

The Sun

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1886.

Advertisements for THE WEEKLY SUN, to-morrow morning, must be handed in this evening before six o'clock.

Two Postmasters.

It is strange that the application of the same principle in politics should produce a Democratic Postmaster in Boston and a Republican Postmaster in New York. The new Postmaster in Boston, Gen. Conner, has been appointed to succeed Mr. Torrey, a Republican. The appointment of Gen. Conner is regarded with unqualified satisfaction by the Democrats. It is a timely recognition of the Massachusetts Democracy, as an Alderman CARROLL says. "It is a recognition of the working-men of the Democracy," says Congressman LOVERING; and doubtless it must have been with a view of gratifying that sentiment that Mr. Torrey, a gentleman who, as the Herald says, "will take into private life that respect and esteem which have sustained him in his official position," and who has been "zealous for the service of the city," was succeeded by another man. The Mugwump faction of Mr. CLEVELAND'S adherents, having succeeded in nominating one of themselves as the Democratic candidate for Governor, would not be disposed to receive this change with dangerous dissent.

On the other hand, in the case of the New York Post Office, it was to satisfy the imperative demands of the Mugwumps that Mr. PEARSON was reappointed, and the Democracy here left in disappointment. Both appointments were primarily the dictate of politics. But there is this difference between the two. While the appointment of Gen. CONNER was made with a view of recognizing the Democratic party, the appointment of Mr. PEARSON was made for the purpose of recognizing the Mugwumps and attaching them more firmly to the fortunes of Mr. CLEVELAND. The fulfillment of attempting to attach them permanently to the Democratic party was shown by the way in which they turned on the nomination of Gen. Conner the next year. But there is a broader principle which can be applied to all appointments, and which, while it does not admit of such personal considerations as were displayed in these two cases, can be relied on to produce good government, for it lies at the foundation of Democracy. This is that the offices should be in control of the party that wins its right to administer the affairs of the country through a national election.

The American Authors Exchange Ideas.

The Indianapolis newspapers have given much less space to the convention of American Authors than they have done to the interest and humors of the event seem to require. We are obliged to look to a Chicago Journal, the Tribune, for anything like a satisfactory account of the proceedings. Perhaps the attention which the Tribune has devoted to the matter is due to the fact that Chicago hopes to have the convention next year, with that distinguished statistician and writer on political economy, the Hon. EGORNE FIELD, as Chairman. Certainly, the country might be searched in vain for a firmer, juster, and at the same time more decorously dignified presiding officer.

At the Indianapolis convention Mr. MATTHEW THOMPSON of Indiana presided over the deliberations of the American Authors, and Miss ROSS ELIZABETH CLEVELAND sent a letter regretting her inability to attend. Among those present was Miss ELLA GILES, "one of the keenest of the corps of Wisconsin girl writers," and Mrs. ANNE OLDFIELD WIGG of Chicago. The exercises took place in Plymouth Church, where they consisted of the reading of essays and poems, the exchange of congratulatory and appreciative comment, the consideration of great questions affecting the profession of American Authorship, and general mutual assistance, in the way of personal experience as to the best method of work, the best hours for writing, the best kind of black ink, and so on. Here is the programme for the discussions of one day; and with Mr. MATTHEW THOMPSON in the chair, we need not doubt it was conscientiously carried out:

- Plans of Collaborative Publication.
Prizes for Literary Work.
Literature as a Means of Support.
The Future of Literature in America.
Literary Criticism.
Relations of East and West.
International Copyright.
What is Poetry?
The Greatest American Poet.
Diagrams of Literature.
Slang and Back.
The Letters of JEROME.
Pseudonyms or Real Names.

The personal habits of eminent authors are always interesting to read about. We find ourselves attracted to the same degree as the incidental or accidental or semi-confidential disclosures that from time to time fall from the lips of members of the convention. In the intervals of more formal discourse. These little things bring us very near to the inner chambers of creative genius.

Major J. W. GORDON of Indiana, for instance, after reading a "Poem to his Mother" by one HENRY BIRCH, candidly confessed that he had no distinct method of composition. He got full of his subject, and the ideas flowed right out in proper literary form. A tendency which he recognized in his own writings, namely, toward over-luxuriance in language, had been partially corrected by a perusal of "Napoleon the Little," and other caustic books.

