THE LANGLEY DIVORCE SUIT.

A CASE THAT ATTRACTS GREAT ATTENTION IN BROOKLYN.

The Millionaire Husband Accused by His Wife—His Counter-charge—The Testimony of Detectives, Bell Boys, and Porters.

Over in Brooklyn, before Justice Landon of the Circuit Court, Mr. and Mrs. William H. Langley, persons of great wealth and of some social position, yesterday began the airing of their domestic scandals and sorrows. It was the trial of the suit for absolute divorce which the wife brought against her husband, the suit which all Brooklyn has been talking about ever since the announcement of it last August. Few of those who knew the Langleys and the Shepards, the latter being the family of Mrs. Langley, thought the case would come to an open trial. It is not often that people of refinement will brave the not at all sympathetic inspection of the public as represented by the peering and curious haunters of sensational trials.

But the trial by jury was made necessary because of the fierce opposition which Mr. Langley raised to his wife's charges that he

MRS. LANGLEY.

had been frequently unfaithful to his marriage vows. The separation of Mr. and Mrs. Langley was early last summer, and was preceded by several furious quarrels which were gossiped all over Brooklyn. It seems that Mrs. Langley had long suspected her husband and had had a detective watching him. This detective gave her such information as to his conduct that she removed from her mind the last doubt and got instead a firm conviction that her husband had been criminally intimate with at least two women on many occasions. After several furious quarrels, one of which took place in a drug shop, Mrs. Langley returned to her father's house at Irvington-on-the-Hudson, and, with the consent of all her relatives, resolved never to return to the handsome home of her husband at Pierrepont and Hicks street.

This was known widely even before the divorce proceedings, and all Brooklyn was stirred and expectant. For Mr. Langley is a son of the late millionaire woollen merchant of that name in this city, and, carrying on his father's business in West street, has increased his fortune to several millions. He is a member of the Brooklyn Club, the Crescent Athletic Club, the Brooklyn Yacht Club, the Atlantic Yacht Club, and the New York Yacht Club. He owns the yacht Comet, and, while his social position was not in the exclusive New York society, it was very good, as it could not fail to be with so much wealth as he has, with so much generosity in the spending of his money, with such an interest in yachting, and with a young and exceedingly attractive wife.

He was a widower of several years when, on Sept. 20, 1881, he married a daughter of Mr. S. L. Shepard, a girl nearly fifteen years his junior, and with a mind as attractive as her person. They had three children, the oldest, a boy, being now 10, the two others, girls, respectively 9 and 7. Mrs. Langley, at the head of a luxurious establishment, with a generous husband and fine children, seemed to be a very happy woman and was envied by most of her acquaintances. Now she lives with her father on $12,000 a year, which Mr. Langley gives her for herself and the children, while Mr. Langley, having closed up his residence, lives at the Gilsey House.

WELLS, THE HALL BOY.

After Mrs. Langley made her charges last summer, he threatened to file a cross-petition and to sue Mr. W. C. De Witt, a Brooklyn lawyer, and a former intimate friend of his, for $250,000 damages for alienating Mrs. Langley's affections from him. But he did not do it, and was silent under the indignant denials of Mrs. Langley and of all her friends. He maintained his determination to fight the divorce to the end. Hence the beginning of the sensational most distressing family scandals, full of painful details.

The bitterness between the two parties to this suit has extended to the attorneys, Mr. Chauncey S. Truax, for the defendant, being especially agitated, as he seems to think that too much of the bitterness has been directed against him. The court room yesterday was filled with loungers for the most part. But there were a few friends of both parties. It must have been one of the overzealous friends of Mrs. Langley who, after the adjournment in the afternoon, hissed an insulting epithet at Lawyer Truax.

Mr. Truax became much excited and called out: "Which loafer was it said that?" He began an anxious examination of the crowd, but could not satisfactorily locate the person. "I will not stand these insults," said he, glaring at the Langleys, who were passing his desk.

"No, indeed," said his assistant, Lawyer Parsons. "We must be protected from insults from the other side. There has been too much of that sort of thing."

Mrs. Langley and her friends went on and said nothing. She looked much worn by the day's excitement and humiliation. For it could not but have been a humiliation to her to hear the testimony to disgraceful actions. She is a tall, slender woman with a good figure, which was well clad in a fashionable black gown. She is of the brunette type, and has fine dark eyes, and a mouth that is exceedingly beautiful. Her face expresses intelligence and refinement. Sometimes she had color in her cheeks, and then her face was beautiful. Again she was very pale, and had to use her smelling salts. But she kept perfectly calm, and made no ostentation of any kind.

Next to her sat her sister, Miss Alice Shepard, who has Titian red hair and a fine high color, and features that are quite regular. She is quite as pretty as her sister, and was dressed in fashionable garments, also black, according to the custom of women attending such functions as funerals, divorce suits, and murder trials. Both she and her sister seemed to be under 25, although Mrs. Langley must be pretty near 30 on one side or the other.

