel report got "from Taylor's safe to 'The New-York World.'" He said that Taylor was on an automobile trip, but General Tracy and others expected to get word to him before night. Mr Nicoll further said that if he had a couple of weeks more he would get at the bottom of the case. Mr. Osborne suggested an adjournment of three weeks in Mr Nicoll's interest, but the hearing was adjourned until this morning at 10 o'clock.

Two days ago Mr. Nicoll said to The Tribune reporter that he "would hardly reopen his case to put Taylor on the stand" even if he could get him. Yesterday it was also said that Mr. Taylor had been for a month under summons to testify.

Shortly before 10 o'clock yesterday morning Nason and Page walked into the District Attorney's library, where the hearing was held. Nason went on the stand. Mr. Jerome examined his former partner as follows:

Q.—Were you at Mr. Amory's house on the 18th of March of this year? A.—I think I was.

Q.—And did you there have a conversation with Mr. Amory between the hours of 8 and 10 o'clock in the evening? A.—I did.

Q.—Did you in that conversation at any time state to him that Mr. Page had sent you there? A.—I think probably I did.

Q.—What is your best recollection as to that? A.—My best recollection is that I did.

Q.—Was that true? A.—I told Mr. Amory——

Q.—Excuse me. Answer my question, if you please. Was that true? A.—The conversation I had with him——

Q.—Never mind the conversation now. Answer the question, if you please. Was it true that Mr. Page had sent you there? A.—It was not true.

Q.—Then when you told Mr. Amory that Mr. Page had sent you there, it was not true? A.—That was not true.

Q.—Did this conversation, in substance, then occur: "Mr. Amory—Now come down to business, Dan; what proposition did Page make? Mr. Nason—Page does not say anything in so many words. Do you suppose he would commit himself in any proposition?" A.—I think probably I said that.

Q.—Is it the best of your recollection that you did say that? A.—It is my best recollection that I did.

Q.—Then did Amory say this: "Mr. Amory—Then, what is your proposition in plain language?" Do you recall that? A.—I think I do.

Q.—And did you then say: "I think the idea is some proposition from you"? A.—That is my memory.

Q.—Then did Mr. Amory say: "Do you mean to say he has not proposed anything?" referring to Page? And that you replied: "I mean that Page has asked me to come up and see you, of course"? A.—I think probably that is true.

Q.—Is it also true that Page had asked you? A.—It is not true that Mr. Page had asked me.

NASON SOUGHT INFORMATION.

Q.—What were you doing there then? A.—I went up there then to get information for myself.

Q.—Information of what character? A.—Information as to what was going on. I had a very great interest in the matter myself. I have told you so time and time again.

Q.—When did you tell me? A.—I told you at your own house, in Rutgers-st.

Q.—What did you say to me? A.—That I represented an estate which had a large amount of stock, and that I was very desirous of obtaining information about it.

Q.—It was not intimated that I had any pecuniary interest in it, in any way, state or manner? A.—Not the slightest.

Q.—And you went to Mr. Amory merely to get information that might enable you to protect your own interests? A.—I did.

Q.—And you represented to him throughout the conversation that you came, and were authorized to come, by Mr. Page? A.—I should not have been surprised if I did represent it.

Q.—You did do that, did you not? A.—Probably.

Q.—Mr. Page was a friend of yours? A.—He is a friend of mine, of about ten years' standing.

Q.—Then, did Mr. Amory proceed to say: "That means business." And did you, in substance, say: "Now, hold on a minute. I happened to meet him at luncheon the other day, and he asked me to come and see you. After I saw you, I went back to see him. Now, I said, 'Page, there is nothing doing.' Then I saw him again. I saw him this afternoon; no, not this afternoon, I saw him yesterday afternoon before I telephoned you, and I told him I could not come up last night. I think old —— will do something; they are not going to do it blindly; if there is anything done, of course, it will have to take the form of what you want to do, and what they want to do." Did that substantially take place between you? A.—That, in my opinion, in substance did take place.

Q.—Then, did Mr. Amory proceed: "In other words, it is a sort of gentlemanly bribe?" And you replied: "No; it is not a bribe." Then, did Mr. Amory say: "Don't they want to buy stocks from me that is practically worthless?" And did you reply: "Yes; they want to buy it; but you don't think it is worthless."

And Amory replied, "It is worthless." And did you in reply say, "Well, do you want to sell the stock, or not?" Did that substantially take place? A.—That, in substance, in my opinion, took place.