The Rev. WILLIAM S. FRITH of Ohio, who had contributed to the day's instruction a solid essay on JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, did not agree with Major GORDON. He objected to haphazard work. He reminded the American Authors that "style came through development." System, he urged, was necessary. Mr. BENJAMIN PARKER, the pioneer versifier of Indiana, contended, on the other hand, that "the inspiration was the poem itself." The first thought continued through all vicissitudes of altered text.

But Mr. JOHN A. WILSTACH, who had promised to read selections from a translation of DANTÉ, decided the contest between the literary formalists and their antagonists by ruling that "the intellectual and mechanical parts" of authorship were "quite distinct, and that the mechanical part was secondary."

Then the discourse turned to the "availability and adaptability of faculties," whether literary work should be forced or not, and about "accruals of growth." The writing habits of SCOTT and BRASS, of LAW and of TENNYSON, were discussed. Mr. LAW S. HARRIS, the author of a poem on Dawn and Twilight, believed that thoughts could not be immediately clothed in words. Mr. MAURICE THOMPSON "considered ideas as different as people." Mr. WALLACE confessed that if he "missed on the first spring, he was lost." And the gallant Major GORDON brought the controversy back to the point at which it started by declaring again that he "had to go right on through his compositions in one fit."

It would have been useful to know how some of the other poets and essayists present are accustomed to write. It would be interesting to have had accounts of the methods of literary work pursued by C. L. PIERCE of California, M. W. A. VENABLE of Cincinnati, E. PRETLOW of Dublin, Ind., ADA LANGWORTHY COLLIER of Dubuque, CHAS. VANDERBENT of Andersonville, Ind., THEOPHILUS VANDERBENT of Winchester, and many others among the delegates to the convention of American Authors.

The Hon. EGORNE FIELD will bring them all out next year at Chicago.

The Irish Menstrap of Church Hill, Chamberlain & Co.

The report in the London Daily News that the Tories had determined to adopt the expedient mooted by Mr. CHAMBERLAIN about a year ago, and break up Ireland into four separate and locally autonomous divisions, each of which would have its own provincial legislature, was evidently put forth as a mere "feeler," for it lacked both definiteness and authority. No light was thrown upon the limits of the powers of the proposed provincial assemblies, or upon their interrelations with each other or with the central law-making body at Westminster. Moreover, the announcement was made, not through an accredited organ of Tory intentions, but in a Liberal newspaper, whose editor is known, however, to stand on very confidential terms with Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

We can safely draw, then, no conclusion from the statement of the Daily News, or from the Lord's Evening Post, or from the Chamberlain's own words, if they could track Ireland out of her nationality, and transform the coveted boon of home rule into a lever of sectional dissension and antipathy. If they could induce Parliament to sanction the divorce of Ulster from the rest of Ireland, we may be sure they would take pains to impose restrictions on the franchise, or hit upon equivalent precautions to insure control of the Ulster assembly to the so-called Loyalists. This is the device for fortifying the hands of an English garrison in Ulster in the hands of an English garrison.

So far as the suggestion of this plan for quarantining Ireland has elicited expressions of opinion from Conservatives and Whig Unionists, there are by no means favorable. Lord HARTINGTON denies that he has sanctioned any such measure as that outlined in the News. Several Tory newspapers have harshly denounced the proposal, and the old-fashioned Tories of the Carlton Club are said to regard it with disgust; not, of course, because they are not eager to fortify the hands of an English garrison in Ulster in the hands of an English garrison, but because they think the sacrifice of three-fourths of Ireland too great a price to pay for it. They perceive also that the erection of provincial legislatures in one kingdom would promptly and inevitably lead to a demand for like powers of local law making by Wales and Scotland. This would ensue an application of those powers fatal to the aristocracy. Lord SALISBURY is quite as far as Lord HARTINGTON, and he is not likely to be followed by disestablishment, first in Scotland and Wales and then in England, while after the expulsion of the Bishops from the House of Peers the lords temporal would not long be suffered to retain the functions of hereditary legislators.