Next to Miss Shepard sat one of the chief witnesses for the plaintiff, an ex-chambermaid in the United States Hotel, where Mr. Langley's infidelities are said to have taken place. The chambermaid was a most respectable-looking woman of 45 or thereabouts, and might well have been mistaken for a chaperone. In front of these three women sat the venerable ex-Judge George G. Reynolds, the chief counsel for Mrs. Langley. At the next table in front of the bench sat the counsel for the defence, Mr. Parsons, Mr. Garnor, and Mr. Truax. Mr. Langley did not appear, but his photograph and his rather notable personality were in evidence. He was described as a person of about 45 years, exceeding fat, and exceeding red in the face.

The witnesses for both sides, the employees of the United States Hotel, were numerous, and for the most part, not at all attractive to look at. They were the proprietor, Mr. Herdling, his clerks, and his bell boys. The names of the co-respondents did not come out, nor are they known to the defendant. The nearest approach to a disclosure of identity was when the detective testified to having seen one woman whom he had seen at the hotel with Mr. Langley. He said she was a tall, slender woman, with very narrow shoulders, and that two weeks ago he was pretty certain that he saw her go into the big apartment house at 234 Fifth avenue, the Harper.

In trying to get a jury the lawyers for Mr. Langley were very anxious to find out whether each man of the panel knew Mr. De Witt. But, although Mr. De Witt has been Corporation Counsel of Brooklyn, none of them had ever heard of him, and few of them had heard of Mr. and Mrs. Langley or of their troubles. As they are an intelligent-looking set of men, these admissions excited a good deal of wonder.

Mr. Reynolds, opening his case to the jury, explained to them that they were simply to try the issue of fact as to whether William Langley had or had not been guilty of adultery upon all or either of the dates alleged—Oct. 21, 1891, Dec. 13, 1891, Jan. 28, 1892, March 29, 1892, Aug. 8, 1892. They would decide as to his guilt, and the Judge would make his decision accordingly.

He then outlined what the detective would testify as to the happenings in the United States Hotel, where, he asserted, Mr. Langley's handwriting appeared upon the register on each of the dates alleged, but his name did not appear. His hand made the signature, "W. Lawlor and lady, Newark." He said experts in handwriting would prove that the handwriting was the writing of Mr. Langley. He said that Mr. Langley always signed the same assumed name, but did not attempt to disguise his handwriting.

Mrs. Langley's first witness was Charles Doescher of 83 Carleton avenue, a detective and ex-gate keeper at several race tracks. Mr. Doescher received, he said, $6 a day and his expenses for shadowing Mr. Langley. He was a lanky man with a long, thin neck and a wrinkled face. He made a good witness, in that he clung closely to his story, but he talked like a man just aroused from a stupor or just about to fall into a trance.

He had been hired by Mrs. Langley first to get knowledge of the movements of her husband, whose fidelity she suspected, and afterward he found out that what he learned was to be used in a divorce suit. He described the United States Hotel, which is at Fulton and Pearl, and has also an entrance on Water street. It is kept by a German named Herdling, and is the residence of a number of families. There is an elevated station in the hotel not far from the office. A hall leads eastward from the office, and in this corridor are several parlors and several bedrooms.

"On Oct. 21, 1891," said Doescher, "I was on the watch for Mr. Langley in New York. I saw him coming up Thomas street toward Broadway about 2 o'clock in the afternoon. A man was with him. They walked down Broadway to Murray street, where they separated. Then Mr. Langley walked to Fulton street and then to the ferry. At the United States Hotel, Fulton and Pearl streets, he stopped and looked up and down the street; then he went round to the Pearl street entrance and walked up the hall. I followed him. He waited for a little time in the hallway at the top of the stairs. I got in a corner where I could get a good view of his movements.

"He went down stairs toward the Pearl street entrance, then came back to the hotel office. He had a roll of bills in his hand. He stepped up to the desk and wrote on the register. He gave the clerk a bill and got a key in return. The price paid for the room was $2.50. He then went to rooms 5, 6, and 7. I followed him along the hallway as far as I dared without attracting attention. I did not actually see him go into the rooms. But I am sure he did. I returned to the hallway and waited.

"Three-quarters of an hour later I saw a woman come from room No. 6. She was about

LAWYER PARSONS.

125 pounds in weight, 5 feet 3 inches in height, and was dressed in a stylish costume and a "three-quarters" coat. I followed her and saw her go out of the Pearl street exit. On my return toward the rooms I met Mr. Langley coming out of the hallway from the direction of the rooms named. I heard a bell boy give an order to a clerk."

Doescher went back in a few days and tore the leaf out of the register. On it was this name, among the others: "W. Lawlor and lady, Newark." They were assigned to room 6. Doescher said he was fairly certain he saw the same woman go into 234 Fifth avenue two weeks before. Mr. Parsons, for the defence, wrestled with Doescher for several hours, but failed to accomplish anything. Doescher said Mr. Edwin Hoot, the lawyer, had told him to watch for Mr. Langley. Mr. Parsons wanted to know why he had stolen the leaf out of the register.

