MISS POLLARD'S WRITING.

A DOCTOR AND A LAWYER GIVE EXPERT TESTIMONY ABOUT IT.

Col. Breckinridge's Attorneys Try to Show that Miss Pollard Did Write the Letter of July, 1884, Which She Says Is a Forgery—Major Moore's Memory and Notes—Judge Bradley Reverses Himself.

WASHINGTON, March 27.—Of the three witnesses examined in the Breckinridge-Pollard case to-day, two were placed on the stand as experts in handwriting to prove for the defence that Miss Pollard had written to Col. Breckinridge asking him to call on her at Wesleyan College in Cincinnati, and that their intimacy was a natural result of such an invitation. Miss Pollard testified on the stand that she had written Col. Breckinridge in July, 1884, asking his advice about the threat of James C. Rodes that he could compel her to marry him unless she paid back the money he had lent her to get an education.

She denied that she had written a second letter urging Col. Breckinridge to call on her, and when a black-bordered note, dated July 20, 1884, was placed in her hands she denounced it as a forgery.

"The work of an expert is here," said Miss Pollard at the time. "And no man knows who wrote it better than that man," looking fixedly at Col. Breckinridge.

In this letter Miss Pollard is made to say that Col. Breckinridge has such a nice face and to invite him to call on her at the college. She had met him only once before the date of the letter, and that was in the preceding spring, when they had a short conversation on a train. The experts' testimony given to-day also hinged to some extent on the writing on a Christmas card, which Miss Pollard claims she left in a volume of Washington Irving's works at St. Joseph's Foundling Asylum near Cincinnati while she was there in 1885.

Last December Miss Pollard went to the asylum with attorneys to secure evidence to be used in the trial. She said she had given the asylum, while there, a set of Irving's works, and going to the library she identified the set. Then, according to the testimony of Sister Agnes, Miss Pollard took one of the books in her hands and cried out:

"Oh, here's the Christmas card I left in the book when I was here."

This Christmas card has written on it "Compliments of W. S. D." and the defence is trying to prove that Miss Pollard slipped it in the volume of Irving to more closely identify herself with the asylum, and also to prove that the words on it were written within a year and not prior to the entrance of Miss Pollard to the asylum in 1885.

Major William G. Moore, Chief of the Washington Police, who had given strong testimony in Miss Pollard's favor, was called to-day by the defence. He was the first witness. The questions asked him by the defendant's attorneys were directed to shew that Miss Pollard had told more in her testimony than was really said at interviews between Major Moore, Miss Pollard, and Col. Breckinridge, during which Col. Breckinridge promised to marry the plaintiff. In answer to Major Shelby, Major Moore said that at neither of the interviews did Col. Breckinridge refer to the scene created by Miss Pollard "as one of life's tragedies," as Miss Pollard had said. Major Moore also denied other remarks that Miss Pollard testified were made. Col. Breckinridge did not say, said the witness, that "This young woman has borne me two children and is about to bear a third," nor did he say anything about Miss Pollard having given herself to him, to which she replied, "Yes, I gave myself to him," nor did he at either of these interviews say that Miss Pollard knew he was a married man, but that she had been everything to him.

Then Judge Wilson took Col. Moore in hand. Judge Wilson has the reputation of being one of the best, if not the best, criminal lawyers in Washington and one of the finest cross-examiners in the country. Heretofore Mr. Carlisle has conducted the cross-examination for the plaintiff. Under the fire of Judge Wilson's questions the contradiction of Miss Pollard's testimony by Major Moore was materially weakened. Major Moore had read his accounts of the two interviews, when on the stand in behalf of Miss Pollard, from shorthand notes which he had made immediately afterward, and one of the first questions asked by Judge Wilson was whether the witness had any recollection of what the plaintiff and the defendant did say, aside from what was in the notes.

"No, sir, I believe not," was the answer.

"Ah," said Judge Wilson, rubbing his hands.

Then Judge Wilson warmed to his work, and succeeded in getting Major Moore to say that the conversation recorded in the notes did not consume more than half a minute, while the interview lasted twenty or thirty minutes; that he had made a memorandum of salient points only, putting down merely what impressed him as important; and that after the lapse of nearly a year he would not undertake to repeat what was said. The first interview was on May 13, 1884, said Major Moore, and was very stormy. Miss Pollard was terribly excited, while Col. Breckinridge was cool. The second interview was on May 17, and was not as lively as the first. It lasted about an hour, and, he thought, Miss Pollard did most of the talking. Major Moore said he made notes of this interview immediately after the plaintiff and the defendant had left.

"There may have been things said," Major Moore testified, "of which I made no note and which have passed out of my mind."

When Judge Wilson asked the witness if Miss Pollard's manner indicated satisfaction when Col. Breckinridge said he would marry her on May 31, the defence objected, but the question was allowed, and Major Moore answered:

"Her manner indicated satisfaction and gratification."