They who speak of a thing accomplished of the subtraction of the Tory-Unionist majority in the present House of Commons to a brace of political adventurers like Mr. CHAMBERLAIN and Mr. GIBSON, lay out their reckoning two men who are at present masters of the situation, and who will fight hard to remain so. It is not likely that Lord HARTINGTON, who has been chosen, might be Prime Minister to-day, or Lord SALISBURY, who is actually Premier, will meekly retire into the background, while a ringmaster in the starched attire of a Brummagem reformer and a clown in the face of the breach of a Tory-Democrat crack the whip and turn the handspike in the Parliamentary arena.

Mr. Phelps.

From Mr. PHELPS'S letter to Mr. THORNTON RICE, published in THE SUN on Sunday, it is seen that he refused to Mr. RICE a favor which is granted to other Americans on the ground that Mr. RICE had published something of which Mr. PHELPS did not approve. Mr. PHELPS says that he is at liberty to present people at court or not, and no one will deny that; but he went so far as to put on record that Mr. RICE's publication formed the precise reason why he refused Mr. RICE.

However strongly Mr. PHELPS may have dissented from Mr. RICE'S criticism, or however laboriously he may attempt in his own mind to prove to his own satisfaction that the North American Review belongs to no political party and therefore is not entitled to the rights possessed by other American publications, his attitude is square in the face of the fundamental principle of free press in this country, and we would say that the last man to give his sanction to such conduct was THOMAS F. BAYARD.

A Warning to the Philistines.

We observe indications of a purpose on the part of some of the Philistine opponents of Mr. GEORGE to endeavor to frighten away people from his support under the threat of social penalties—that is, they would make a man's position with reference to him a test of respectability.

Of course, such people are ignorant and narrow-minded, dull, stupid, and intellectually benighted; but that is the mental and moral condition of the Philistine community generally. Alas! too, it is a large community. Yet even the Philistines should not be left unwarned when they meditate folly which is likely to have consequences very uncomfortable for them.

If they pursue the course suggested by their timidity and bigotry they will contribute to the election of Mr. GEORGE even more powerfully than if they gave him their own votes. They will further consolidate the workingmen in his favor, and people not now on his side will rush to him and simply forth as aids of beating the Philistines.

Abner G. Caruth.

Mr. ABNER G. CARUTH, who has been nominated in the Louisville district to succeed the Hon. ALBERT S. WILLIS, is just what his predecessor was not. He is a sound Democrat, a bitter enemy of sham civil service reform, of excessive appropriations, and of appropriations great or small for unconstitutional or unnecessary purposes.

We congratulate him on his success, and we congratulate our ostensible contemporary, the Louisville Courier-Journal, on the happy result of its able and persistent opposition to Mr. WILLIS'S re-nomination. The Democracy of Kentucky can be trusted every time.

The Irish Menstrap of Church Hill, Chamberlain & Co.

In nominating ABNER S. HEWITT for Mayor Tammany Hall has offered the Democracy of the city a straight way out of the perils into which it was drifting.

We are persuaded that Mr. HEWITT will see all that, and will accept nomination which is equivalent to a defeat. If he will run for the County Democracy will make him its candidate as a matter of course. He is a straight, fair, and able man, and there is no doubt that he would defend justly by both organizations. Nor is there any doubt that he would make a good Mayor. He does not want to go to Congress again, he says, and the Majority of New York offers work worthy of any man's ambition, coupled with the privilege of living in New York, which is not to be despised.

Mr. HEWITT will not be the victim of all the party calling on him to accept the nomination. Gov. HILL'S pardon of the THREE LOYALISTS will be generally approved. Considering the novelty of their office, and the fact that they were acting in a regular way, they certainly have been punished sufficiently.

Minister PHELPS'S note to Mr. RICE, who has refused to present him in court: "You may be assured that, if I had sent in your name for that purpose and the attention of the Royal Highness had been drawn to the article in your issue, he would have been received very graciously." Does Mr. PHELPS really think this?

Samuel J. Tilden's Will.

Creditors May Bring Suit on the Nephew's Rights of Action to Contest.

