

The court quickly suppressed. Mr. Ketcham said he was opposed to the method of carrying out the death penalty in New York State, but was not opposed to capital punishment. That was strongly in favor of him as a juror, and nodded his head emphatically to his counsel. His lawyers tried hard to have Mr. Ketcham accepted, but a challenge for cause by the prosecution was sustained.

GLEASON EXAMINES TALESMEN. John B. Gleason assisted Mr. Hartbridge in the examination of talesmen for the first time yesterday. His questions were on somewhat different lines than those asked by his associate counsel. The first man he examined was Charles H. Nesbitt, a wholesale dealer in shoes. When Mr. Nesbitt's name was called, its similarity to that of the defendant's wife was quickly noticed. Mrs. Evelyn Thaw turned to look at the talesman as he rose from his seat and watched him narrowly as he walked past her. She leaned forward to hear every word of his examination. The state challenged him peremptorily.

Six of the talesmen yesterday swore they had known Stanford White personally, another was a member of two clubs of which White had also been a member, and still another had had business relations with the firm of McKim, Mead & White for several years. They were all excused by consent.

When court adjourned the seven jurors were taken, under guard, to the Broadway Central Hotel, where they will remain until Monday morning. They are allowed to receive visits from their wives, but from no one else. All newspapers are censored before they can have them, every item about the Thaw case first being cut out. All their letters are opened, and anything referring to the trial is excluded. Magazines are also examined to see if letters or notes are left in them. The jurors may spend their time playing cards, reading, chatting, or, as far as possible, in attending to their private business. Their confinement is scarcely less rigorous than that of the prisoner they will try.

The rollcall had been read at the morning session and Thaw brought in, when a delay occurred to allow of the arraignment before Justice Fitzgerald of William A. Brewer, Jr., ex-president of the Washington Life Insurance Company, who is under three indictments charging perjury. William Rand, Jr., who appeared for him, shook hands heartily with District Attorney Jerome, whose chief aid he had been in many criminal cases, and after Mr. Brewer had pleaded not guilty, the Thaw case was resumed.

TALESMAN WAS PREJUDICED. Walter M. Jackson, the first talesman called, was under examination for the same time before being challenged for bias. He lives at No. 1206 East 167th street. Mr. Jerome asked him:

Q—Have you any private opinion about mental derangement or unsoundness of mind that might interfere with your judgment? A—I have not. Q—Would you allow any such opinions to sway your mind? A—No. Q—If drawn as a juror could you give a faithful verdict on the evidence and not let emotion or sympathy sway you? A—Yes. Q—Would you convict if the evidence satisfied you beyond all reasonable doubt? A—Yes. Q—Do any reasons exist why you would not be a fair and impartial juror? A—Certain prejudices which make me think I might not be perfectly fair.

Mr. Jerome went deeper into insanity pleas when Astley C. Jennings, manager of No. 242 Lenox avenue, was called. He asked:

Q—There is only one kind of unsoundness of mind which excuses a crime. Would you accept the law on that? A—I would. Q—Would you correct if the prosecution proved the defendant sane beyond a reasonable doubt? A—I would. Q—You wouldn't require proof beyond all possible doubt? A—I would not.

Questions by Mr. Hartbridge brought such favorable answers that it looked as if another juror would be chosen. He asked:

Q—As long as the court instructs you that the defendant is to be held sane, would you make any difference to you what that defense was? A—It would not. Q—It wouldn't make any difference if there were half a dozen defenses? A—No. Q—Do you know of any reason why you would not make a fair and impartial juror? A—I do not.

Then Mr. Jennings whispered to the court and his excuse, which was not announced, was allowed.

The next two talesmen were quickly disposed of. Charles M. Levey, a jeweler, of No. 1864 Seventh avenue, was exempt and was excused. Charles A. Fuller, a real estate dealer, of No. 129 Broadway, had an opinion which would influence his verdict.

Charles D. Halsey, a broker, of No. 49 East 72d street, also said he had a decided opinion. He declared that he didn't think he could change it and added that he knew some of the principals in the case and was a member of two clubs to which White had belonged. He was challenged for bias.