"Wasn't it safe in the possession of Mr. Herdling?"

"Well," said the witness, with a look of great cunning, "he might destroy it. And where would I be then? No, sir, I wanted to have something to back me up."

Then came a hall boy, Arthur Wells, an English youth of twenty-five, dirty, and speaking an Americanized cockney, the product of a two years' residence in this country. "On Oct. 21, 1891," said he, "Mr. Vail, the clerk, sent me to room 6 to answer a call. I looked in the register, as I always do before going to a room, and I saw 'W. Lawlor and lady.' I went to the room, and a man whom I have since found out was Mr. Langley gave me an order. I think it was for oysters, a stew or a fry. I can't remember which. He opened the door only a little way and I did not see anybody else in there."

"Did you hear anything?"

"I heard a voice inside. It sounded like the voice of a female."

"Did Mr. Langley say anything?"

"He said to her—to the voice—to the female, if she would have anything—a drink or the like. The female said 'No, thank you.' I went away and gave the order to the clerk."

"When did you see this man again?"

"On Dec. 16, 1891. The clerk sent me to room 6, and on the register I saw 'W. Lawlor and lady, Newark,' again. I went to the door and he ordered a pint of champagne. When I came with it I knocked, and went in to put it on the table. Mr. Lawlor or Langley was there. There was a female standing by the wash stand. She was tall and slim and had narrow shoulders. Her back was to me. I could not see her face. I went out and closed the door after me. They were in there about an hour or an hour and a half. Mr. Langley went out first. She came soon after."

On March 29, 1892, W. Lawlor and lady were again on the register, he said, and again on Aug. 8, 1892. The latter time he saw Mr. Langley register and take the key, and go toward the stairway. "The female," said Wells, "came shortly after. She came from the ladies' parlor. I could not say whether she was the same or not. When they came out, he went down to the bar, and she went toward the ticket office of the elevated station."

Judge Reynolds tried to anticipate the bombshell the defence had ready, but was unable to do so. Lawyer Parsons took Wells in hand, and, after drawing from him that he had been a bar boy in the tough quarters of London, laid two affidavits before him. Wells looked embarrassed and said he recognized both as documents signed by him. Lawyer Parsons read one of them, which set forth the matters in the above testimony. Then he read the other. It set forth that the affiant, Wells, could not remember the appearance of Lawlor; that he did not detect any resemblance between Langley's picture and his memory of Lawlor; that, being faced with Langley, he was certain that Langley and Lawlor were not the same persons. In explanation of this Wells said:

"Mr. Herdling told me to sign that affidavit. I was in his employ, and when he told me I did it. He said for me to come with him to Mr. Truax's office. He said I would see Mr. Langley there and that I would not recognize him. He said there might be several hundreds in it for me, and that if I went away during the trial I would be taken care of. I told him Marguerite, the chambermaid, had seen Mr. Langley. He asked me where she lived. I told him I could find out. He said: 'We shall see about that afterward.'

"In the lawyer's office were Mr. Truax, Mr. Herdling, Mr. Langley, and Mr. Crandall, and the stenographer. When I made the affidavit the stenographer went with me into another room, looking for a notary. The one they wanted wasn't there, but another man spoke up and said, 'I'm a notary, I can do it.' So the stenographer told him, 'This young man has made this affidavit,' and the notary signed it without saying anything."

"Didn't you swear to it?" asked Mr. Parsons.

"No, I did not," said Wells. "They never asked me to. But I thought it was the same thing."

"Do you know what perjury is?" asked Mr. Parsons.

"I didn't think such gentlemen as Mr. Truax and Mr. Herdling would let a man like me commit perjury," said Wells with just a trace of a smile. Then he went on: "After I made the affidavit, Mr. Herdling says: 'We must see Marguerite before they get her.'"

Marguerite, the chambermaid, was the next witness. She arose from her place with Mrs. Langley and Miss Shepard and went to the witness stand. A short, stout woman, with a very dark, honest face, around which was a great black veil descending from a crêpe bonnet. Her full name was Marguerite O'Grady, and until December, 1892, she had worked as chambermaid on the first and second floors of the United States Hotel. Now she is a domestic in the young ladies' boarding school of the Misses Ely at Seventy-fifth street and the Riverside Drive. Said she:

"In August, 1892, I cannot remember the day or the date, I was on the second floor of the hotel one afternoon when I saw a man and a woman come down the hall and go into room 25. I noticed them particularly, because he was so large and she was so small. He was such a large gentleman to what she was a lady, largely built I mean. He was stout and red-faced and tall, about as red-faced as Mr. Herdling there, but not quite. She was a lady built like me, about my size."

Judge Reynolds gave her Mr. Langley's photograph and asked if he was the man.