After several objections to questions had been made and sustained, the defence called Dr. E. M. Schaefer, who assists the Coroner of the District and who was called deputy Coroner until the Ford's Theatre disaster, when he was prevented from continuing the inquest by Col. Ainsworth, who secured a decision from the District Supreme Court that there was no such office. Dr. Schaefer said he called himself expert in handwriting, and gave an account of his experience in determining forgeries and alterations and in running down anonymous letter writers. Judge Wilson objected to Major Butterworth's reference to the witness as an expert.

"I don't consider him an expert at all," said Judge Wilson, and when he had concluded the cross-examination of Dr. Schaefer he made the same remark with positiveness.

For a long time the witness was questioned as to his knowledge of handwriting, and particularly as to how he had time while at the Army Medical Museum to study blood, lungs, livers, writings, and all sorts of documents. For a half of the morning session Dr. Schaefer was made to tell how he compared handwritings, how he detected similarity, and how he discovered dissimilarity, and how circumstances and character should be also considered, as for example:

"I would not expect a profane letter from a minister, nor a pious one from a policy man."

At the end of this examination Judge Wilson objected to allowing Dr. Schaefer to give testimony as an expert, but Judge Bradley decided to let the witness go ahead.

Dr. Schaefer examined carefully the alleged forged letter dated July 20, 1884, which Major Butterworth handed him, and then said he had examined it yesterday in the District Attorney's room in the Court House. Dr. Schaefer also identified a letter marked "W. C. P. R. No. 1," as having been examined by him. Then the bundle of blind notes, written by Miss Pollard to James C. Rodes when she claims to have been in Cincinnati and Rodes thought she was travelling in the far South, was handed to Dr. Schaefer, and these, too, he said he had examined.

"Now," said Major Butterworth, "after your comparison what is your opinion as to whether the letter marked 'W. C. P. R. No. 1,' and dated 'Wesleyan College' was written by the same person that wrote the others?"

"Yes, sir," said the witness. "It was written by the same person."

"Now look at this Christmas card," said Major Butterworth, "and say whether you have examined the words written on it, 'Compliments of W. S. D.,' as to determining how long ago these words were written?"

"I have."

"How long a time do you think has elapsed since it was written? Five years?"

"I should think not more than three or four" was the reply.

"On what do you base your opinion?"

"On the freshness of the ink. If it had been left on a table exposed to the air it would seem to be much more recent writing. If it had been kept in a place not exposed, it was probably written not more than three or four years ago. While the writing may have been done three or four years ago at the furthest, it might have been written within three or four months."

All this testimony was corroborative of the claim of the defence that the card had been prepared since the suit was filed, and placed in the volume of Irving by Miss Pollard when she visited St. Joseph's Foundling Asylum last December.

Dr. Schaefer was coy when Judge Wilson took him for cross-examination. The lawyer asked particularly about the charge made by the witness for giving expert testimony, and after repeated evasions by Dr. Schaefer, objections by the defence, and insistance by Judge Wilson, the witness was made to answer by Judge Bradley. It was clear that Judge Wilson wanted to show that a high price might cause the witness to be prejudiced in favor of a certain side. Dr. Schaefer said he had received as much as $75 and as little as $5, and, in answer to other questions, said that he made the examination of some of the papers at his house on Sunday and the others at the Court House yesterday. Desha Breckinridge had brought them to his house. Dr. Schaefer said he did not submit the ink on the card to any but an ocular test. He had used a magnifying glass, but no acids.

"If the ink was not manufactured by some chemist for the purpose of deception, I am perfectly sure it has not been on that card more than three or four years," said the witness in answer to a question by Judge Wilson.

To another question he said: "I am more positive that this letter (the alleged forgery) was written by Madeline Pollard than I am as to the exact accuracy of the date of the writing on the Christmas card."

Judge Wilson left his seat and walked up to the witness box, and, standing there with his eyes turned heavenward, the astute old lawyer managed to make the expert say some things that were not favorable to the claim of the defence that Miss Pollard wrote the letter dated July 20, 1884. Dr. Schaefer admitted that if he were employed to find similarities in letters he supposed he would be influenced by a desire to prove what was wanted by those who employed him, and he would regret being obliged to give an adverse opinion. He admitted that he had not noticed that the letter "C," in "College" (Wesleyan College), in the alleged forgery and the "C" in other letters acknowledged to have been written by Miss Pollard were dissimilar. The "w's" were also dissimilar, but Dr. Schaefer defended his opinion in the statement that he had based it on the general character of the writing. He admitted that a "p" in the letter said to be forged and another "p" in another letter were so very different that he would not have supposed that the same person had written them. That the figures "20, 1884," in the alleged forgery were very different from Miss Pollard's figures was also admitted.

"Can you tell whether these two characters, representing the same letter, and yet so entirely different," said Judge Wilson, leaning over the witness box and poining out two "ts" in separate notes, "were written by the same person?"

"I might," said Dr. Schaefer.

"But can you tell?"

"I might."

"You don't know," said Judge Wilson, in a tone that implied that the witness knew absolutely nothing about the study of handwriting.