Three others occupied the stand in rapid succession, all being excused by consent, because they had strong opinions which nothing could alter. They were Horace M. Smith, of No. 71 West 93d street; Bruce Hopkins, of No. 1264 Madison avenue, and Andrew B. Grafius, of No. 350 West 71st street.

PRISONER WANTED HIM. When James M. Ketcham, a travelling salesman for the Sprague Electric Company, was called, however, over half an hour passed before he was challenged for cause by the defence. To the prosecution he said he had formed an opinion. Mr. Hartbridge then examined him.

Q—Would it take evidence to change your opinion? A—It would. Q—Do you know of capital punishment? A—I have no conscientious scruples against capital punishment, but I am opposed to the death penalty being inflicted in this case. Q—Did you know Mr. Stanford White? A—I am pleased to say I did not. Q—Did you know any member of his firm. A—I have done business with McKim, Mead & White for twenty years.

Thaw plainly showed his desire for the selection of the talesman, and the defence withdrew its challenge. The prosecution tried to escape using a peremptory challenge, and the defence attempted to force it. Justice Fitzgerald put several questions to the talesman, and explained:

Q—My reason for putting questions to the talesman was to allow him to explain his answers. At first his replies seemed contradictory. The talesman was challenged for cause by the prosecution, and the challenge was sustained.

A telegram was received by the court at this time addressed to Albert A. Brockway, of No. 16 West 61st street. Mr. Brockway was one of the panel. He said he had been notified that his father was dead, and the court excused him for the remainder of the term.

Two more talesmen hardly more than answered to their names before they were excused. Augustus H. Sands, of No. 888 West End avenue, felt so much objection to capital punishment that he could not serve. Walter G. Mor-

YOUR AILMENT IS NATURE'S REPROOF. To overcome that ailment you require Nature's Assistance ENO'S FRUIT SALT Is Nature's Own Remedy NO FAMILY SHOULD EVER BE WITHOUT IT.

Prepared only by J. C. ENO, Ltd. ENO'S FRUIT SALT WORKS, London, S.E., Eng., by J. C. ENO'S Patent.

decal, of No. 167 West 80th street, had formed an opinion that no testimony could change. Charles H. Nesbitt, of No. 211 West 142d street, answered all the questions of Mr. Jerome satisfactorily, and John B. Gleason, of counsel for the defendant, began the cross-examination. He asked:

Q—You understand a reasonable doubt is not a mere guess or surmise, but a true reasonable doubt, and you would give the defendant the benefit thereof? A—Yes. Q—You can give a perfectly impartial verdict; your mind is open to the evidence? A—Yes. Q—Would the fact that you would be looked up for several weeks away from your family and business affect your judgment in rendering an impartial verdict? A—I do not think so.

Mr. Jerome, however, was not satisfied with the talesman and challenged peremptorily. JUROR OBTAINED AT LAST. Harold R. Fair, the next talesman, was the first juror obtained for the day. He is a broker, living at No. 21 Manhattan avenue. He answered the questions of both prosecution and defence satisfactorily. Mr. Fair is only thirty-three years old. He has a smooth face and is the youngest juror thus far obtained.

Only one more talesman was examined before recess. Aaron M. Klav, of No. 140 West 21st street, who was excused for cause.

To allow of the opening of court promptly on time in the afternoon, luncheon was served to the six jurors in the jury room. Mrs. Evelyn Thaw and Miss May Mackenzie, Mrs. William Thaw and Mrs. Carnegie, formed two parties at different tables in a little room off the judge's room. This division gave even stronger point to the differences in the Thaw family. When she had finished her luncheon Mrs. Evelyn Thaw went back to the room where the jurors had eaten their meal, and talked for a few minutes to her husband.

The afternoon session began promptly at 2 o'clock, and Emil W. Cohen, of No. 321 Fifth avenue, was first called. He was excused by consent, after Mr. Jerome had asked:

Q—Are there any business or family matters that would affect your judgment if you were selected as a juror? A—I fear so. I am afraid that some distress of mind might affect my judgment, so that I could not give the cold and impartial verdict. My wife has undergone a serious operation and has been home from the hospital only a few days, and I am much worried.