"I could not swear to it. He looked like that, but I am not positive."

"Well, have you seen the man since?"

"Yes," said Mrs. O'Grady. "I saw him on Fulton street during the noon recess. He was walking along on the other side of the street. I was with Mrs. Langley and her sister and her brother and her father. I said: 'There is the man I saw at the hotel. There is Mr. Langley.' And Mrs. Langley and her sister looked and they said: 'Yes, that is Mr. Langley.'"

Marguerite was positive about this identification. "His photograph," said she, "doesn't look so much like him as he does personally." Judge Reynolds tried to get in her testimony that $500 was offered to her as an inducement to go away and stay until the trial was over, but he failed to do it, except by intimation. The young man who had offered her the money had been in court, she said, but had gone out while she was on the stand. Judge Reynolds charges that many of Mrs. Langley's witnesses have been sent out of the way by the inducements of the other side, but he has several left who will corroborate those who were on the stand yesterday. The other side has Mr. Herdling as one of its witnesses. According to Wells, Mr. Herdling said he had known Mr. Langley for twelve years. Besides Mr. Herdling, there will be Mr. Langley himself, in all probability.

W. B. HAYES'S TRIAL FOR PERJURY.

His Wife's Maid Testifies to Miss Keating's Confession of Theft.

The trial of William B. Hayes, charged with perjury, in swearing that he did not give a note for $2,000 to Miss Anna M. Keating, the mother of his three children, upon which she recovered judgment, was continued yesterday in the General Sessions, before Judge Martine. Mrs. Hayes, whose loyalty has been the remarkable feature of the trial, greeted her husband warmly when he was brought from the Tombs to the court room.

Lawyer Howe called as the first witness of the defence for the day Arthur M. Harris, aged 19, a clerk and law student in Hayes's office. Harris said that he was frequently invited to Hayes's home at 136 West 127th street to dine. Last summer he met Miss Keating there. She had her son Willie with her, and they were treated as members of the family by Hayes and Mrs. Hayes. On July 2 Miss Keating went to Hayes's office at 19 Broadway and said that she had received that morning, at the Twelfth Ward Bank, a certificate of deposit for $2,800, which she then had with her. This money, she said, had been deposited by Mrs. Hayes for the benefit of Miss Keating's son Willie, and, in consideration, Miss Keating was prepared to sign an agreement giving the boy Willie for adoption to Hayes, at least temporarily. Later she said she had lost the certificate.

Betty Smith, Mrs. Hayes's young colored maid, testified that Miss Keating came to Hayes's flat, at 136 West 127th street, about June 1 last. Her boy Willie, who was with her, was taken sick. Despite his illness Miss Keating paid several visits to Rochester. While she was away Mrs. Hayes nursed Willie as a mother would, and, she showed him more affection than his mother did. Early in July the witness heard Miss Keating say to Mrs. Hayes: "Now, Mrs. Hayes, that everything is settled up and I have my certificate of deposit, I will acknowledge the truth to you. I did break open your trunk, and I took the note and your diamond earrings and other things. Senator McNaughton has the diamond earrings. I am going to Rochester, and when I come back I will bring them with me. When I come back I want to stay here a few days, so that I can teach Willie to love you and call you mamma, because I have put the little fellow against you." Miss Keating went that evening to Rochester. The witness heard Miss Keating say that she was going to marry Senator McNaughton.

Charles N. Ellis, a gray-haired man, testified that he had known Hayes since about 1867, when he met him in Chicago. In December, 1890, he saw Miss Keating swear to an affidavit, declaring that Hayes had never given her a note and that he owed her nothing, before Notary Public Morris Coster of 19 Broadway. He went down to Surrogate Ransom's when Hayes went with Lois Fuller, the serpentine dancer, to back her financially in her endeavor to produce a play called "Caprice." Ellis said he was willing to do any service for Hayes because Hayes had been a good friend to him.

"Can you tell us anything, Mr. Ellis," asked Mr. Weeks, "as to the claim that stolen property was secreted in Mr. Hayes's safe when you were in his employ in Chicago in 1867-'68?"

Lawyer Howe objected, but Hayes said vigorously to Mr. Howe: "Withdraw your objection and let him answer."

Judge Martine, however, sustained the objection.

The trial was adjourned until to-day. It is expected that Hayes will testify to-day.

BORN TO WEALTH, A BEGGAR NOW.

A Son of the Richest Colored Woman in the Country Fined for Begging.

In the batch of prisoners brought to Jefferson Market Police Court for vagrancy yesterday was a tall, well-formed negro, whose intelligent face seemed somewhat out of place in those surroundings. When arraigned before the Justice he said that his name was Charles N. Gloster, that he was 32 years old, and lived at 144 West Twenty-sixth street. The policeman who had arrested him said: "He was drunk last night, and I saw him ask people for money. At the corner of Fifth avenue and Twenty-seventh street he came up to me—I was in citizen's clothes—and asked me for a few cents."