Q.—Did you then tell Amory that if you succeeded you would receive $10,000, and that if you failed you would receive $5,000? A.—I do not think that I ever said that to Mr. Amory.

Q.—Did you say something in substance like that? A.—There was talk about a retainer of $5,000, and, if I succeeded, a fee of $10,000.

Q.—Who was to pay you this? A.—I probably represented to Mr. Amory that Mr. Page was to pay me. That is the best of my recollection.

Q.—Did Amory then say, "I don't believe you know how serious this matter is that I have undertaken. I tried to tell you the other evening when you were here, and tried to make you understand, by telling you that they could not buy me by offering me any price for any d—— worthless stock which I had in my possession! now, there is the whole thing in a nutshell, and that is the same situation to-day. You and I have got to be frank, and now Page is trying to put you onto me"? And did you say to Amory, "Of course, that is the idea"? Did that substantially occur? A.—In substance, I believe that did occur.

IDEA WAS THAT PAGE SENT HIM.

Q.—Did the prior conversation include the idea that Mr. Page had sent you there to buy this stock from Mr. Amory, of some pneumatic bicycle seat? A.—Undoubtedly.

Q.—And on this occasion did you mention the figure which would be given for the stock? A.—To the best of my recollection I did not. The figures were mentioned by Mr. Amory.

Q.—And that you assented to them? A.—My impression is, and my best recollection is, that in this first conversation I told Amory that I did not come there for that purpose at all; and that Amory insisted on his statement, "That cannot be bought for $250,000,000."

Q.—Did Amory say to you: "You offered me $100,000 the other night for this stock"—that is, for this pneumatic bicycle, or bicycle seat, and that you practically assented to that? A.—My best recollection is that Mr. Amory mentioned the figures. I mentioned no figures at all.

Q.—Did Mr. Amory say this at this interview? A.—Which interview do you refer to?

Q.—The interview of the 18th. Then did Amory say: "You came to see me and wanted to know what I would sell my stock in the patent business at; whether I would sell it for $75,000 or $100,000." And did you say: "I did not mention any figures." Mr. Amory—You did. You asked me if I had $75,000 or $100,000 worth of these stocks. Mr. Nason—I forget now. Mr. Amory—I thought you did. I think you remember that then I told you to go to hell. You go back to Page and tell him that you cannot deal with me." Is that correct? A.—That probably is a correct transcript of what took place. But I think that any sums which were mentioned were mentioned by Mr. Amory.

Q.—I will let it rest right there. Then, did this conversation occur on the 18th, in substance: "Mr. Amory—Damn it, I will throw you out. Mr. Nason—No, you won't; you want to know my proposition. All I know about the whole matter is what I have seen in the newspapers. Page has never opened his lips to me."

Mr. Amory—What was Page's proposition?

Mr. Nason—Page's proposition is to see what there is in it, to see what you wanted; that is what I told you.

Mr. Amory— ——.

Mr. Nason—Do you want to sell this stock or not? You wanted to know what the proposition is, and I have told you. Was that said in substance? A.—That was said in substance, but not in the spirit in which you read it.

Q.—Did you then go on to say:

Mr. Nason—I went back and told him so.

Mr. Amory—You came back to me again, and ask me to make——

Mr. Nason—Some proposition.

Mr. Amory—I will do exactly what you want.

Mr. Nason—Page has paid me $500.

Mr. Amory—He ought to pay you $1,000, and you ought to get $5,000 more.

Did that occur in substance? A.—Amory said that he ought to pay me $1,000, and that he ought to pay me $5,000 more; so that was as you have read it.

Q.—That is, Mr. Amory said that Page ought to pay you a thousand, after you had said that Page paid you five hundred? A.—Yes.

Q.—He said: "He ought to pay you a thousand, and you ought to get five thousand more?" A.—Yes; that took place, in substance, so far as I can recollect; to the best of my recollection.

Q.—Then, was this said:

Mr. Amory—If Page wants to make me a proposition, come and make the proposition. (Then, after some general talk.) You go back and tell your friend Bill" Page there is no use of trying further to make a deal with me.

Mr. Nason—The whole point is here—you have reduced it to a business proposition.

Mr. Amory—No; you have; you make your best proposition, and I will decline it.

Mr. Nason—Let me tell you what it is. I came up here to see what is doing, then you said you make a proposition to me.

Mr. Amory—I have already declined your proposition.

Mr. Nason—Now, suppose a proposition was made so that the whole thing could be cleared up. Suppose I came to you—are there any strings to it? Suppose you and I agree that this thing will be between us—what strings are there—is there anybody else who could undo it—does that end it?