"Excused by consent," said Mr. Jerome, interrupting. HAD KNOWN WHITE. Three men in succession said they had been personally acquainted with Stanford White.

Henry C. Cryder said he had known him for years. Francis C. Green, of No. 15 East 46th street, said his acquaintance with White would preclude him from properly weighing the evidence. Abraham H. Fourtswanger, of No. 987 Madison avenue, advanced the same reason.

Charles Raphael, of No. 260 West 16th street, was excused, as he had formed an irrevocable opinion. Charles M. Anderson, of No. 75 West 125th street, was excused, owing to a recent severe illness.

Justice Henry A. Gildersleeve, of the Supreme Court, sat with Justice Fitzgerald for some time. He listened with close attention to the examinations.

Martin T. Ford, of No. 502 Lexington avenue, a general agent of the Equitable Life Assurance Society, feared to take the responsibility of deciding the guilt or innocence of a man on trial for murder. Mr. Jerome, however, was anxious to fill the jury box, and made a determined effort to get Mr. Ford to take one of the seats. He asked:

Q—Don't you think that you could try this case on the evidence, uninfluenced by any opinion or impression you may have formed? A—I believe so. Q—Is it your best belief that you could? A—Yes. Q—Do you know of any reason that would render it impossible for you to draw conclusions from the evidence, uninfluenced by sympathy or emotion? A—As far as my opinion is concerned, I don't feel that I should assume such a responsibility. Moreover, I am not certain I fear the responsibility. Moreover, I am not certain I fear the responsibility. Moreover, I am not certain I fear the responsibility.

The defence did not want a man of this frame of mind, and so challenged for cause and was sustained.

For a full hour talesman after talesman was put on the grill and dismissed after the shortest of examinations. The majority urged that their minds were already made up. It looked as if the day would come to a close without another juror being chosen. Thaw became bored at the deadly dullness of the proceedings, and shifted uneasily in his seat.

"NAN" PATTERSON JUROR EXAMINED. With the advent of Paris M. Fletcher, of No. 188 Manhattan avenue, there was a slight revival of interest. Mr. Fletcher was a juror at the second "Nan" Patterson trial. He voted guilty at that trial. He was also on the special panel for the Terranova trial, but after the state had accepted him was peremptorily challenged by the defence. Thaw's counsel followed the same course. Then followed another period of dullness.

Lenix S. Lake, of No. 440 East 122d street, was excused because he was opposed to the death penalty. Walter J. Peck, of No. 173 Madison avenue, and William H. D. Van Duser, of No. 982 East 156th street, were challenged for cause. Archibald Le Roy, of No. 88 East 49th street, knew Stanford White, and so had John R. Hinchman, of No. 292 Central Park West. Robert E. Mackay, of No. 316 East 20th street, was excused, as he had moved to Newark. George Van Vorst, of No. 180 West 104th street, and Solomon N. Levy, of No. 145 West 70th street, had opinions. Samuel J. Cohen, of No. 174 East 76th street, was excused by consent, and so was Gustave A. Schnitzler, of No. 162 West 141st street. Henry A. Dewey, of No. 95 Liberty street, and Thomas T. Dempsey, of No. 2005 Seventh avenue, were challenged for cause. Lathrop Thatcher, of No. 597 West 142d street, had a positive opinion, but was examined more fully. Mr. Garvan asked him:

Q—If you are accepted as a juror could you render a verdict on the evidence, uninfluenced by any opinion? A—I could not. Q—You have a very decided opinion? A—I have. Milton W. Curry, of No. 312 West 101st street, had a physician's certificate, which excused him. Henry W. Donald, of No. 27 West 60th street, was excused. Luther W. Jacobs, of No. 211 West 85th street, said it would take very strong evidence to change his opinion, and was also excused.

Benjamin F. Stangland, of No. 957 West 122d street, said he had done business with McKim, Mead & White, and was excused.