"And now," said Judge Wilson, in concluding this line of inquiry, "if you were obliged to base your judgment on these letters alone, what would be your answer?"

"I would doubt gravely," was the answer, "whether the papers were written by the same person."

After recess Judge Wilson succeeded in getting Dr. Schaefer to say that experts were frequently deceived through good imitations of handwriting. The witness also admitted that in feigned handwritings it frequently happened that the forger allowed the characteristics of his own handwriting to be made prominent. The word "July" in the alleged forgery he acknowledged to be above the average in handwriting, and also that the figures "20, 1884," appeared to have been written by a crude hand.

Miss Pollard was a schoolgirl at the date of the disputed note, it was obvious what Judge Wilson was trying to show. Here was the "July" written in an easy hand, while the figures following were crude in their construction. Forgers sometimes forget to follow the characteristics of the person whose writing they are imitating. In plain language, Judge Wilson was endeavoring to prove by the defendant's witness that the word "July" was written by a skilled penman in his own handwriting in a moment of forgetfulness and that the figures were written in close imitation of Miss Pollard's chirography.

In answer to Judge Wilson, Dr. Schaefer admitted that the word "July" in the disputed letter differed considerably from the characteristics of Miss Pollard's handwriting as shown in other letters. Dr. Schaefer could not explain why he overlooked what Judge Wilson called "so glaring a dissimilarity." This concluded the examination of the witness.

Edwin Forrest Bradley, Washington lawyer, was the next witness. He said he was an expert in handwriting. He disclaimed in pantomime the honor of being called "Major" by Major Butterworth, and this led Judge Bradley to remark:

"He's not from Kentucky."

"Then he's not armed," responded Major Butterworth.

This was a sly dig at Judge Bradley, who had said on the day following the face-slapping episode outside the court room, that he had been informed that "gentlemen connected with the defense had come into court armed."

"Oh, don't make him swear to that," said Col. Phil Thompson, with the rememorance fresh in his mind of how he had informed the Court that he "didn't carry a gun" into the court room.

Of course there was a laugh at this exchange, and there was more amusement when Judge Wilson called Mr. Hay "Colonel."

Mr. Hay's qualifications as an expert were carefully inquired into, and he was allowed to give testimony as to the alleged forged note, which he said he had compared with the "Wessie Brown" letter, written by Miss Pollard in 1885, and in his opinion they were written by the same person. He could find nothing, he said, to make him believe that the writing in the disputed letter was merely an imitation of the writing of the letters which Miss Pollard acknowledged as her own.

An argument over expert testimony in a dog fight was started when Judge Wilson began to cross-examine Mr. Hay. Judge Wilson was told by the witness that in the case where a woman named Oliver sued the late Senator Simon Cameron for seduction and breach of promise, Mr. Hay and the other experts had differed materially in their conclusions.

"Of course," interpolated Major Butterworth, "when two men see a dog fight they differ considerably in giving testimony about it. I object to the question about the Oliver case."

"Objection sustained," said Judge Bradley.

"Now, your Honor," said Judge Wilson, "the cases are not analogous. In a dog fight one witness is looking at the upper dog and the other witness at the under dog, and, of course, their testimony differs. I simply want to show that experts differ just like other witnesses."

"That is so," said Judge Bradley. "You may proceed, Judge Wilson. I withdraw my ruling."

Continuing his testimony, Mr. Hay differed in his opinion from Dr. Schaefer in reference to the word "July."

"Now, Mr. Hay, look at the word 'July' in this letter (the disputed note), and say whether the individual who wrote that didn't give himself away when he wrote 'July' by a little quicker use of the pen," asked Judge Wilson.

"No, sir," said Mr. Hay positively. "There is no difference in the making of the characters in July."

Mr. Hay said that a long letter could not be imitated without showing some dissimilarity in the handwriting. Imitators usually showed nervousness in forging a letter, he said, but he could not find any signs of nervousness in the disputed note. In answer to Judge Wilson, Mr. Hay said that Desha Breckinridge had brought him the letters he had examined, and he had studied them several hours. Young Breckinridge had said nothing about what the defence wanted to prove by these letters, but he suspected that it was desired that the alleged forged letter should be shown to be in Miss Pollard's handwriting.

"That letter was not forged," said Mr. Hay positively. "I mean by that that it was not written in an assumed handwriting, nor copied word for word from some other letter. It is impossible for a person to imitate the handwriting of a letter of this length without betraying himself through nervousness."

"In your opinion," added Judge Wilson.

"In my opinion," assented Mr. Hay, bowing.

This concluded Mr. Hay's testimony, and the court adjourned until to-morrow.

MRS. SCHNEIDEL'S LETTERS.

One Contained a Hypothetical Question and Figures in Her Divorce Case.