The citations issued to the heirs and next of kin of the late Samuel J. Tilden are returnable a week from to-morrow, and there is no reason to believe that any objection will be made to the probate of the will. There promises, however, to be serious trouble immediately afterward, and the three trustees may find they have a serious fight on their hands. There is reason to believe that the validity of the Tilden trust will be contested, and that claims will be put in for payment of the debts of the New Lebanon drug factory. The attacking parties in these suits will be the creditors of the drug firm, and it is pretended that they are not assailed by those who would be benefited by the failure of the will.

On the day after the reading of the will George A. and Samuel J. Tilden were very emphatic in the expression of their intention to contest the will. Their first plan was to have the will set aside, and the estate to be divided among the heirs. But the will was so framed that the heirs would be bound to accept it, and the estate would be divided among the heirs.

On the day after the reading of the will George A. and Samuel J. Tilden were very emphatic in the expression of their intention to contest the will. Their first plan was to have the will set aside, and the estate to be divided among the heirs. But the will was so framed that the heirs would be bound to accept it, and the estate would be divided among the heirs.

On the day after the reading of the will George A. and Samuel J. Tilden were very emphatic in the expression of their intention to contest the will. Their first plan was to have the will set aside, and the estate to be divided among the heirs. But the will was so framed that the heirs would be bound to accept it, and the estate would be divided among the heirs.

On the day after the reading of the will George A. and Samuel J. Tilden were very emphatic in the expression of their intention to contest the will. Their first plan was to have the will set aside, and the estate to be divided among the heirs. But the will was so framed that the heirs would be bound to accept it, and the estate would be divided among the heirs.

On the day after the reading of the will George A. and Samuel J. Tilden were very emphatic in the expression of their intention to contest the will. Their first plan was to have the will set aside, and the estate to be divided among the heirs. But the will was so framed that the heirs would be bound to accept it, and the estate would be divided among the heirs.

On the day after the reading of the will George A. and Samuel J. Tilden were very emphatic in the expression of their intention to contest the will. Their first plan was to have the will set aside, and the estate to be divided among the heirs. But the will was so framed that the heirs would be bound to accept it, and the estate would be divided among the heirs.

On the day after the reading of the will George A. and Samuel J. Tilden were very emphatic in the expression of their intention to contest the will. Their first plan was to have the will set aside, and the estate to be divided among the heirs. But the will was so framed that the heirs would be bound to accept it, and the estate would be divided among the heirs.

On the day after the reading of the will George A. and Samuel J. Tilden were very emphatic in the expression of their intention to contest the will. Their first plan was to have the will set aside, and the estate to be divided among the heirs. But the will was so framed that the heirs would be bound to accept it, and the estate would be divided among the heirs.

On the day after the reading of the will George A. and Samuel J. Tilden were very emphatic in the expression of their intention to contest the will. Their first plan was to have the will set aside, and the estate to be divided among the heirs. But the will was so framed that the heirs would be bound to accept it, and the estate would be divided among the heirs.

On the day after the reading of the will George A. and Samuel J. Tilden were very emphatic in the expression of their intention to contest the will. Their first plan was to have the will set aside, and the estate to be divided among the heirs. But the will was so framed that the heirs would be bound to accept it, and the estate would be divided among the heirs.

On the day after the reading of the will George A. and Samuel J. Tilden were very emphatic in the expression of their intention to contest the will. Their first plan was to have the will set aside, and the estate to be divided among the heirs. But the will was so framed that the heirs would be bound to accept it, and the estate would be divided among the heirs.

On the day after the reading of the will George A. and Samuel J. Tilden were very emphatic in the expression of their intention to contest the will. Their first plan was to have the will set aside, and the estate to be divided among the heirs. But the will was so framed that the heirs would be bound to accept it, and the estate would be divided among the heirs.

On the day after the reading of the will George A. and Samuel J. Tilden were very emphatic in the expression of their intention to contest the will. Their first plan was to have the will set aside, and the estate to be divided among the heirs. But the will was so framed that the heirs would be bound to accept it, and the estate would be divided among the heirs.

On the day after the reading of the will George A. and Samuel J. Tilden were very emphatic in the expression of their intention to contest the will. Their first plan was to have the will set aside, and the estate to be divided among the heirs. But the will was so framed that the heirs would be bound to accept it, and the estate would be divided among the heirs.