"Aren't you ashamed of yourself?" Justice Voorhis asked the man.

"Oh, I've recovered from that sensation long ago," was the flippant answer.

Lawyer Gitchon, who was in the court room at the time, said that he knew the prisoner. "His mother, Mrs. Dr. Gloster," said Mr. Gitchon, "died four years ago leaving an estate of nearly $500,000. She left five children. Her husband, who is a physician and a minister, is still alive and has married. There was some trouble over the division of the estate after Mrs. Gloster's death. This fellow was educated in a Western college, but when he came back to Brooklyn, where his mother lived, he was so shiftless and lazy that she disinherited him. He has gone from bad to worse. He speaks four languages, and for the past year has been begging in each one of them. I collected rents for his mother many years ago."

The prisoner listened with lowered head to this story, and when the Justice fined him $3 winked to the pen without saying a word.

Mrs. Gloster was one of the wealthiest colored women in the United States. She was very shrewd in real estate speculation. She owned the Remsen House on Remsen street, near Clinton, and also the site of the Hamilton Club. Her daughter keeps the Remsen House now.

TOOK TWO GRAVES TO HOLD HER BODY.

Mrs. Halpin's Was the Largest Coffin Ever Buried in Calvary Cemetery.

The largest coffin that ever entered Calvary Cemetery was taken there yesterday. It was of so unusual size that two graves had to be purchased to furnish a grave of sufficient width to hold it. The body was that of Mrs. Julia Halpin of 301 East Eleventh street. At the time of her death, which occurred on Saturday, Mrs. Halpin was 55 years old. She had lived in the neighborhood of First avenue and Eleventh street for over twenty years. About eight years ago she began to grow exceedingly stout, and although not confined to her bed, she seldom left her room. Her weight was estimated at 400 pounds.

In spite of this fleshiness Mrs. Halpin was otherwise physically healthy and cheerful. Most of her time she spent in sewing and knitting. Two weeks ago she was taken with pneumonia, which was the immediate cause of her death. Undertaker Joseph T. Hart says that hers was the largest body he ever handled. It was necessary to build a coffin to order. It measured 5 feet 9 inches in length, 35 inches in depth, and 36 inches in width. The doorway of the house in which the dead woman lay was too narrow to permit of the passage of the coffin and the sash of a double window on the ground floor was removed, and the body taken out that way. Eight men were needed to carry the body down from the third floor, and they were obliged to rest on every landing, so great was the exertion.

No hearse could be found large enough to transport the box. It was taken to the cemetery in the undertaker's wagon. Mrs. Halpin leaves three sons and two daughters, none of whom are of unusual physical dimensions.

Chang Tseng Chaou Pays His Respects.

Chang Tseng Chaou, the new Chinese Consul, accompanied by L. Wing of the Consulate, paid an official visit to Mayor Gilroy yesterday. The foreign officials were arrayed in their gay robes of office, and attracted the wonder and curiosity of the City Hall corridor loungers. The Consul is a man of unusual stature. He called on Superintendent Byrnes later.

HALSTED AGAINST HALSTED.

THE OLD DRY GOODS MERCHANT'S SON SUING FOR A DIVORCE.

He and His Wife Make Cross Charges of Misconduct, He Naming One Co-respondent and She Several—Clendenin Thompson Has No Objections to Make to a Divorce.

Charles Stockton Halsted has been directed by Chief Judge Daly of the Court of Common Pleas to pay Sarah B. Halsted a counsel fee of $250 in his action against her for an absolute divorce. She has also procured an order requiring him to show cause why he should not live up to articles of separation by which he agreed to give her $3,500 a year. The plaintiff is a son of the late James Mayer Halsted of the old firm of Halsted, Haines & Co., at one time wealthy dry goods merchants in this city. The son, who is the only member of his immediate family now living, resides at 780 Park avenue. Jacob Halsted, whose executors were sued last summer by Mrs. Florice von Ax, who claimed to be Halsted's widow, was an uncle of the plaintiff. Mrs. Halsted, the defendant, was a Miss Sarah Bokee of Brooklyn. Her parents, both invalids, reside there. Her grandfather was David Bokee, Navy Agent under President Fillmore.

The Halsteds were married in Brooklyn on Oct. 13, 1874. They separated last spring. They have three children, Catharine H., 16 years old; James Mayer, 14 years old, and Charles Stockton, 10 months old. Mr. Halsted makes Louis G. Johnson, a friend of himself and his wife, co-respondent, and says of Johnson:

> Under the guise of a friend the said Johnson has proved to be a viper in deponent's domestic affairs, actuated solely by selfish and criminal motives.

Halsted says that Johnson, who lives apart from his wife and two children, had undue relations with Mrs. Halsted at 153 Clinton street, Brooklyn, last September and in October at 780 Park avenue, this city.