Mrs. Alberta Schneider was subjected to a long and trying cross-examination before Judge Van Wyck in the City Court in Brooklyn yesterday, after she had explained why she wanted a separation from Edwin Howard Schneider. Her story was that much of her married life of fourteen years had been embittered by the cruel treatment of her husband. She charged him with having knocked her down, put her out of the house in her night clothes, and with having accused her of trying to poison him. They had never lived harmoniously since she caught him flirting with the servant girl.

Mr. Schneider's lawyer produced a batch of torn, crumpled, and half-consumed letters, some of which were pasted together, and which he declared his wife had received from unknown admirers. One of the letters began, "Darling," and was signed "V."

Mrs. Schneider explained that they were simply insulting notes which a lawyer, whom she had once consulted but had not retained, had sent her. This letter, signed by Mrs. Schneider, the witness admitted was authentic:

"Can a husband get a divorce from his wife simply because he has letters suggesting infidelity, but which were never answered?"

The letters were received a year ago. Mrs. Schneider also admitted that she had partly written two other letters which her husband had torn from her before she had finished them. The letters were intended for a woman, although they appeared to be more suitable for a man.

Schneider denied all the allegations of ill-treatment and accused his wife of answering newspaper personals and flirting with strangers. Justice Van Dyck reserved his decision.

As an auctioneer, old Dr. Johnson offered for cash "wealth beyond the dreams of avarice," meaning a brewery. We do the same thing in books. Send 10c. for catalogue. United States Book Co., Publishers.—Adv.

There Is Quite a Match to Filbert's fur furniture. Stores, 14th st. near 6th av.—Adv.

CANADA AND THE TARIFF.

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE ANNOUNCES THE GOVERNMENT POLICY.

It Moves Fairly and Squarely on the Policy of Protection—The Schedule Submitted Shows a General but Not a Large Reduction—Looking Out for the Farmers.

OTTAWA, March 27.—In the Dominion House of Commons this afternoon the Hon. G. E. Foster, Minister of Finance, delivered the budget speech. The House was crowded and the keenest interest was manifested, as important tariff changes were expected.

The first part of the speech was a general review of trade conditions, from which the speaker passed on to the question of Canada's revenue and expenditure for the current and coming years, and finally detailed the proposed tariff changes. During his speech Minister Foster called attention to the figures of the last fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, most of which showed increased customs receipts, to prove, he said, the recuperative power of this country's business, inasmuch as most, if not all, other commercial countries had been experiencing a period of business stagnation or depression, while Canada, almost alone, showed last year a largely increased trade, both on exports and imports, and a tidy Treasury surplus of $1,250,000.

Coming to the current year, 1893-94, which will close June 30 next, the speaker said he could not promise as favorable a showing. He anticipated that the revenue for this year would be about $37,000,000, or $1,500,000 less than for last year. This was due, he thought, principally to two causes: first, the wise caution of the business men of the country in view of the expected tariff changes, and, second, the general dulness of the times. Nevertheless, as the Government had been acting, and would continue to act, with strict economy, the national expenditure was decreasing also, and three would be no deficit.

As to the general condition of the country, the trade of Canada had continued to increase during the current year, and the deposits in the savings banks had increased by over $2,000,000 since 1892. All this was the more gratifying, inasmuch as the time was almost at hand when the country's large expenditure on construction account would cease.

The work which had cost the most money lately, the Sault Ste. Marie Canal, was so near completion that probably in three months vessels would pass through, and Canada would have a waterway of her own from the heart of the continent to the ocean.

Mr. Foster then came to the tariff. He laid down the basis on which the Government considered that the tariff should be handled. He said the question with which the Government approached the matter was "how much money ought to be raised for the current expenses of the country," and and when this amount was settled the Government could consider how to raise that revenue by a tariff that would do most to protect the trade and encourage the development of the country.

After an elaborate defence of the theory of moderate protection, especially as required in self-defence by a young and undeveloped country like Canada, the Finance Minister attacked the Liberal leaders for their lack of definiteness and honesty in their views which, he asserted, were constantly changing. He defended the Canadian tariff as it had existed since 1878, quoting figures to show that the average customs rates on imported dutiable goods had never exceeded 28½ per cent., whereas in the United States it had been far higher. He said that even in the United States, where protective duties were far lower than in some European countries, the average customs rates on imported dutiable goods had since 1878 averaged 45 per cent., or about 17 per cent. higher than the Canadian average.

The Finance Minister asserted that the Canada the protective tariff had never been burdensome to the mass of consumers or unjust to any large class, which he thought was proved by the four successive victories which the Conservatives had won in general elections since the national policy was introduced in 1878.

On the contrary, he showed that Canada had developed marvellously in nearly every respect, and that this was largely due to the beneficial effects of a protective tariff. The savings of the people alone, as shown by the bank returns, had increased from $87,000,000 in 1878 to $242,000,000 this year. The speaker proceeded to deal with the recent census figures for the purpose of showing a great general progress in the Dominion. Considerable heckling of the speaker by members of the opposition at this stage, and some sharp passages at arms took place.