M. S. FRASER ACCEPTED. Malcolm S. Fraser, a salesman, of No. 82 West 50th street, was the first likely juror to make an appearance in an hour. He answered all of Mr. Garvan's questions satisfactorily. Whatever opinion he had formed would not influence his judgment, he said. Mr. Hartbridge examined him.

Q—Do you know of any reason why you could not give the defendant a fair and impartial verdict on the evidence? A—I know of none. Q—You would give the defendant the benefit of every reasonable doubt? A—I would. After a few questions of similar import he was sworn in as the seventh juror. He apparently had the approval of the Thaw family and the defendant himself. He was scrutinized closely by all the defendant's relatives as he took the seventh seat behind the foreman.

Another long list of talesmen who had excuses which permitted them to quickly leave the witness stand followed Mr. Fraser. John Calvin, of No. 184 West 82d street, was excused because he had known Stanford White; Joseph M. Tobias, of No. 162 Fifth avenue, was challenged for bias; Willard Church, a journalist, and son of Colonel William C. Church, was excused by consent, as was William E. Soles, of No. 163 West 140th street. William H. Hum-

phrey, of No. 150 East 88th street, said that his wife and family had been intimate friends of the White family for years. He was challenged for cause. Marcus W. Cane, of No. 1 West 30th street, had a strong opinion, and was also challenged for cause.

Then Robert Underwood Johnson was examined. Mr. Johnson is associate editor of "The Century Magazine." He did not have to answer many questions. Mr. Garvan examined him:

Q—Have you any reason why you should not be able to serve as a juror and give a just and equitable verdict? A—I am theoretically opposed to capital punishment, but I would not permit my conscientious scruples to influence a statement of facts. I would obey the law. Q—Have you formed an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendant? A—I have. Q—Could you say if you were entering the jury box and give a fair verdict? A—I could not. My reason for this is that for thirty years I was an intimate friend of the White family.

After this statement Mr. Johnson was quickly dismissed.

The last three talesmen of the day were disposed of in short order. Julius Goldstone, of No. 121 St. Nicholas avenue, was excused by consent, and Henry D. Moeller, Jr., of No. 7 East 42d street, had a decided opinion. Mr. Jerome tried to get him to change it but without success.

Q—Could you say if you were entering the jury box and give a fair verdict? A—I could not. My reason for this is that for thirty years I was an intimate friend of the White family.

Richard Hitchens, a white-haired old man, who said he had been connected with the United States commissary department, was challenged by Mr. Hartbridge after he had asked if he knew any one connected with the District Attorney's office. "Yes, I have a son employed in that office," replied Mr. Hitchens.

Justice Fitzgerald then declared court adjourned to Monday, after repeating his warning to the jurors not to discuss the case in any way.

HARTBRIDGE DENIES QUARRELS. Clifford W. Hartbridge, Thaw's senior counsel, expressed his annoyance at the stories of quarrels in the Thaw family. He denied them emphatically, and explained the Countess of Yarmouth's absence by declaring that it was due solely to the fact that she was suffering from a severe illness. Mr. Hartbridge's denials, however, were looked upon as being made purely through motives of policy.

With seven jurors chosen from 101 talesmen it is believed there will be no difficulty in getting the other members of the panel. The defence had a conference on Thursday night which lasted until early yesterday morning, and last night held another, at which the members of the jury committee held a conference of counsel and the family will be held to-day and to-morrow.

MRS. HOLMAN SAYS SHE WONT TESTIFY. Pittsburgh, Jan. 25.—Mrs. Charles J. Holman, wife of Mrs. Evelyn Nesbit Thaw, said to-day that she did not intend to go to New York to become a witness for the prosecution, or even as a spectator at the Thaw trial. She said she had no thought of seeking vengeance.