Johnson and Mrs. Halsted both deny these accusations. Mrs. Halsted makes counter charges against her husband, declaring that at their former residence on Clinton street, between Nov. 2, 1891, and April 29, 1892, he was intimate with Ida Bokee, her cousin. She accuses him also of intimacy with his servant girls. At their out-of-town residence at Sheepshead Bay, she alleges, he was intimate with Matilda Olsen between June 15 and Oct. 20, 1891, and again at Belle Haven, Greenwich Village, Conn., between Sept. 4 and Oct. 16, 1892, and in this city, between Oct. 16 and Dec. 3, 1892, at 780 Park avenue. She accuses him of relations with a negress at Washington on Sept. 29, 1892. She says that her husband has been cruel to her and an habitual drunkard. He has, she declares, violent passions and an ungovernable temper and had driven her from their house.

On May 13 last they agreed to articles of separation, by which he promised to give $3,500 a year for her support. He was also to furnish her with as good a house as 153 Clinton street, Brooklyn, and four servants. He agreed, in addition, to pay for the maintenance, education, and travelling expenses of the children, all of whom were to remain in her custody. It was provided, however, that she could live where she liked and entertain whom she pleased. He covenanted not to enter any house where she might be living without her permission.

The trustee for her under the agreement is Louis C. Johnson. Halsted's trustees are his brother, James Mayer Halsted, and Henry C. Fitney. On default of any of his obligations under the agreement, his trustees and the United States Trust Company are to pay her $5,000 a year. Part of the estates of his father, James Mayer Halsted, his mother, and a brother are held under trust provisions by this company. Mrs. Halsted says her husband's income is $14,000 a year. He says that in 1892 it was exactly $9,701.05.

Halsted says that through his wife's extravagance he is $5,000 in debt, and that he has but $375 cash to meet the claims. He declares that he is being sued by a dry goods firm for $1,027.30, a bill contracted by his wife. He admits that he does not pay his wife anything for her own support since last October, when he began the present action, but he says that he has continued to make full provision for his children.

Alice White Sutherland, who is a daughter of Anna C. Sutherland, and who was married on Dec. 23, 1886, at the Church of St. Mary the Virgin, to Clendenin Thompson, has secured an absolute divorce from him in the Supreme Court from Justice Truax. She left him in January, 1890, and returned to the home of her mother. An attempt to effect a reconciliation was unsuccessful, and he subsequently went to South Dakota and sued her for an absolute divorce upon the ground of cruelty and desertion. He confessed his infidelity to some of her relatives, and this action was then brought by her father. He discontinued his suit in South Dakota. In a letter saying that he could get her sufficient evidence upon which she could secure her divorce, he addressed his wife as "Daisy," and says among other things:

> I have only one request to make, and that is that you make no scandal, not even for your own family sake, but for mine also, and that the case be tried before a referee of the superior Court, as I proposed yesterday. But your uncle will best know how to manage the matter so that it causes no scandal.

Justice Truax of the Supreme Court has granted Marie Finck a decree of absolute divorce from her husband, Joseph Finck, to whom she was married in March, 1888. The husband made no defence.

JULIA PHILLIPS INSANE.

She Was Supposed to Be Dead and a Body Sent Home Was Identified by Her Parents.

LOCKPORT, Jan. 23.—"They are following me." "Don't let them find me," and other expressions of fear were uttered by a woman with long, streaming Titian red hair and dark, sunken eyes as she crouched down in her room to-day, when the officers of the State Insane Asylum came to take her away. The woman is Julia Phillips, who was thought to have been killed in a railroad accident in Chicago in August last. Her remains were shipped home and identified by the family, even to a missing tooth and other peculiarities, and were interred here. The real Julia Phillips afterward turned up in a Chicago hospital, and the body interred here was identified as that of another girl. The notoriety this sensation gave the girl and the persistent hunt of the Chicago reporters and detectives for her preyed upon her mind, and when she returned last October to her home in this city she was on the verge of insanity. The looks of the neighbors and the various stories which reached her ears gradually made her grow taciturn and sullen, and tears were entertained by her family that she would do herself bodily harm. Her insanity seemed to increase, and it was finally decided to take her to the asylum in Buffalo for treatment.

Miss Phillips's case has few equals on record. Her father and mother positively identified the body as that of their daughter, and but for the appearance of the living Julia Phillips herself they would still think that the body lying out under the snow in Glenwood Cemetery was hers. The sad sequal is a woman made crazy by an untoward chain of circumstances over which she had no control. The handsome, dashing Julia Phillips of ten months ago is to-day the hollow-eyed mad creature in the State Insane Asylum. The doctors have hopes of curing her.

ARRESTED AS AN ANARCHIST.

Mr. Koehn's English Letters Were Regarded as Suspicious by French Officials.

M. F. Koehn, a watch manufacturer of Geneva, who arrived last Friday on the Aller, has a story to tell of the ignorance of French officials.