Mr. Foster, having by this time spoken nearly two hours, announced that he had reached the consideration of the proposed revision of the tariff. The Government had conceded in the previous session, he said, that the time had come when the changing circumstances of the country required a thorough revision of the tariff in the interest of business, but while the Government recognized this fact and were prepared, nay, determined, to adapt the tariff thoroughly to the well-being of Canada, no mistake should be made as to their attitude to the principle of protection.

The Government would stand fairly and squarely upon the principle of protection. The degree of protection they proposed to regulate by the probable benefit to Canada, but the principle they would not swerve from. (Conservative applause.) The Government did not expect this year nor next to have any considerable surplus. They knew they would have to exercise strict economy, and this was a factor in the rearrangement of the tariff. They had not attempted accordingly any uniform or horizontal reduction in the tariff. They had simply gone on the true national policy plan of a practical adaptation of the tariff to the Dominion's needs. Neither had the Government followed the rule of advalorem duties to the exclusion of specific duties or vice versa, as they considered there were arguments in favor of both, the specific duties often preventing frauds in importation and also conducing to the importing of a better class of goods.

At this point, it being near 6 o'clock, Mr. Foster asked the House to adjourn. At 8:30 he resumed his speech, and at once took up the details of the proposed tariff changes. To begin with, he said that if any class of the people were in danger of being overlooked in tariff arrangements, it was the agricultural class, the farmers, struggling as they were now with low prices. Their interests more than ever demanded sympathetic consideration, although they had always been carefully considered by the Conservative administrations of Canada. The national policy, he asserted, had greatly protected Canadian farmers. For instance, in the three years, 1877-79, the average importation of agricultural products into Canada, chiefly from the United States, was $13,817,541, whereas in the three years, 1890-93, the average was only $3,835,834.

This showed that the home market was being preserved by the national policy for our own farmers. On the other hand, the agricultural exports, which in 1877-79 only averaged $25,980,000, amounted in 1890-93 to $47,000,000. The speaker then announced the tariff changes.

There were no changes in tobacco or spirituous liquors. The duty of 2 cents per pound on malt was proposed to be changed to 1½ cents. The loss on revenue from this would be possibly $200,000, unless more malt were used. Upon agricultural products there was little proposed change.

Animals, living, formerly 30 per cent., would be 20 per cent., excepting hogs; live hogs, instead of 2 cents per pound, would be 25 per cent.; fresh mutton would be 2 cents per pound instead of 3. Pork would be 25 per cent., instead of 1½ cents per pound on heavy pork and 3 cents on light pork. Lard and cottolene were changed from 3 cents per pound to an ad valorem duty of 25 per cent.

Beeswax was reduced to 10 cents per pound from 20; all candles were changed to an ad valorem duty of 25 per cent. Soap, common, reduced to 1 cent per pound instead of 1½ cents, and other soaps to a uniform duty of 35 per cent. Castile soap was put at 2 cents per pound. Glue and mucilage were reduced to 25 per cent. All undressed feathers were put at 20 per cent., and dressed feathers reduced from 35 to 30 per cent. The entire schedule as read shows a very general, but not a large reduction all along the line.

CANADIAN VIEWS ON THE TARIFF CHANGES.

TORONTO, March 27.—The tariff changes made by the Ottawa Government were scarcely as sweeping as had been predicted by some enthusiastic Government supporters. They do not reduce the general duties nearly as much as the tariff reform proposed by the Liberals. They are, however, a certain indication that the present Administration at Ottawa is fully alive to the importance of reducing the duties in response to the urgent appeal of the Canadian Northwest, where all classes insisted upon their placing less restriction on importations from the United States. It was really a matter of life and death with the present Government for the tariff reform movement had become so general throughout the country that it is quite certain they could never have carried the next general election unless they had decided to make a general reduction of the duties.

A well known annexationist here said this evening that anything in the shape of tariff reduction, or any move on the part of the Canadian Government that tended to increase trade with the United States, might be regarded as unfavorable to the annexation movement, and he considered that the more trade we could do with the neighboring republic were encouraged, the more difficult it would be to promote the annexation sentiment.

All who favor unrestricted trade relations with the States consider the tariff changes announced at Ottawa to-day as very auspicious, as the Senate at Washington will now, it is hoped, consider the proposed changes in their tariff with a more kindly feeling toward Canada since the Dominion has taken the initiative in making reductions in the duties by which the manufacturers of the United States will benefit.

A great many of the tariff changes announced to-day are not pleasing to Canadian manufacturers, but it is not expected that the present Government will lose anything in that direction, since, whatever changes they make in the tariff, the manufacturers will scarcely expect to fare any better at the hands of the other party in Canada.

TO PAY $2,000 FOR CHURCH MUSIC.

In Spite of Protests That $1,000 a Year Is Too Much for an Organist.

The First Presbyterian Church in Emory street, Jersey City, under the Rev. Dr. Herr's pastorate, has become one of the most prosperous churches in the town. It numbers in its membership many wealthy and prominent men, such as ex-Gov. Joseph D. Bedle, George F. Perkins of Perkins & Goodwin, paper manufacturers; Dr. Forman, Charles D. Ridgeway, William Dickinson, William F. Stires, and John H. Watson.

When the annual meeting was held Monday night everything was harmonious until the subject of music was brought up. Then there was discord. In their annual report the trustees announced that the Music Committee had decided to rechgage Dr. Pierce as organist at a salary of $1,000, and that Precentor Smock would be requested to retain his place at the same salary. Dr. Forman started the discord as soon as the reading of the report had been finished.

"The trustees," he said, "have no right to engage an organist beforehand. They should consult us before they take action in matters like this. This church can't afford to pay an organist $1,000 a year. The idea of paying $1,000 a year to an organist is preposterous. It is a piece of outrageous extravagance."

The trustees were amazed at this outburst, which was entirely unexpected. They are a very dignified body, and were evidently chagrined that such an attack should be made upon their action.

"Will Dr. Forman be kind enough," said Trustee Ridgeway with dignity, "to state how much he would be willing to pay an organist?"

"I think $500 a year is enough."

"That is out of the question," said Mr. Ridgeway. "It is going too far. We can't take steps backward. We must keep up with the times. A cheap and incompetent organist creates dissatisfaction, and we can't have one in this church. Good music can't be had for less than $2,000 a year, and I think we can afford to pay that."

Dr. Forman said he didn't think there was an organist in the city getting $1,000 a year.

Pastor Herr went to the support of the trustees. He said a good organist and a good precentor could not be engaged for less than $1,000 a year each, and it was his belief that there were not five as good organists as Dr. Pierce in the whole city of New York.

"He has his peculiarities," Dr. Herr continued, "and if it were not for them, we couldn't get him at any price. He is not able to manage a very large chorus. If you remove him and put another in his place there will be as much difference as between semi-barbarism and culture. As for Mr. Smock, he has the rarest of voices, and is surely worth more than $1,000."

Everybody supposed that the pastor's argument settled the matter, and there was some surprise, therefore, when Elder W. F. Stires said:

"I would be glad if Pierce was pitched out altogether. He has a peculiarity of making so much noise with that old organ that I can't hear the singing, even when the most inspiring music is being sung. I will be glad if he gets out."

The question of spending $2,000 for music was put to a vote of the congregation and carried by a small majority.

GLASSES OF WHISKEY IN A ROW.

As Her Husband Drank Them, Mrs. Dolan Says, He Threw the Glasses at Her.

In the suit of Mrs. Ona Dolan for divorce from Peter H. Dolan, a Jersey City contractor, the plaintiff testified before Master in Chancery Isaac S. Taylor yesterday that her husband came home drunk very frequently. On one occasion he tore valuable oil paintings from the walls, slashed the canvas to ribbons, and chopped up the costly gilt frames. At another time he locked Mrs. Dolan in the dining room with himself. Then he ranged a row of glasses on the table, poured whiskey into them, and as soon as he drank the whiskey out of one he threw the glass at her head. She was kept busy dodging the missiles.

Dolan has not appeared yet to defend the suit. He is said to be hiding in Elizabeth to avoid the service of a warrant.

As orts Silk Weavers Strike.

Two hundred and fifty weavers employed in the Astoria silk works in Long Island City struck yesterday morning because they were forced to work overtime at the same rate of wages paid for day service. The mills employ 300 hands, about one-third being girls and women. A platoon of police guarded the place throughout the day. There was no violence. The strikers had pickets posted on all the street corners near the works, but they made no attempt to interfere with the weavers at work. The strikers are members of the Textile Workers' Union, having joined that body a few days ago. They held a meeting yesterday afternoon and decided to return to work if Superintendent Charles Mattmann would reduce the hours of labor from twelve to ten. They gave him until Friday to think over their proposition, and upon his suggestion consented to go back to work in the mean time.

Propositions by a Bogus Policeman.

Charles Yeamans, aged 28 years, of 34 Beekman place, was held at the Yorkville Police Court yesterday on a charge of personating a policeman. Mrs. Lillie Martin, a widow of 206 East Thirty-second street, said that while she and her sister were returning from the Madison Square Garden on Monday night he stopped them. First he pretended to arrest her, then he asked for money, and he wound up by requesting permission to call upon her. She had him arrested. He denied the charge. He said he was formerly janitor of the Madison Square Garden, and was now trying to get an appointment to the Fire Department.

Keenan Pays Upington.

A satisfaction of judgment was entered yesterday in the County Clerk's office showing that the judgment for $8,860 which George P. Upington, the lottery dealer, secured in November last against John Keenan, the former Bismarck of the County Democracy, has been paid. The amount of the judgment as satisfied is $8,293.72. It was the result of a second trial, the verdict on the first trial having been for $80,064.

BEST & CO

LILIPUTIAN BAZAAR

A Russet Shoe

Is just the thing for children's school and general wear in spring and summer. We've a shoe made from stock imported expressly for us. It has stout yet pliable soles, spring heels and fits to perfection. We have sold them for years and can give them our unqualified recommendation. Button or lace.