Mr. Amory—Not by a d—— sight! Is that your proposition from Page?

Mr. Nason—No, it is not. It is between you and myself. You will permit me to say this to Page. I will probably see him to-morrow. Can I say this to him: "Amory said to me: 'What is your proposition? Come to me with your proposition.'" Can I say that to him?

Mr. Amory—I will tell you now. You can go to Page and ask him, "What is your proposition?" But I will tell you my answer now to that.

Mr. Nason—Never mind, I don't want to know it.

Mr. Amory—You would like to be able to go to Page——

Mr. Nason—Yes.

Mr. Amory—You would like to know what my answer is?

Mr. Nason—No, I don't.

Mr. Amory—You can't deal with me.

Mr. Nason—Now, sit down a minute, now hold on——

Mr. Amory—You can't deal with me.

Mr. Nason—I am going to Page to-morrow.

Mr. Amory—You are going to Page to-morrow, what then?

Mr. Nason—I am not going to say anything to him, except what you authorize me.

Mr. Amory—All right, I authorize you to say to Page——

Mr. Nason—What is your proposition?

Mr. Amory—My proposition is that he can go to h——.

Q.—Did that take place in substance? A.—It sounds like it. It sounds familiar. I have no doubt that it took place.

Q.—Had you seen Mr. Page before going to see Mr. Amory the first time? A.—Yes, I had.

Q.—Did this take place: "Mr. Amory—You offered me a hundred thousand dollars the other night for this stock. Mr. Nason—A hundred thousand? I thought it was a couple of hundred thousand. Mr. Amory—No; seventy-five or a hundred thousand—whatever the price was, I would not accept." Did that, in substance, occur? A.—I believe that did occur.

Q.—Now, prior to your first interview with Mr. Amory on this subject did you see Mr. Page? A.—I did.

Q.—And did you discuss with Mr. Page at all going to Mr. Amory- A.—I met Mr. Page, to the best of my recollection, about half past four o'clock on the twenty-seventh day of February. Mr. Page telephoned to my office, asking me if I would meet him. I said, "Yes." Then I asked him "what time?" He said "About half past four." I met him at half past four; and this is the gist of the conversation. I can hardly give it to you accurately, but I will give it as far as I can. Mr. Page said to me, "What do you suppose Amory is up to?" I said, "Page, I think Amory is carrying into effect a scheme which I spoke to you about nearly a year ago." He said, "You mean at the conversation which we had at the New-York Athletic Club?" I said "Yes." Mr. Page said, "I have got a good deal of personal interest in this matter." And I said, "Mr. Page, I have got a great deal of personal interest in this matter."

This conversation, interrogation by De Lancey Nicoll brought out, was about a "bitter blackmailing attack" Nason believed Amory was going to make on Metropolitan, because of the "Lexington-ave. franchise."

In further testimony Mr. Nason said that he had, from time to time, told Page all the results of his interviews with Amory, and explained about the retainer of $500, which, Mr. Page declared, was in relation to a newspaper he intended to buy.

Q.—There was no contingent fee agreement between you and Page? A.—Absolutely none.

Q.—Or between you and Page as representing anybody else? A.—Absolutely none.

Q.—And did you tell Page that you had represented yourself to Amory as coming from Page? A.—Yes.

Q.—You told Page that? A.—I will not say that; I do not think I did.

Q.—Was there any fee paid you in connection with this matter? A.—Absolutely none whatever.

Q.—You had originally from Page $500? A.—I did.

Q.—What was the date of that payment? A.—I got that on the 5th day of March; I deposited it in my bank account on the 6th day of March.

Q.—Was that a personal check from Page? A.—It was cash.

Cross-examination by Mr. Nicoll resulted only in a reaffirmation that the purpose of Nason in going to see Amory was to gain information which would enable him to protect his own interests, and that he was not authorized by Page to make any proposition to Amory.

"Do you know Mr. Vreeland?" Mr. Nicoll asked.

"I never saw him; never met him," replied Nason.

Q.—Did Mr. Page ever tell you that the Metropolitan Railroad was willing to pay anything to Amory? A.—Never.

Q.—Or that Mr. Vreeland was? A.—Never.

Q.—Did Mr. Page assume to act for Mr. Vreeland? A.—He did not.

Q.—And were any of these facts brought to their attention, or to the attention of Mr. Vreeland, so far as you know? A.—No.