"I arrived in Paris from Geneva, Jan. 8, at 6:45 A. M.," he said. "My satchels were taken care of by the driver of a four-wheeler, and as I was about to step into the carriage some one took hold of my arm from behind and said: 'I arrest you.' The first thought that came to me was that my friend, H——, a Paris jeweller, had seen me, and was trying to play a joke, but on turning around I was much surprised to find myself in the clutches of two uniformed gendarmes. They would give me no explanation of their conduct, but marched me to the nearest police station, where I was photographed and searched. The place was filthy and ill smelling and gave me great nausea. I managed after a while to get one of them to go to my friend H——, with a message. The Prefect arrived just as my friend came in. The matter was soon explained, and after four hours of most disagreeable detention I was discharged.

"I asked the Prefect if he took me for a pretender to the throne of France, and he answered 'No,' but that the Government officers who had examined my belongings at the frontier had found among my papers certain mysterious documents which they could not read, and which they regarded as anarchistic, so a telegram was forwarded for my arrest. The fact was that the manuscripts were letters of credit and other valuable papers written in English to American firms.

"The Paris officials were profuse in their apologies, but I think the French Government should establish a kindergarten for its employees."

The President Refuses to Pardon Bank Wrecker Harper.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 23.—The President has refused to pardon Edward L. Harper, the bank wrecker, ex-President of the Fidelity National Bank of Cincinnati and convict in the Ohio penitentiary.

SENATOR HILL FOR PLAINTIFF.

His First Appearance in the Tweed Court House Since He Was Elected Governor.

Senator David B. Hill put on the legal gloves before Justice Ingraham of the Supreme Court yesterday in behalf of the Columbus, Hocking Valley and Toledo Railway Company, which is seeking to make Winslow, Lanier & Co. responsible for $8,000 bonds of the road alleged to have been converted by Stevenson Burke and his associates.

Senator Hill was forced to hold quite a levée before the case got under way by counsel who pressed about him for a hand shake, and the court room was crowded all day, although the case is dry enough.

"This is my first appearance in this court house," Senator Hill said to the reporter, "since my duties as Governor took me away from the practice of law. But it is not the first time I have appeared in court since then. You know I had two cases in the Court of Appeals."

Senator Hill was in a conventional black suit, and wore a black tie. In opening the case he told the old story of the suit. It involved the same bonds which Congressman Belden sought to recover for himself and the other bondholders from Burke and his associates. Belden lost his case by a decision, also, of Justice Ingraham, but that case is pending on appeal.

"If Winslow, Lanier & Co. will admit they sold these bonds," said Elihu Root, who, with Police Commissioner Charles F. McLean, assisted Senator Hill, "we can drop much of the documentary evidence."

"We didn't sell them," said Joseph H. Choate, who, with Benjamin F. Bristow, Hugh Cole, and George W. Wilcox, represented the defendants.

"Didn't what?" broke out Senator Hill.

"Our answer speaks for itself," said Mr. Choate.

"Did you make a remark?" Mr. Choate said soon after, while Senator Hill was buried in the documents. The Senator remained buried and did not reply, and Mr. Choate said: "Ah, I thought you did."

The documentary testimony was presented by Mr. McLean, naming page and folio. When one page was offered, which was not read, Mr. Choate objected, saying:

"That might do at Police Headquarters, but it won't do here."

Mr. Choate objected to some of the evidence offered, and Senator Hill said later:

"All that we offer now is evidence that they sold our bonds. There seems to be a question about it on the other side. They admit it in their answer, but not outright."

The Judge ruled with him. The case being over for the day, Justice Ingraham shook hands with Senator Hill, and they joked together for a time.

SHE HAD A CRUEL DRIVER FINED.

Miss Grace Crossman is an Active Member of the S. P. C. A.

Miss Grace Crossman, a young and pretty member of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, was instrumental in having Car Driver Edward Coffey of the Fourth avenue street railway fined $10 in the Court of Special Sessions yesterday for ill treating his horses. Miss Crossman is the daughter of Mr. W. H. Crossman of 29 East Sixty-fifth street. The offence complained of was committed on Jan. 8. She was present in court yesterday, and in describing the occurrence Miss Crossman said:

"A party of friends and myself were returning from my father's country house at Great Neck on Jan. 8, and we boarded an up-town car. I sat next the front window, where I could see the driver and the horses. I noticed that we went at a furious pace through the tunnel, and in rounding the curves at Forty-second and Forty-fourth streets we were going so fast that the passengers who had not seats were almost thrown down. Then I saw that the driver was sawing dreadfully on the reins, and was not using the brake in stopping the car. Instead he would pull the reins until the car crowded upon the poor horses' heels. It made me so nervous that I spoke to Mr. Carnrike, who was with us, about it. He spoke to the driver, but the latter became very abusive, and began to beat his horses. So when we came to Sixty-fourth street we had a policeman arrest the man. The complaint was brought in my name because I am a member of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.