Sizes 8 to 10 1-2 $2.00.
Do. 11 to 2 $2.50.

For shoes, as well as for everything else pertaining to children's clothing, it's an advantage to shop at a store that has such facilities as ours for their complete outfitting.

60-62 West 23d St.

REST AT CAMP BUNKER HILL.

COXEY'S TRAMPING ARMY HAS NOW INCREASED TO 194 MEN.

They Reach Alliance, and, Although Cold and Weary, Find Provisions in Plenty Awaiting Them—Much Enthusiasm, and Confident Speeches by Coxey and Brown.

LOUISVILLE, O., March 27.—After a breakfast of eggs, fresh meat, potatoes, and bread and coffee, Coxey's army, which spent a quiet night in the Town Hall, prepared to leave Louisville. Camp was struck at 9:15, and the command moved fifteen minutes later on its fourteen-mile march to Alliance. All of the men seemed satisfied. Louis Smith, the unknown, was in command. Coxey and his aides stopped at a hotel last night, but returned to camp this morning for breakfast. The weather moderated and good cheer prevailed.

MAXIMO, O., March 27.—At 10:45 o'clock Coxey's army marched through Maximo, en route to Camp Bunker Hill, Alliance. The entire populace lined the road. Soon after leaving Louisville the sky became overcast, the temperature went down, and snow squalls came up.

ALLIANCE, O., March 27.—The Coxey army reached Alliance at 12:50 to-day, hungry, cold, tired, but enthusiastic. Crowds waited its coming, and 200 recruits were promised. A troop of Alliance horsemen fell into line and were cheered as they passed by. The supplies exceed requirements, and Coxey says a shipment will be made to some place East if the donations continue to come in.

Great crowds flocked out to see the odd cavalcade pass. Tents were raised at the fair grounds, and the shivering, thinly clad citizens of the communes gathered wood for fires. By the time supper rations were distributed things were comfortable.

Alliance is the most enthusiastic town yet reached. Many sympathizers with the movement live here. Supplies to the amount of half a car load came in. A load of hay for the stock was included. The street railways ran excursion cars to the scene every fifteen minutes.

As evening came on recruits began to come in, and Adjt. Smith had 175 new men on the rolls to-night. This shaken up the men last strong. The new men are somewhat better looking than their predecessors. At 4 o'clock a public meeting was held in the opera house of the town. Commander Coxey spoke to an immense house, and was followed by Chief Marshal Carl Brown. Another meeting was held later in the evening.

The Independent Church, a body of free thinkers, offered their building for sleeping quarters, but it was declined by Marshal Brown. Hostility was noticeable to-day in the camp towards the correspondents accompanying the expedition. The men say that they have been mercilessly abused, and want revenge.

Mayor Excel has appointed twelve special police officers for to-night, but anticipates no trouble. It was, however, learned from a prominent State militiaman to-night that the feeling at the capital has entirely changed and some insecurity is felt.

The fear of the State officials is that the army may be set upon by disorderly elements in some of the towns to be passed through. For that reason a letter has been written to the Captains of all militia companies along the route. No order to keep under arms is given, but the letter advises the officers to have the men ready for muster.

At 5 o'clock Commander Coxey left for Massillon, thence to go by a later train to Chicago to attend a stockholders' sale at the Union Stock Yards. He denies that the trip has anything to do with his financial difficulties. Mr. Coxey says he will resign the command at Columbiana on Thursday.

WASHINGTON, March 27.—"Oh, it's foolish—childish," remarked Senator Peffer this morning when asked about Coxey's army. "I have advised against it from the first, and have written letters and in speeches pointed out that no object could be attained by any such hapharzard movement as this. It is no spontaneous uprising and organization like the Farmers' Alliance. Coxey is a horse trader, horse racer, and a gambler, to start with, and it is not presumed that he could bring about him the men who would be necessary to give weight to such a movement.

"I believe in organization, but there is nothing in this movement that commends itself to the judgment of those who desire to stand up and fight for men and women. This is, of course, one of peace, and I do not anticipate that it will cause any trouble, but the authorities cannot but prepare to see that no breaches of the peace are committed. In making demands or even in a peaceable way trying to secure what they wish, as soon as there is a show of force there will be men to say, 'Stand aside,' 'Move on,' just as there would be if any person should attempt to interfere with any public movement. This does not belong to you, but to the public, they would be told, and any attempt to interfere with the orderly workings of the public would be swept aside. Coxey sent out his circulars and secured some notoriety. He got replies from people who thought it would be a jolly trip. 'Oh, yes,' they said, 'we will join you. We'll go down there and make those fellows come to time,' and all that sort of thing. But there were no replies from men who gave stability to a movement against wrong.

"I do not think I have had such a hearty laugh for months as I did when I read in the despatches yesterday that the army would stop at Camp Peffer last night. I could not believe that I was to be so honored, as I have discouraged the movement from the first."