SHARK MEAT FOOD SUPPLIER GUILTY. Cape May Jury Also Decides He Ill Treated His Children. (By Telegraph to the Tribune.) Cape May, N. J., Jan. 25.—James Wister Brown, who was accused of feeding his children on shark meat, and with keeping them out in the cold, half-dressed, on the plea that such treatment was good for their health, was convicted here this afternoon of cruelty. The verdict was rendered by a jury of only eleven men, the twelfth juror, Frederick Hoenig, having been ordered from the jury box by the court after having attempted to pass a note to the defendant's counsel. The defendant, unaided by sympathy or emotion, insisted upon telling humorous anecdotes, and left the courtroom in an angry mood after a severe reprimand from the court.

The jury acquitted Brown of the two charges of assault, confining his guilt to the six counts of the indictment. The defendant admitted all the facts of the case, and practically admitted all the direct charges of the state's witnesses, so far as the facts were concerned, but denied that his treatment was cruel.

The defence did not want a man of this frame of mind, and so challenged for cause and was sustained.

For a full hour talesman after talesman was put on the grill and dismissed after the shortest of examinations. The majority urged that their minds were already made up. It looked as if the day would come to a close without another juror being chosen. Thaw became bored at the deadly dullness of the proceedings, and shifted uneasily in his seat.

"NAN" PATTERSON JUROR EXAMINED. With the advent of Paris M. Fletcher, of No. 188 Manhattan avenue, there was a slight revival of interest. Mr. Fletcher was a juror at the second "Nan" Patterson trial. He voted guilty at that trial. He was also on the special panel for the Terranova trial, but after the state had accepted him was peremptorily challenged by the defence. Thaw's counsel followed the same course. Then followed another period of dullness.

Lenix S. Lake, of No. 440 East 122d street, was excused because he was opposed to the death penalty. Walter J. Peck, of No. 173 Madison avenue, and William H. D. Van Duser, of No. 982 East 156th street, were challenged for cause. Archibald Le Roy, of No. 88 East 49th street, knew Stanford White, and so had John R. Hinchman, of No. 292 Central Park West. Robert E. Mackay, of No. 316 East 20th street, was excused, as he had moved to Newark. George Van Vorst, of No. 180 West 104th street, and Solomon N. Levy, of No. 145 West 70th street, had opinions. Samuel J. Cohen, of No. 174 East 76th street, was excused by consent, and so was Gustave A. Schnitzler, of No. 162 West 141st street. Henry A. Dewey, of No. 95 Liberty street, and Thomas T. Dempsey, of No. 2005 Seventh avenue, were challenged for cause. Lathrop Thatcher, of No. 597 West 142d street, had a positive opinion, but was examined more fully. Mr. Garvan asked him:

Q—If you are accepted as a juror could you render a verdict on the evidence, uninfluenced by any opinion? A—I could not. Q—You have a very decided opinion? A—I have. Milton W. Curry, of No. 312 West 101st street, had a physician's certificate, which excused him. Henry W. Donald, of No. 27 West 60th street, was excused. Luther W. Jacobs, of No. 211 West 85th street, said it would take very strong evidence to change his opinion, and was also excused.

Benjamin F. Stangland, of No. 957 West 122d street, said he had done business with McKim, Mead & White, and was excused.

M. S. FRASER ACCEPTED. Malcolm S. Fraser, a salesman, of No. 82 West 50th street, was the first likely juror to make an appearance in an hour. He answered all of Mr. Garvan's questions satisfactorily. Whatever opinion he had formed would not influence his judgment, he said. Mr. Hartbridge examined him.

Q—Do you know of any reason why you could not give the defendant a fair and impartial verdict on the evidence? A—I know of none. Q—You would give the defendant the benefit of every reasonable doubt? A—I would. After a few questions of similar import he was sworn in as the seventh juror. He apparently had the approval of the Thaw family and the defendant himself. He was scrutinized closely by all the defendant's relatives as he took the seventh seat behind the foreman.