"I joined the society over a year ago. One day I was riding in a Fifth avenue stage and we ran over a dog. It was a dreadful sight. The poor thing's back was broken, and he dragged himself to the curb and looked in every one's face. I hurried from Fifth avenue and Twenty-second street to the society's house and had an ambulance sent to remove the poor dog. The next day I went down to the society's rooms again to see what had become of the dog, and Mr. Hinches thanked me and showed me all through the place. I was so pleased with everything that I joined the society. This is the first time I ever had any one arrested, and I had no idea it was so much trouble. First I had to go to Yorkville Police Court and then to the Tombs. There the driver has been discharged by the company, so he can't ill treat any more horses on the Fourth avenue road."

STORY OF AN ITALIAN MURDER.

The Fish Peddler Saw It and This is the Way He Tells It.

This is the story of the murder of Francisco Mele, told in the General Sessions yesterday, by Alfonso Masucci, fish peddler, on the trial of Antonio Morello for the murder:

"I saw Constanza Morello, Antonio's wife, walking past the saloon at 71½ Mulberry street. Then I saw her turn and speak to Mele sharply. Next I saw her slap Mele's face and knock his hat off. Mele said, 'Go away, go away.' Then he stooped to pick up his hat and Mrs. Morello walked away.

"A few minutes later she returned with her husband. She put her hand on Mele's shoulder and said to her husband, 'This is the man.'

"Morello fired three shots at Mele, and Mele threw up his hand, exclaiming, 'Don't kill me! don't kill me! I have done nothing!'

"Morello exclaimed, 'You are not dead yet, by the blood of the Virgin!' and fired two more shots at Mele, who writhed around and fell upon the sidewalk, dead."

The trial was adjourned until to-day.

MARINE INTELLIGENCE.

MINIATURE ALMANAC—THIS DAY.

Sun rises .... 7 16 | Sun sets .... 4 59 | Moon sets, mor.

HIGH WATER—THIS DAY.

Sandy Hook 12 04 | Gov. Island 12 30 | Hell Gate.. 2 49

Arrived—MONDAY, Jan. 23.

Ss Rovic, Thompson, Liverpool.
Ss Athos, Low, Port Limon.
Ss Johannes Brun, Wesenberg, Nassau.
Ss Kaiser Wilhelm II., Stormer, Gibraltar.
Ss Portia, Ash, Halifax.
Ss Burnley, Cary, Port Spain.
Ss Nannoch, Stevens, Bermuda.
Ss Holstein, Voge, Havana.
Ss Yucatan, Allen, Havana.
Ss El Callao, Saunders, Trinidad.
Ss Roanoke, Skinner, Philadelphia.
Ss Tallahassee, Askins, Savannah.
Bark Sardinian, Anderson, Demerara.
Bark Uterpe, Hallmeier, Demerara.

(For later arrivals see First Page.)

ARRIVED OUT.

Ss H. H. Meier, from New York, at Southampton.
Ss Steinhoft, from New York, at Baltimore.
Ss Chattahoochee, from New York, at Savannah.
Ss El Monte, from New York, at Port Eads.

SAILED FROM FOREIGN PORTS.

Ss Fuerst Bismarck, from Southampton for New York.
Ss Bohemia, from Havre for New York.
Ss Suevia, from Hamburg for New York.

SAILED FROM DOMESTIC PORTS.

Ss El Sol, from Port Eads for New York.
Ss Kansas City, from Savannah for New York.
Ss H. M. Whitney, from Boston for New York.

OUTGOING STEAMSHIPS.

	Mails Close.	Vessels Sail.
Sail To-day.		
Dresden, Bremen	6:00 A. M.	9:00 A. M.
El Paso, New Orleans	.....	3:00 P. M.
Sail To-morrow.		
Majestic, Liverpool	8:30 A. M.	11:30 A. M.
Friesland, Antwerp	9:30 A. M.	12:30 P. M.
Saratoga, Havana	1:00 P. M.	3:00 P. M.
Philadelphia, Laguayra	11:00 A. M.	1:00 P. M.
City of Augusta, Savannah	.....	3:00 P. M.
Roanoke, Charleston	.....	3:00 P. M.
Lampasas, Galveston	.....	3:00 P. M.

INCOMING STEAMSHIPS.

Due To-day.		
India	Gibraltar	Jan. 4
Montezuma	London	Jan. 12
Westernland	Marseilles	Jan. 4
America	London	Jan. 11
Russia	Hamburg	Jan. 24
Alene	Kingston	Jan. 18
Due Wednesday, Jan. 25.		
Waesland	Antwerp	Jan. 14
City of Washington	Havana	Jan. 21
Argyll	Gibraltar	Jan. 9
Due Thursday, Jan. 26.		
Siberian	Glasgow	Jan. 15
Chateau Lafitte	Bordeaux	Jan. 21
Manhattan	London	Jan. 12
Due Friday, Jan. 27.		
Britannic	Liverpool	Jan. 18
Massdam	Rotterdam	Jan. 14
Due Saturday, Jan. 28.		
Fuer