It was noticeable, when W. H. Page, jr., took the stand that he was careful about his answers and a trifle nervous. In some cases there was a perceptible hesitation. His explanation of the Nason-Amory affair was that he was so deeply engrossed with other cares that what Nason told him "went in one ear and out the other," but, while he paid little attention to it, he understood that Nason was representing to Amory that "Page sent him."

This was part of Mr. Page's examination by Mr. Jerome:

Q.—In February or March of this year did Nason meet you and tell you that he had had a conversation with Amory? A.—He did.

Q.—Did he tell you what the substance of that conversation was? A.—He told me, in conversations lasting only five or ten minutes—for that was the general length of the conversations—of certain things which had happened in the way of conversation between himself and Mr. Amory. They did not touch the question which I was anxious to ascertain about; and his statements went in, as I might say, one ear and out the other. I suppose he told me what Mr. Amory had said, but, with few exceptions, I have only a very hazy recollection of what took place, except that he was trying to find out who was behind Mr. Amory.

Q.—And you discussed Amory; you talked about Amory? A.—There was hardly a "discussion." Mr. Nason told me what he had learned, as I recollect——

Q.—He told you of his interviews with Mr. Amory? A.—He told me that he had had interviews with Amory.

Q.—Did he tell you that he represented to Amory that he came from you? A.—I did not understand that he gave Amory to understand that he came as an agent from me, but I did understand that my name was mentioned and statements made as coming from me. But as to what was said by Mr. Nason to Mr. Amory about me at this time—inasmuch as it did not strike me that I was interested in it—I paid little or no attention to it.

Q.—But you had an interest in this whole business, did you not? Did you have a personal interest or a professional interest? A.—I had a personal interest.

Q.—And that alone? A.—It was a personal interest which had grown out of very strong professional relations. I will explain that if I may.

Q.—Did Mr. Nason say to you that he had mentioned to Amory that your object was to get an interest in this patent? A.—My recollection is that he said that the offer came from me; I have no recollection about making it. I have absolutely no recollection of what Mr. Nason said to me about that. In fact, I have very little recollection of anything that Mr. Nason said to me, with two or three exceptions. If you will permit me, I will explain. Mr. Nason said to me, in general, that he was using Macchiavellian methods in trying to elicit from Mr. Amory who was actually behind him in this matter. Having said that, I paid very little attention to what the methods were, although Mr. Nason may have explained them to me very many times.

Q.—You are not prepared to state here, are you, that Mr. Nason did not tell you at least four times that in the interviews with Mr. Amory, he had made these statements to him in regard to this transaction? A.—I most explicitly state that I have no recollection of it whatever.

Q.—I do not ask for your recollection. You do not mean to state that he did not say that? All you mean to say is that you do not recollect having heard it. He has sworn that he did. Do you recall that he did not? A.—I say that I have no recollection on that subject, with one exception. I have an indistinct recollection that Mr. Nason said at one time that he claimed that I had used words to that effect—that I had said so to Nason. I said to him, "It is tolerably clear to you, that you did not come from me." I want that matter to be very clear. I do not want to say that Nason had got some definite information through a misapprehension on his part. My understanding was that a personal interest took him to Mr. Amory, and that it was akin to my own interest.

Q.—Did you ever retain Nason, ever before in your life, as you remember, before you retained him in this matter to which reference has been made, and gave him the $500? A.—No; I never retained him before.

EXPELS THREE CONSULS.

Venezuela's Drastic Action May Cause Renewed Trouble.

Washington, April 29.—Information has reached the State Department from Caracas to the effect that the Venezuelan Government has retired the exequaturs of several foreign consuls on the ground of alleged interference in the internal affairs of the country. The consuls are Von Jess, German consul at Maracaibo, a German subject, and head of a German firm in Maracaibo; Gosewisch, German consul at Valencia, a German subject, and engaged in business at that place; Vincentini, Brazilian consul at Ciudad Bolivar, a Venezuelan by birth, and an employe of the Orinoco Steamship Company.

There is some apprehension that these retirements, although within the legal right of the Venezuelan Government, taken in connection with a drastic decree affecting foreign residents in Venezuela, will tend to prevent a restoration of the former friendly relations between Venezuela and some of the powers.

WANTS MR. CLEVELAND NOMINATED.

"The Brooklyn Eagle" Says He Is Only Man Who Can Lead Democrats to Victory.