Another long list of talesmen who had excuses which permitted them to quickly leave the witness stand followed Mr. Fraser. John Calvin, of No. 184 West 82d street, was excused because he had known Stanford White; Joseph M. Tobias, of No. 162 Fifth avenue, was challenged for bias; Willard Church, a journalist, and son of Colonel William C. Church, was excused by consent, as was William E. Soles, of No. 163 West 140th street. William H. Hum-

phrey, of No. 150 East 88th street, said that his wife and family had been intimate friends of the White family for years. He was challenged for cause. Marcus W. Cane, of No. 1 West 30th street, had a strong opinion, and was also challenged for cause.

Then Robert Underwood Johnson was examined. Mr. Johnson is associate editor of "The Century Magazine." He did not have to answer many questions. Mr. Garvan examined him:

Q—Have you any reason why you should not be able to serve as a juror and give a just and equitable verdict? A—I am theoretically opposed to capital punishment, but I would not permit my conscientious scruples to influence a statement of facts. I would obey the law. Q—Have you formed an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendant? A—I have. Q—Could you say if you were entering the jury box and give a fair verdict? A—I could not. My reason for this is that for thirty years I was an intimate friend of the White family.

After this statement Mr. Johnson was quickly dismissed.

The last three talesmen of the day were disposed of in short order. Julius Goldstone, of No. 121 St. Nicholas avenue, was excused by consent, and Henry D. Moeller, Jr., of No. 7 East 42d street, had a decided opinion. Mr. Jerome tried to get him to change it but without success.

Q—Could you say if you were entering the jury box and give a fair verdict? A—I could not. My reason for this is that for thirty years I was an intimate friend of the White family.

Richard Hitchens, a white-haired old man, who said he had been connected with the United States commissary department, was challenged by Mr. Hartbridge after he had asked if he knew any one connected with the District Attorney's office. "Yes, I have a son employed in that office," replied Mr. Hitchens.

Justice Fitzgerald then declared court adjourned to Monday, after repeating his warning to the jurors not to discuss the case in any way.

HARTBRIDGE DENIES QUARRELS. Clifford W. Hartbridge, Thaw's senior counsel, expressed his annoyance at the stories of quarrels in the Thaw family. He denied them emphatically, and explained the Countess of Yarmouth's absence by declaring that it was due solely to the fact that she was suffering from a severe illness. Mr. Hartbridge's denials, however, were looked upon as being made purely through motives of policy.

With seven jurors chosen from 101 talesmen it is believed there will be no difficulty in getting the other members of the panel. The defence had a conference on Thursday night which lasted until early yesterday morning, and last night held another, at which the members of the jury committee held a conference of counsel and the family will be held to-day and to-morrow.

FIVE PLATOONS NOW. Bingham Announces New Plan to Solve Police Problem.

General Bingham announced yesterday a five platoon patrol system for the police, to begin at 2 a. m. to-morrow. It is a compromise between the three platoon system, which he recently discarded as a failure, and the old two platoon system, under which the police force of the city worked well for half a century.

As readers of The Tribune have been told, the two platoon system keeps practically the entire patrol force on duty, either in patrol on posts or in reserve at the police stations, from 6 p. m. to 6 a. m., while in the day hours one-quarter of the patrolmen are patrolling and one-eighth are in reserve. Six hour tours of duty are maintained.

Under the three platoon system only one-third of the force could be on duty at one time, a patrolman working eight hours and then having sixteen hours off duty in the twenty-four. The tours of duty were eight hours at a stretch, and the night posts were about four times as long as under the two platoon system. The arrangement encouraged shirking and general neglect of patrol duty.

General Bingham's five platoon system, as he has explained in a statement accompanying the order, is intended to give patrolmen more time off duty without materially lessening the night patrol force. Two platoons are kept on patrol in six hour tours and one platoon in reserve in the night hours, from 8 p. m. to 8 a. m., the relieving time being 2 a. m. instead of midnight.

The five platoon system is made to rotate once in five days, and in that time each platoon has one whole day off duty, the platoons alternating in hours of duty and off duty. Each platoon also has two periods of twelve hours off duty in the five days, but there are two days of the five in which each platoon will have only two hours of freedom in the twenty-four. The extra time off for the patrolmen, since the day duty remains practically the same as in the two platoon system, is obtained by cutting down the reserve force at night.