HAMILTON, O., March 27.—About fifty recruits to the Coxey Commonweal army camped at the gravel pit south of this city this forenoon. Lew Evans, their leader, says he lives at Evansville, Ind. They will endeavor to meet Commander Coxey at Economy, Pa. They have some provisions with them, and say that they have supplies coming. Their presence caused considerable comment here to-day. They moved on this afternoon at 3 o'clock. A detachment from Lockland, O., will join Evans and his crowd near Middletown to-night.

CHICAGO, March 27.—Coxey's army is recruiting in Chicago. Marshal Albert Madison is here fresh from Massillon, and as a result of two days' labor fifty soldiers have been enlisted. Thirty-eight of them were quartered at the Hyde Park police station last night. It was the second meeting of the Chicago wing, the first gathering being held at the Thirty-fifth precinct police station on Easter night. According to the assertions of Marshal Madison, about twenty-five men were converted to his crusade last night while lodging behind the bars. The men resort to the police stations voluntarily, seeking shelter for the night.

RICHMOND, Ind., March 27.—A detachment of tramps, deserters from Coxey's Commonweal Army at Massillon, O., passed through here this morning en route home to Omaha, Neb. They said they were disgusted with the whole business.

EL PASO, Tex., March 27.—The army of unemployed, under Gen. Fry, got away on Sunday morning after breaking a switch lock in order to sidetrack a train to secure passage. The train was stopped at Findlay, seventy-one miles out, and an injunction granted by District Judge Buckler to restrain the army from interfering with the railroad was served. This order was executed by Capt. Hughes of the Rangers, and the army moved on to Sierra Blanc, where it is now.

AUSTIN, Tex., March 27.—Gov. Hogg declares that if the Southern Pacific railroad drives the tramps belonging to the Fry army to commit any overt act, he will hold the railway officials responsible. The Governor informs the railway officials that he has no more right to call out troops to protect the railways from tramps than he has to protect the residences of citizens from tramps begging food.

DENVER, March 27.—"Gen." Hamilton's Denver contingent to Coxey's army will have to walk out of town unless they pay their fares. It was announced on Sunday night that the Santa Fe would be called upon to furnish a train for the pilgrims. At the Santa Fe office it was said last night that the company had refused to furnish a train to the California division of the army, and would undoubtedly repeat its refusal should the Denver contingent make its demand. The other roads will also decline to give free transportation.

WOONSOCKET, R. I., March 27.—Col. W. S. Young, formerly a partner of Coxey, expects to raise a regiment of 1,000 men for the Commonweal army, and start from this place April 12 for Washington, via Sioux Falls. In Young's paper is a call for recruits in South Dakota.

TORONTO, Ont., March 27.—In anticipation of the crowd of unemployed men now on the march to Washington being broken up and scattered, the Grand Trunk Railway managers have issued instructions to their officials to be on the alert for parties trying to steal rides or damaging property.

GEN. HERNANDEZ ONLY AN AGENT.

He Thinks Mrs. Underhill Should Get Her $25,000 Out of the Venezuelan Government.

The suit of Mrs. George F. Underhill against Gen. José Manuel Hernandez, Vice-President of Venezuela, for $25,000 damages for alleged illegal detention in her own home in Bolivia, in August, 1892, was on trial yesterday before Judge Wheeler in the United States Court in Brooklyn. The plaintiff is the wife of George F. Underhill, who also has a suit pending against Gen. Hernandez for $75,000 for alleged false imprisonment. Coudert Brothers are counsel for the defendant.

Mr. Underhill went to Venezuela and established a water works plant for the Goverment. Gen. Hernandez seized the plant, which was located at Bolivia, and held it as the military agent of the Government. Mrs. Underhill testified that she had been imprisoned in her own house by his orders and that he placed cannon around the house and maltreated her when she demanded her liberty.

The contention of Gen. Hernandez is that he was acting as the agent of the Venezuelan Government when he seized the plant and imprisoned the Underhills, and that the claims should be made against the Government. He denies the alleged maltreatment. The trial will be continued to-day.

A MAN OF THE NAME OF JOHNSON.

His Letters to Young Mrs. Norris Lead to a Divorce Suit in Jersey City.

Alfred W. Norris of 55 Dwight street, Greenville, and Mamie Harris, one of the prettiest girls in Greenville, eloped about a year ago. Norris was then 19 years old and the girl 16. The elopers were forgiven by their respective parents, and to all appearances the future looked bright. Yesterday Lawyer E. K. Suguine, acting for Norris, filed papers in the Chancery Court for a divorce. He alleges in his complaint that within a few months after his marriage he made the discovery that his wife was corresponding with somebody who signed himself Joseph Johnson. The letters were postmarked Brooklyn, and Norris believes that Johnson lives in Brooklyn. The letters were couched in very affectionate terms, and all of them fixed dates for meetings

DEMAND POND'S EXTRACT. AVOID ALL