"For President: Grover Cleveland," is the caption of a column and a half editorial in yesterday's issue of "The Brooklyn Daily Eagle." "Millions of Americans," according to "The Eagle," "again desire to make Grover Cleveland President of the United States. He is to-day regarded as the only man who could beat Theodore Roosevelt."

The editorial continues in part:

Those who would not have Cleveland may, by the support of any other Democrat, fail to beat Mr. Roosevelt, and would thereby indirectly contribute to Mr. Roosevelt's election. They may dislike Cleveland more than they dislike Roosevelt, but if they prefer Democracy to Republicanism in the Presidency, they should support Cleveland regardless of their prejudices against him or of their preferences for some other Democrat.

We know that it will be said that there should be no third term for any American President. But what of it, if it be said? There is nothing in it, when the three terms are not consecutive. No one could accuse Mr. Cleveland of the use of the Presidential office to promote his nomination, for he will have been out of it for eight years before a vacancy will occur in that office.

The gratitude of the country now is unmistakable. It is growing hourly and daily. The East attests it. The North recognizes it. The West is stirred by it. The South is alive with it. The Democracy of the whole nation is not only conscious of it, but is vivified by it, and sends its hopes and its prayers forward in its behalf.

Grover Cleveland can and should be nominated for President in 1904 by the Democratic National Convention as the only man who can assuredly lead the party to victory then.

FOOT FOUND IN WASTE PAPER.

Police Do Not Believe It Came from Dissecting Room.

While an Italian laborer, working for the Century Paper Company, which has a dump at East Sixty-ninth-st., was overhauling waste paper yesterday, deposited by the Street Cleaning Department, he discovered a human foot—that of either a small man or a well grown woman. It had been severed a few inches above the ankle. It was packed in cotton batting and had gauze about the stump. Gauze and cotton were soaked with blood.

The foot was taken to the East Sixty-seventh-st. station. An abrasion was found on the heel, but no other marks. It was not discolored, but slightly swollen, and it was thought that it could not have been injured sufficiently to require amputation.

The Century Paper people said that a Street Cleaning driver, William Vaun, dumped paper there. Vaun is said to collect paper in the district bounded by Eighty-second and Eighty-third sts., from Fifth-ave. to the East River.

The police are at work on the case. Captain Hogan did not believe the foot had been used for dissecting purposes, and thought it had been cut from a person alive.

MONTREAL IN STATE OF SIEGE.

As Far As Appearances Go from the Effect of Strike.

Montreal, April 29.—Everything is quiet on the wharves to-day as the result of the presence of the troops. To one looking from the river St. Lawrence the city appears to be in a state of siege. No one can approach the wharves without a pass. The only ship that is unloading as usual is the steamship Lake Champlain, of the new Canadian Pacific Railway line, which brought sixty of its own laborers from England. The other boats are working with about one gang of unskilled laborers each.

OFFICER OVER BRIDGE.

JUMPS TO SPEEDWAY.

Clark, Accused of Beating His Child, a Suicide.

Accused with his wife Mary of gross cruelty to their three-and-a-half-year-old child Thomas, Patrolman William A. Clark, attached to the West One-hundred-and-fifty-second-st. station, jumped from Washington Bridge yesterday afternoon to the Speedway and expired two minutes after his horribly mangled body had been picked up by Mounted Policeman Weiner. Half an hour before Clark had been released from the Harlem court prison on $1,000 cash bail furnished by friends, he and his wife being held in that sum on Tuesday for trial in Court of Special Sessions by Magistrate Flammer.

When he was released his oldest son, William, was with him. They boarded an Amsterdam-ave. car together and started for home. One block below the house, in Amsterdam-ave., Clark handed his overcoat to his son and said: "Here, Willie. You jump off here and go home. I am going up a little further, as I want to see a man. I will buy something for supper before I get back."

Willie, who is employed as a messenger boy by the Postal Telegraph Company, jumped from the car and hastened to tell his brothers and sisters and his grandmother of his father's release. The father continued on and rode to Washington Bridge. He walked out on the north promenade to a semi-circular stone seat in the break at the first arch and stepped up on the seat. Extending above the seat about two feet is the parapet wall. Clark hesitated a minute, then, resting his left hand on the wall, he vaulted clear of the bridge and his body shot downward. Several men on the bridge, a large crowd of people on the pathway bordering the Speedway on the west, and a number of horsemen on the Speedway saw him. He struck the ground, 130 feet below, with a thud that made a deep rut in the soft roadway. After striking the ground face downward he turned over on one side and lay motionless. He struck near the curb on the west side of the Speedway.

Elmer Stevens, a member of the Riders and Drivers' Club, who lives at Morris-ave. and One-hundred-and-seventy-seventh-st., was driving north on the Speedway at the time Clark jumped. Just as he was passing under the bridge he saw what appeared to be a shadow above him, and thought part of the bridge was giving way. He urged his horse forward, and then, seeing that the object was near him, pulled up short. Clark fell within a foot of the horse.

Weiner was just south of the bridge, and was riding north, when he saw the man fall. He hastened to the spot at once, and, picking up the mangled form, carried it to the sidewalk. Clark was still alive, but was unconscious. His skull had been fractured, his right arm and both legs were broken, and the body was so limp that it almost doubled up when Weiner picked it up. The policeman went at once to a telephone and sent in a hurry call for an ambulance. When one arrived from the J. Hood Wright Hospital, with Dr. Fahnestock, Clark was dead. The body was removed at once to the West One-hundred-and-fifty-second-st. station to await the action of the coroner.

Clark had been on the police force for nineteen years, six of that time being attached to the West One-hundred-and-fifty-second-st. station. The men with whom he was associated say that he was quiet and always kept to himself. He was inclined to be melancholy at times. They did not appear to be surprised at the deed. Clark was not in uniform, having been suspended yesterday by General Greene.

About ten minutes before the body was taken to the station Sergeant Robinson was informed by telephone that Clark had been suspended.

"That's a shame," remarked one of the men; "he's nearly crazy now with his troubles, and this may drive him to suicide."

The man who spoke the words was standing in the doorway of the station when he saw an ambulance approach ten minutes later. Weiner was riding alongside. He jumped from his horse when the station was reached, and ran up the steps.

"It's Clark, and he's dead," said Weiner.

"Washington Bridge?" asked the policeman who had foretold the suicide.

"That's right," said Weiner; "he was driven to it."

His comrades say that Clark was not responsible for his child's condition. Since his arrest he seemed to lose all interest in life.

Mrs. William A. Clark, his aged mother, did not know of her son's end, and no one had the heart to tell her of it last night. She thought he had met with an accident.

"William was always a good boy," said Mrs. Clark, "and had it not been for his wife, he would have been a happy father. About two years ago he had to break up housekeeping on account of his wife's habits, and had her sent to the House of the Good Shepherd. The children, all but William, were sent to the Protectory. Then he took pity on the woman and brought her home. But she was nearly as bad as before, and pawned everything to get money for whiskey. She even pawned the children's shoes. This home was well furnished once, but look at it now. She pawned all but these few things."

The floors were bare. There were two beds, one table, a few broken dishes, three chairs and a stove. The woman sobbed a minute, and then spoke again:

"William never beat that child," she said. "He was a good father. He loved his children, but he couldn't help what his wife did."

When William, the son, reached the station, he was told the truth. He kissed his father's dead face and cried out:

"Oh, papa, why did you leave us children all alone! We only had you to love us!"

TO BEGIN FOUR BIG BUILDINGS.

Company Will Soon Start Hotels, Office Building and Apartment House.

The work of building two big hotels, an office and loft building and a large apartment house is soon to be begun by the United States Realty and Construction Company. These are only some of the large building projects which the company will undertake in the near future. Many millions of dollars will be spent in these improvements.

The hotel is to stand on the site of the Sturtevant House, at the southeast corner of Twenty-ninth-st. and Broadway, which the company bought some weeks gao. No details as to the plans or cost of this building were given yesterday, but it was officially said that it would equal, if not surpass, any uptown hotel. This may be considered a broad assertion, as some of the finest hotels in this country are in what is commonly called the uptown hotel section. This hotel is to be leased to a well known hotel man for twenty-one years.

The other hotel planned by the company will be at the southeast corner of Fifty-seventh-st. and Broadway, and it will be similar in some respects, it is said, to the Netherland and the Savoy, at Fifty-ninth-st. and Fifth-ave. At the southeast corner of Sixty-ninth-st. and Broadway the proposed apartment house will be erected. It will be twelve stories high, with three apartments on each floor. The company says it will be one of the best apartment houses in the West Side section.

On the premises occupied by the old Young Men's Christian Association, at Twenty-third-st. and Fourth-ave., is to be built the office and loft building, which will be eleven stories high.

Representatives of the company said yesterday that the work of erecting a twenty story office building on the site of the Trinity Building would be begun soon. This work, however, may be delayed about sixty days, on account of changes in the building plans. It is said that the company now owns more valuable parcels in this city than any other corporation.