General Bingham's statement includes the following: It is deemed to be beyond controversy that in New York City it is necessary that there should always be a reserve of police in every station house sufficient to be of value when called upon, also, that during the night hours, 8 p. m. to 8 a. m., the patrolling force should be double what it is during the daytime.

On the other hand, it seems beyond controversy that a policeman who is called upon to patrol only six hours continuously should do better work if he had a patrol of eight hours continuously. Also, if possible his time on duty should be continuous and his time off duty continuous, as much as possible. One of the main difficulties of all systems of patrol which have been studied is that there was a great deal of broken time—that is, only short periods of rest between periods of work.

The five platoon system now adopted runs its cycle of duty and rest in a period of five days, less than six hours, followed by reserve, which must be counted as resting time, during which time the men can sleep if they wish to, unless called upon for emergency duty. The five platoon system gives patrolmen a full twenty-four hours off every five days. In addition, there is no off time which is less than twelve hours.

Chairman Marks of the Civic Federation's committee on the police said last evening:

The new plan gives the policemen an opportunity to go to their homes for rest four days out of every five, a period of at least twelve hours each time, which is a distinct improvement over the present system, which enables them to go home for rest only every other day.

The change is a distinct improvement in the hours now made by Commissioner Bingham, not because it considers the new arrangement ideal, but because it believes it to be a step in the right direction. A gradual improvement is always safer and more likely to be lasting than a sudden drastic change. We hope to see great improvement in our police service if this system is adopted.

The new patrol system will not affect the hours of duty of the traffic squads and other special squads of the force.

COURT REINSTATES POLICEMAN. The order of Police Commissioner Bingham dismissing Patrolman Hugh F. Maguire, of the 25th Precinct, was annulled by the Appellate Division yesterday. It was charged that Maguire disobeyed the rules in inducing Maurice McMahon, of No. 26 East 12th street, to pledge in a pawnshop a watch worth \$100 to the police. Maguire was fined \$5 for the same. The court decided that evidence was lacking.

AGREEMENT NO BAR TO DOWER. Appellate Division Decides That Bequests Do Not Vitate Widow's Rights. The Appellate Division of the Supreme Court handed down yesterday a decision modifying a judgment of the lower court in the case of Alfred R. Brown against Anne Brown, Augusta A. Brown and others in connection with the estate of Paul S. Brown.

Mr. Brown was married to Miss Augusta Andree on August 2, 1901. He died a week later, intestate. Mr. Brown was then ninety years old, but in the full possession of his faculties so far as the evidence goes. There was no question as to the validity of the will. It was held that if Mr. Brown should die within three years his widow should receive 300 Swedish kronas, and if he should die after that time she should get 500 kronas, besides receiving, on her husband's death, \$50 a month until the division of the funds was completed. The will was held to be valid.

Justice Dowling decided that Mrs. Brown was not entitled to the dower, holding that the special payments were in lieu thereof. That decision the Appellate Division reversed, and she is held to be entitled to her full dower rights. Presiding Justice Patterson and Justice Houghton dissent from the opinion.

BIG YEAR FOR HOME LIFE COMPANY. Largest Issue of New Insurance and Greatest Growth in Insurance in Force. The assets of the Home Life Insurance Company, as given in the company's forty-seventh annual statement, amount to \$9,818,810 and its gain in admitted assets for 1906 is \$1,322,213. Its premium receipts, according to the statement, showed a gain of \$556,622.91 over those of 1905, as a result of the largest issue of new insurance in the company's history, and the greatest growth in insurance in force on December 31, 1906, is given as \$8,113,589.

The principal item set down on the liabilities side of the company's statement is its policy reserve, amounting to \$16,076,728. The company's assets in detail, according to the statement, are: Bonds and mortgages, \$5,900,000; bonds and stocks (market value), \$2,807,357.91; real estate, \$1,620,000.00; cash in banks and trust companies, \$28,425.73; loans to policyholders, \$1,000,000.00; and other assets, \$406,229.52. The officers of the company are: President, E. E. Ide; Vice-president, William A. Marshall; Secretary, E. E. Ide; Treasurer, E. E. Ide; Assistant Secretary, E. E. Ide; Actuary, E. E. Ide; General Counsel, E. E. Ide; Superintendent, E. E. Ide; Director, E. E. Ide; and other officers, E. E. Ide.