On the day after the reading of the will George A. and Samuel J. Tilden were very emphatic in the expression of their intention to contest the will. Their first plan was to have the will set aside, and the estate to be divided among the heirs. But the will was so framed that the heirs would be bound to accept it, and the estate would be divided among the heirs.

On the day after the reading of the will George A. and Samuel J. Tilden were very emphatic in the expression of their intention to contest the will. Their first plan was to have the will set aside, and the estate to be divided among the heirs. But the will was so framed that the heirs would be bound to accept it, and the estate would be divided among the heirs.

On the day after the reading of the will George A. and Samuel J. Tilden were very emphatic in the expression of their intention to contest the will. Their first plan was to have the will set aside, and the estate to be divided among the heirs. But the will was so framed that the heirs would be bound to accept it, and the estate would be divided among the heirs.

Pastor Staunton's Stories.

Mrs. Emerick Says Some which he Told at her House were Indecent.

The trial of Pastor Staunton of the Fort Greene Church for alleged immorality was continued yesterday before the Brooklyn Recorder, Mrs. Flora H. Emerick testified.

Mrs. Emerick made a call on me on Jan. 2, 1886, with her wife. He used language at that time unbecomingly of the Gospel. He told some stories which hurt me very much and which I did not consider proper. The stories were very indecent, and I would prefer not to repeat them here, but I am willing to do so in private. I have frequently heard Mr. Staunton in town, and he has told me the same stories which he told me at his house. He told me that he had told them to his wife and to his children, and that he had told them to his friends and to his neighbors. He told me that he had told them to his wife and to his children, and that he had told them to his friends and to his neighbors.

Mrs. Emerick testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M.

Mrs. Emerick testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M.

Mrs. Emerick testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M.

Mrs. Emerick testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M.

Mrs. Emerick testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M.

Mrs. Emerick testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M.

Mrs. Emerick testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M.

Mrs. Emerick testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M.

Mrs. Emerick testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M.

Mrs. Emerick testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M.

Mrs. Emerick testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M.

Mrs. Emerick testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M.

Mrs. Emerick testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M.

Mrs. Emerick testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M.

Mrs. Emerick testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M.

Mrs. Emerick testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M. She testified that she had seen Mr. Staunton in the company of a woman named Mrs. M.

Needle's Big Swindle.

President Nash Says the Corn Exchange Bank's Loss will be Less than \$100,000.

CHICAGO, Oct. 11.—William A. Nash, President of the Corn Exchange Bank of New York, arrived in the city last evening, to look into the failure of the banking and grain house of J. C. Ferguson & Co., through Nathan M. Need, one of the firm. Of the \$400,000 which Need swindled the several banks out of, it was reported that \$100,000 was lost by the Corn Exchange Bank of New York. Mr. Nash said at no time did they have more than \$20,000 of Ferguson & Co.'s money. And at the present time their holdings aggregate probably not over \$75,000, against which they have claims from which they can realize about \$25,000. The remainder was loaned on the bogus warehouse receipts issued by Need.

"Our loss," he said, "will not reach very near to \$100,000, but the Corn Exchange Bank could contemplate such a loss with a great deal of complacency. The members of the firm, who had charge of the New York end of the business, arrived in Chicago this morning. I intend to return to Chicago this morning. It takes me ten years to do it. I believe in the investigation of the truth. I do not believe that he took away with him a dollar of anybody's money. Overtrading has been the cause of all the trouble. The liabilities of the firm have been greatly exaggerated. There is every prospect that the firm will resume business."

CHICAGO'S IDLE LABORERS. No Indication of an Agreement Between the Pork Packers and their Men. CHICAGO, Oct. 11.—None of the large pork packing establishments at the Union Stock Yards opened their doors this morning, and the idle laborers who were employed in these departments offered to return to work on the ten-hour basis proposed by the owners of the packing houses. Fifty of the best killers employed in the Fowler packing house stopped work and joined the main body of the strikers. The strikers are now on strike, and the freight cars by the Armour house also stopped work.

CHICAGO'S IDLE LABORERS. No Indication of an Agreement Between the Pork Packers and their Men. CHICAGO, Oct. 11.—None of the large pork packing establishments at the Union Stock Yards opened their doors this morning, and the idle laborers who were employed in these departments offered to return to work on the ten-hour basis proposed by the owners of the packing houses. Fifty of the best killers employed in the Fowler packing house stopped work and joined the main body of the strikers. The strikers are now on strike, and the freight cars by the Armour house also stopped work.

CHICAGO'S IDLE LABORERS. No Indication of an Agreement Between the Pork Packers and their Men. CHICAGO, Oct. 11.—None of the large pork packing establishments at the Union Stock Yards opened their doors this morning, and the idle laborers who were employed in these departments offered to return to work on the ten-hour basis proposed by the owners of the packing houses. Fifty of the best killers employed in the Fowler packing house stopped work and joined the main body of the strikers. The strikers are now on strike, and the freight cars by the Armour house also stopped work.

CHICAGO'S IDLE LABORERS. No Indication of an Agreement Between the Pork Packers and their Men. CHICAGO, Oct. 11.—None of the large pork packing establishments at the Union Stock Yards opened their doors this morning, and the idle laborers who were employed in these departments offered to return to work on the ten-hour basis proposed by the owners of the packing houses. Fifty of the best killers employed in the Fowler packing house stopped work and joined the main body of the strikers. The strikers are now on strike, and the freight cars by the Armour house also stopped work.

CHICAGO'S IDLE LABORERS. No Indication of an Agreement Between the Pork Packers and their Men. CHICAGO, Oct. 11.—None of the large pork packing establishments at the Union Stock Yards opened their doors this morning, and the idle laborers who were employed in these departments offered to return to work on the ten-hour basis proposed by the owners of the packing houses. Fifty of the best killers employed in the Fowler packing house stopped work and joined the main body of the strikers. The strikers are now on strike, and the freight cars by the Armour house also stopped work.

CHICAGO'S IDLE LABORERS. No Indication of an Agreement Between the Pork Packers and their Men. CHICAGO, Oct. 11.—None of the large pork packing establishments at the Union Stock Yards opened their doors this morning, and the idle laborers who were employed in these departments offered to return to work on the ten-hour basis proposed by the owners of the packing houses. Fifty of the best killers employed in the Fowler packing house stopped work and joined the main body of the strikers. The strikers are now on strike, and the freight cars by the Armour house also stopped work.

CHICAGO'S IDLE LABORERS. No Indication of an Agreement Between the Pork Packers and their Men. CHICAGO, Oct. 11.—None of the large pork packing establishments at the Union Stock Yards opened their doors this morning, and the idle laborers who were employed in these departments offered to return to work on the ten-hour basis proposed by the owners of the packing houses. Fifty of the best killers employed in the Fowler packing house stopped work and joined the main body of the strikers. The strikers are now on strike, and the freight cars by the Armour house also stopped work.

CHICAGO'S IDLE LABORERS. No Indication of an Agreement Between the Pork Packers and their Men. CHICAGO, Oct. 11.—None of the large pork packing establishments at the Union Stock Yards opened their doors this morning, and the idle laborers who were employed in these departments offered to return to work on the ten-hour basis proposed by the owners of the packing houses. Fifty of the best killers employed in the Fowler packing house stopped work and joined the main body of the strikers. The strikers are now on strike, and the freight cars by the Armour house also stopped work.

CHICAGO'S IDLE LABORERS. No Indication of an Agreement Between the Pork Packers and their Men. CHICAGO, Oct. 11.—None of the large pork packing establishments at the Union Stock Yards opened their doors this morning, and the idle laborers who were employed in these departments offered to return to work on the ten-hour basis proposed by the owners of the packing houses. Fifty of the best killers employed in the Fowler packing house stopped work and joined the main body of the strikers. The strikers are now on strike, and the freight cars by the Armour house also stopped work.

CHICAGO'S IDLE LABORERS. No Indication of an Agreement Between the Pork Packers and their Men. CHICAGO, Oct. 11.—None of the large pork packing establishments at the Union Stock Yards opened their doors this morning, and the idle laborers who were employed in these departments offered to return to work on the ten-hour basis proposed by the owners of the packing houses. Fifty of the best killers employed in the Fowler packing house stopped work and joined the main body of the strikers. The strikers are now on strike, and the freight cars by the Armour house also stopped work.

CHICAGO'S IDLE LABORERS. No Indication of an Agreement Between the Pork Packers and their Men. CHICAGO, Oct. 11.—None of the large pork packing establishments at the Union Stock Yards opened their doors this morning, and the idle laborers who were employed in these departments offered to return to work on the ten-hour basis proposed by the owners of the packing houses. Fifty of the best killers employed in the Fowler packing house stopped work and joined the main body of the strikers. The strikers are now on strike, and the freight cars by the Armour house also stopped work.

CHICAGO'S IDLE LABORERS. No Indication of an Agreement Between the Pork Packers and their Men. CHICAGO, Oct. 11.—None of the large pork packing establishments at the Union Stock Yards opened their doors this morning, and the idle laborers who were employed in these departments offered to return to work on the ten-hour basis proposed by the owners of the packing houses. Fifty of the best killers employed in the Fowler packing house stopped work and joined the main body of the strikers. The strikers are now on strike, and the freight cars by the Armour house also stopped work.

CHICAGO'S IDLE LABORERS. No Indication of an Agreement Between the Pork Packers and their Men. CHICAGO, Oct. 11.—None of the large pork packing establishments at the Union Stock Yards opened their doors this morning, and the idle laborers who were employed in these departments offered to return to work on the ten-hour basis proposed by the owners of the packing houses. Fifty of the best killers employed in the Fowler packing house stopped work and joined the main body of the strikers. The strikers are now on strike, and the freight cars by the Armour house also stopped work.

CHICAGO'S IDLE LABORERS. No Indication of an Agreement Between the Pork Packers and their Men. CHICAGO, Oct. 11.—None of the large pork packing establishments at the Union Stock Yards opened their doors this morning, and the idle laborers who were employed in these departments offered to return to work on the ten-hour basis proposed by the owners of the packing houses. Fifty of the best killers employed in the Fowler packing house stopped work and joined the main body of the strikers. The strikers are now on strike, and the freight cars by the Armour house also stopped work.

CHICAGO'S IDLE LABORERS. No Indication of an Agreement Between the Pork Packers and their Men. CHICAGO, Oct. 11.—None of the large pork packing establishments at the Union Stock Yards opened their doors this morning, and the idle laborers who were employed in these departments offered to return to work on the ten-hour basis proposed by the owners of the packing houses. Fifty of the best killers employed in the Fowler packing house stopped work and joined the main body of the strikers. The strikers are now on strike, and the freight cars by the Armour house also stopped work.

CHICAGO'S IDLE LABORERS. No Indication of an Agreement Between the Pork Packers and their Men. CHICAGO, Oct. 11.—None of the large pork packing establishments at the Union Stock Yards opened their doors this morning, and the idle laborers who were employed in these departments offered to return to work on the ten-hour basis proposed by the owners of the packing houses. Fifty of the best killers employed in the Fowler packing house stopped work and joined the main body of the strikers. The strikers are now on strike, and the freight cars by the Armour house also stopped work.

Schleicher Still Holds Out.

Justice Frost Ordered to Render Judgment or Show Why He Shouldn't.

A Jury of Queens county citizens assembled in Justice Samuel Frost's court in Glen Cove yesterday to try Frederick Schleicher for selling liquor without a license. Mr. Schleicher, the proprietor of a hotel in Glen Cove, his lawyer, William H. Dupuy, wanted to proceed with the trial, but Lawyer William J. Kelly representing the District Attorney, objected on the ground that Mr. Schleicher had been tried already. Mr. Kelly said that he had been tried already, but Justice Frost, while the complaint was present, the prosecution had admitted its desire to go on with the trial. The case was adjourned to Sept. 27, but between that date and the original arraignment of Schleicher a certificate of Special Sessions (Justice Frost) was filed. The case was called on the 27th and Mr. Schleicher and his lawyer were present. Witnesses were examined and cross-examined. Mr. Schleicher's lawyer, William H. Dupuy, wanted the right to further examination and asked for a day for the trial. Lawyer Kelly refused to grant it, and Justice Frost decided that there had been only one examination. He designated yesterday for the trial.

Justice Frost