His Traits From His Face

Reliability, steadiness and bottom, under all conditions, are indicated by the harmonizing, firm lines of this head. The neck joins in forming the well-defined cast of trustworthiness and constancy. He will take work with readiness and give ample speed over the country road and suburban drives—the requisites for a horse to be used in a

No. 7. Physiognomy of the Horse.

Copyright, 1903, by Studebaker Bros. Co. of New York.

Studebaker

Station Wagon

Convenience of use, harmony of design, beauty of finish, are the impressions given by the exterior of a Studebaker Station Wagon—cutunder, movable glass and curtains, provision for baggage boot, easy step; graceful sweep of beautiful lines; varnish that rivals plate-glass. Interior surprisingly roomy; comforts that delight all the senses.

No. 1345 has glass all around; in doors, in division front and in rear quarters. All the glass may be raised or lowered—making an open carriage for bright days or tight as a Brougham for cold or stormy weather. No. 1207½ has all curtains—no glass; No. 1258½ has glass in doors and division front. Built in Studebaker's way—serviceable, correct, symmetrical, durable.

STUDEBAKER,

Broadway and 7th ave. at 48th street, New York.

Makers of Automobiles. Send for a free copy of "Equipage," the authoritative journal of horse and vehicle.

CITY'S LOSS MILLIONS.

EFFECT OF LABOR CLAUSE.

McDonald May Sue for Loss Due to Eight-Hour Provision.

L. Laflin Kellogg, counsel to the Contractors' Association of this city, says that the eight-hour labor clause, which the Court of Appeals on Tuesday declared to be unconstitutional, involves a loss to the city of between $10,000,000 and $12,000,000; and this estimate does not include the increased cost of the work on the subway, which will amount to about $5,000,000 more.

In connection with this it is rumored that John B. McDonald will sue the city for the loss involved by his compulsory compliance with the eight-hour law. Mr. McDonald was not at his home last night when a Tribune reporter called, and the report could not be verified.

"There never was any sane reason for the adoption of any such law as the eight-hour law" said Mr. Kellogg yesterday. "It was purely and simply class legislation, and it largely helped a class of laborers who have the benefits of working in the open air, while it extended no benefits to the thousands of clerks and other unorganized workers who are busy indoors. There never was any reason why the city should be compelled to pay this increased price for labor while the private employer is exempted. I think the law has occasioned a loss to the city aggregating nearly $12,000,000. The effect of the decision by the Court of Appeals is to enable the contractors at work on public undertakings to work their men as many hours as they please and at such rates as they can agree on with their employes. The practical effect of the eight-hour law was that even where the laborers themselves were willing to work at a price mutually agreeable to the employer and employe it was impracticable for them to do so, because the factory inspectors would prevent it. The factory inspector would inform the department of the city having the work in hand of any violation of the law, and the department would summon the offending contractor and threaten to take away his contract if he did not obey the eight-hour clause. If the department did not effect a change in the working hours the factory inspector would file an affidavit with the Controller and the contractor's pay would be held up.

"The practical effect of the decision is to decrease the cost of public work. This question has come up in several different cases before the courts, and it has been proved in those cases that the cost of the public work, owing to the law, was increased about 25 per cent. It came up in the case of Bridge No. 3. There were two lettings; one for a contract with the labor law in, obliging the contractor to abide by its terms, and the other with the stipulation left out. The difference between the two sets of bids in a contract amounting to about $800,000 was, if I remember correctly, about $300,000.

"This same eight-hour question is involved in a case now before the Court of Appeals in the contract held by the Pennsylvania Steel Company for the steel on the Williamsburg Bridge. The decisions of the lower courts have been adverse in most instances. The claim made by a taxpayer in this particular suit is that the contract awarded to the Pennsylvania Steel Company by the old East River Bridge Commission is invalid with the labor clause provision inserted. The taxpayer brought his action to restrain the letting and the performance of the contract on the ground that if it were so let it would constitute a waste of city funds. The case was partially tried, and on the trial it was proved that the loss to the city by virtue of the eight-hour clause was between $700,000 and $800,000. This case will be prosecuted to the Court of Appeals and an effort will be made to compel the Pennsylvania Steel Company to restore this amount of money to the city. The decision handed down yesterday will not invalidate contracts entered into in good faith without notice of any increase in cost. The same question is up in a taxpayer's suit against Norcross Brothers, the successful bidders for the contract to build the new public library at Bryant Square."

There is a strong eight hour clause in the subway contract awarded to John B. McDonald. It is estimated that more than half the work, or about $20,000,000, was done by unskilled labor, and that the eight hour clause caused this proportion to cost 20 per cent, or $4,000,000, more than it would have cost if the contractors had not been tied down to the eight hour provision.

"The city will not be a loser in the end on account of the eight hour clause and subway work. Whatever it costs the contractor must refund to the city, plus interest," said President Orr of the Rapid Transit Commission last night. At the same time it is conceded that the tunnel would not have cost much more than about $30,000,000 if the eight hour clause had not been in the contract.

Corporation Counsel Rives said: "The decision relates to a section of the Penal Code which says if a man shall employ workmen for a period longer than eight hours he shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. It declares that section unconstitutional. You can see what effect that will have. The State may make a law providing for an eight hour day and that law may be enforced on State work only."

SUCCEEDS JAMES M. BECK.

J. C. McReynolds Appointed Assistant Attorney General.

Washington, April 29.—Attorney General Knox has appointed J. C. McReynolds, of Tennessee, Assistant Attorney General of the United States, to succeed James M. Beck, resigned. Mr. McReynolds is a lawyer of Nashville, forty-two years old. He formerly lived in Washington as the private secretary to Senator Howell E. Jackson, of Tennessee, who became an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

THE NORTH-WESTERN LINE

TO OMAHA AND THE WEST

The Chicago & North-Western Railway is the only double-track railway between Chicago and the Missouri River, and the Pioneer Line West and Northwest of Chicago. Four fast daily trains between Chicago and Omaha, provided with all the luxuries of modern travel, bring Chicago and the East within easy reach of the trans-Missouri region and the Pacific Coast.

Three solid through trains daily Chicago to San Francisco; three Chicago to Portland; three Chicago to Denver; three to Sioux City and one to the Black Hills, provide en route

The Best of Everything.

All agents sell tickets to the West and Northwest via Chicago and The North-Western Line. For particulars call upon or address

H. A. GROSS,
Gen'l Eastern Agent, C. & N. W. Ry.
461 BROADWAY.

Kennedy

SPORTING AND MUFTI TAILOR

292 FIFTH AVENUE

Invites attention to his exclusive materials for Hunting Frock and the smart Sack Suit.

"FOURNIER" COAT FOR AUTOMOBILING RAIN-PROOF SLIP-ON

Silver Plate

FOR THE TABLE.

Our hard metal spoons and forks, heavily silver-plated and re-enforced at the wearing points, are designed for general use in city and country homes. The Tea Sets, Fruit Dishes, Cake Baskets and Salad Bowls we are showing are also very priceworthy.

Six Tea Spoons	1.00
Table Spoons and Forks	2.25
Four-piece Tea Sets	9.50
Cake Baskets	2.75

A. Frankfield & Co.

Importers and Jewelers,
52 West 14th Street, New York.

THE MANHATTAN STORAGE AND WAREHOUSE COMPANY

"Indestructible" Fire and Burglar Proof.

Warehouses { Lexington Ave., 41st and 42d Sts. and Offices, { 7th Ave., 52d and 53d Sts.

Superior advantages and unexcelled security for storage of Furniture, Merchandise and Valuables.

SAFE DEPOSIT BOXES, $5 PER YEAR. VAULTS FOR SILVER TRUNKS.

Furniture, Ornaments, etc., carefully packed.
Van service by skilled workmen.
Illustrated descriptive pamphlet sent on application.
Inspection of buildings invited.

ADRIAN ISELIN, JR., Sec'y and Treas. LAWRENCE WELLS, Pres't.

WELCHS GRAPE JUICE.

A delicious fruity beverage, unequalled for the table. Try it. Welch's is without alcohol or antiseptic.

No trouble to get the best if you ask for Welch's. The Welch Grape Juice Co., Westfield, N. Y.

Flint's Fine Furniture.

Newest ideas for Summer, at Factory Prices.

45 WEST 23d STREET.

Auction Sales.

EXCEPTIONAL SALE.

HIGH GRADE STOCK OF

FURS, RAW and DRESSED SKINS, Etc.

CONSISTING OF

ERMINES, CHINCHILLAS, SEAL, BROADTAIL, PERSIAN LAMB, SABLES, ETC.

United States District Court, for the Southern District of New York in Bankruptcy, in the matter of Abraham Marquis, Jacob Marquis and Harry A. Newman, individually and composing the firm of

A. MARQUIS & CO., Bankrupts.

CHAS. SHONG