NOTES OF THE STAGE. It is announced from Philadelphia that Richard Mansfield, who opens at the New Amsterdam on February 5, will play "Peer Gynt" for three weeks.

"Miss Americana," a dramatization by Will A. Page of Archibald Claverley Gunter's latest novel, will have its first presentation in February at the Worcester Theatre, Worcester, Mass., when Miss Florence Reed, daughter of the late Roland Reed, will play the leading part. The scenes of the play are laid in Japan and Manchuria during the war. Mr. Gunter has collaborated with Mr. Page.

"Neptune's Daughter" and "Pioneer Days," at the Hippodrome, reached their 100th performance at the matinee yesterday. Since "Neptune's Daughter" was first produced, November 28, not one member of the cast has been discharged. Henry Woodruff will give a professional matinee of "Brown of Harvard" at the Majestic on next Tuesday.

The Hebrew vaudeville strikers paraded through the East Side yesterday afternoon in an effort to arouse public sympathy.

THE NORTH-WESTERN LINE. THE NORTH-WESTERN LIMITED TO ST. PAUL and MINNEAPOLIS. It is modeled to please particular people—electric-lighted and luxuriously furnished, heated by steam and ventilated by electric fans. Each section and compartment in the sleeping cars has its individual reading lamps. The table d'hôte dinner in the dining car is one of the finest meals served on wheels. The Limited leaves Chicago daily at 6.30 p.m. There are three other daily trains to St. Paul and Minneapolis via The North-Western Line, leaving Chicago at 9.00 a.m., 10.00 p.m. and 3.00 a.m., making a most complete daily service to the Twin Cities. H. C. Cheyney, General Agent, O. & N.-W. Ry., 461 Broadway, New York.

OFFICE OF THE Atlantic Mutual Insurance Company. New York, January 22, 1907. The Trustees, in conformity with the Charter of the Company, submit the following statement of its affairs on the 31st of December, 1906. Premiums on Marine Risks from 1st January, 1906, to 31st December, 1906, \$7,100,847.87. Premiums on Policies not marked off 1st January, 1906, \$82,181.88. Total Marine Premiums, \$7,183,029.75. Premiums marked off from 1st January, 1906, to 31st December, 1906, \$3,773,489.84. Total Premiums, \$10,956,519.59. Interest received during the year, \$319,437.38. Rent less Taxes and Expenses, \$155,301.58. Losses paid during the year, which were estimated in 1905 and previous years, \$209,817.14. Losses occurred, estimated and paid in 1906, \$1,819,041.46. Net Surplus, \$1,017,178.57. Re-insurances, \$190,179.74. Returns of premiums, including other clerical compensation, stationary, newspapers, advertisements, etc., \$844,098.57. United States and State of New York Stock, City, Bank and other securities, \$5,877,189.96. Special Deposits in Banks and Trust Companies, \$4,339,000.00. Real Estate and Exchange Risks, \$6,339,000.00. Other Real Estate and claims due the Company, 75,996.00. Premium notes and Bills Receivable, \$1,191,974.88. Cash in the hands of European Bankers to pay losses under policies payable in Europe, \$52,621.65. Cash in Bank, \$12,797,822.75. Aggregating, \$12,797,822.75.

A dividend of six per cent. interest on the outstanding certificates of profits will be paid to the holders thereof, or their legal representatives, on and after Tuesday, the fifth of February next. The dividend will be paid to the holders thereof, or their legal representatives, on and after Tuesday, the fifth of February next, from which date all interest thereon will cease. The certificates of profits for the year ending 31st December, 1906, for which, upon application, certificates will be issued on and after Tuesday, the seventh of May next.

- By order of the Board, G. STANTON FLOYD-JONES, Secretary. TRUSTEES: