MAGNIFICENT MANSFIELD.

The Falstaffian Fisk Routed, Horse, Foot and Dragoons, by the Late Partner of His Joys.

JOHN M'KEON GETS HIS BACK UP.

The Dirty Linen of a Lifetime Washed Publicly in a Police Court.

A ROW AMONG THE LAWYERS.

The Cleopatra of the Erie Railroad Stands a Three-Hours Cross-Examination Without a Flaw Being Found in Her Character.

Two great forces met yesterday at half-past nine o'clock in the Yorkville Police Court. These two colliding forces were Marc Antony Fisk, Jr., who has offered up an entire railroad, with all its rolling stock, and an opera house, together with a fleet of Sound steamboats, at the feet of a woman who once toyed with his well-waxed mustache, and Cleopatra Helen Josephine Mansfield, the beautiful and gorgeous heroine of Jersey City and the owner of the palace in Twenty-third street now the fee *vi et armis* of this Dugald Dalgetty of colonels.

The court room of the Yorkville Police Court is in Fifty-seventh street, near Third avenue, and hither went many an Erie Railroad employé yesterday, prepared to cheer for the agonized Fisk, providing that this was necessary to be done. The court room will hold about three hundred people when crowded, and it was full yesterday to repletion. It was a gala day for the lawyers, who fought and squabbled and tore each other to pieces so ravenously that one would have thought that they really were in earnest.

William A. Beach, the senior counsel for Fisk, an old, precise and formal gray-headed lawyer, sat on the front bench, and by his side were his associates, Charley Spencer, whose eloquence is of the frightful order, and the incredulous Shearman, partner of David Dudley Field, whose particular line it was yesterday to laugh suspiciously, lean back and shake his head doubtingly, and in a general way to get up an appearance of sadness whenever Mrs. Mansfield made a strong point in her testimony.

For Mrs. Mansfield appeared the fearless, irritable and white-headed John McKeon and the little aggressive bantam Colonel Fellows, who also appeared for the people of the city of New York.

On the bench sat Judge Bixby, a very solid-looking magistrate, who wore a red necktie and a closely shaven face, yellow as saffron. Beside the Judge sat the beautiful and interesting blonde John E. McGowan, who is noted from the First Assembly district to Harlem bridge for the exquisite fit of his lavender trousers and the frankness of his disposition. Two or three policemen ran around in an excited state, opening gates and bringing visitors to reserved seats. The back part of the Court was well crowded with a hard looking set of fellows as ever were seen in a hall of justice.

At a little after ten o'clock Helen Josephine Mansfield entered the court room, followed by her cousin, Mrs. Lyddy Williams. Soon after Mr. Edward S. Stokes, who has filled the *rôle* of Octavius Ceasar in this most wonderful case, which threatens to be as long winded as that of Jarndyce vs. Jarndyce.

Mrs. Mansfield looked so lovely that she created quite a flutter in Court by her appearance. This lady merits some brief description, as she is now well known from Maine to Oregon from her connections with Mark Anthony Fisk and Octavius Caesar Stokes. She is much above the medium height, having a pearly white skin, dark and very large lustrous eyes, which, when directed at a judge, jury or witness have a terrible effect. Her delicate white hands were encased in faultless lavender kid gloves, and over her magnificent tournure of dark hair was perched a jaunty little Alpine hat, with a dainty green feather perched therein. Her robe was of the heaviest black silk, cut a la Imperatrice, and having deep flounces of the heaviest black lace over Milanaise bands of white satin. At her snowy throat the only article of jewelry on her person a small gold pin glistened and heightened the effect. Her hair was worn *a la Cleopatre*, and a superb black velvet mantle covered her shoulders. Sitting there this supero woman was the impersonification of coolness and proud disdain as she looked every now and then with fiery glances of contempt at the agonized Fisk and his cross-examiner, Charley Spencer, who made every endeavor to badger the fair witness during a long three hours' examination, which would have tested the patience of a saint, but which never ruffled or discomposed the serenity of Mrs. Mansfield. When Mrs. Mansfield took the witness' box, which placed her on an elevation in the court, her cousin, Mrs. Williams, who is a medium-sized and coquettish little beauty, sat immediately behind Helen Josephine. Mrs. Williams is about twenty-two years of age, having a nose of the *retroussé* order, and a fair, white, pink and rather innocent face, in which there is a spice of roguery. Mrs. Williams looks as timid and as shy as a dove, and yesterday wore a sealskin jacket, a plush velvet hat, pink-colored kid gloves, and a wine-colored silk dress, made in an exquisite fashion.

The exquisite Stokes was all glorious in a new Alexis overcoat of a dull cream color. An elegant diamond ring glowed on his little finger like a glow worm in a swamp, and a cane was swung carelessly to and fro between his manly legs. Stokes looked so handsome that Mrs. Mansfield found it quite impossible to take her eyes off his face, while she directed only withering glances of contempt at the agonized Fisk. The taller gentleman came into court after Mrs. Mansfield in a strange kind of a blue naval uniform that fitted him wretchedly, with double rows of brass buttons. His mustaches bristled ferociously, in the fashion of General Beum, and a big diamond pin shone out of his fat chest like the danger light at the Sandy Hook bar. During the examination, when even Mrs. Mansfield looked directly at Fisk, his glance wavered and his eyes turned away partially, and, in fact, he was so much discomposed that he left early. During one of the severest cross-examinations ever undergone in New York and of three hours' duration Mrs. Mansfield never wavered a bit, and one of the counsel for Fisk stated that she was the most perfect witness that ever sat in a witness box. She was cross-questioned and badgered and yet never betrayed the slightest temper, but was throughout perfectly well bred, courteous and ladylike in her demeanor.

THE PROCEEDINGS.

The Court having been regularly called to order Assistant District Attorney Fellows arose, amid great silence, and said that a notice had been served on the defence to produce certain documents which were believed to be in their possession. There had been, among other papers, an affidavit by a party in the employ of the defendant, and he called the attention of the Court to the fact that the original was still in his possession.

Mr. BEACH observed that the counsel for the prosecution called upon the defendant to furnish evidence against himself, which, he submitted, was in direct opposition to all principles of law. There was no evidence that the papers were in the possession of the defendant, and even if they were the prosecution had no right to demand them from the counsel to whom they had been entrusted. They were not called upon to aid the District Attorney in making out the accusation. The confidential relations existing between counsel and client must not be sacrificed. It struck him (counsel) with astonishment that they should be called upon to produce papers placed in the possession of counsel. It was a matter to be argued whether the citizens of the community should be persecuted by being compelled to produce papers handed to counsel in confidence.

Mr. JOHN MCKEON warmly denied that there was any persecution in this case. He did not consider as a persecuted man one who had hired another to swear a libel and then got that person out of the way.

Mr. BEACH characterized the charge and imputation as falsehoods, and contended that counsel had no right to wander from the path of professional duty to make an accusation before the Court without proving it.

Mr. MCKEON replied that if he wandered out of his professional path Mr. Fellows could have a chance at him. He knew the risk of opposing James Fisk. The man's life was in danger. Counsel might sneer at it; but he asserted that Fisk was positively the most dangerous man in the city. The day would come that revelations would be made that would cause his downfall. At all events he (counsel) would not be intimidated.

Judge BIXBY intimated that counsel were wandering from the case.

Mr. BEACH humorously suggested the propriety of the Court furnishing a body guard to protect himself and his client from the anger of the opposing counsel.

Mr. FELLOWS asked what was a person of his slender proportions to do. He had no idea that any discordant elements would have been introduced. Notice had been served on the other side requiring the production of certain papers. The original instrument was demanded, but was not forthcoming, and the complainant was entitled to give parole evidence as to its contents. Counsel then alluded to the fact that Mr. P. B. Sweeny had been appointed receiver in the suit to which Mr. Stokes was a party. A package of papers was handed to Mr. Sweeny in his capacity as receiver, and that package was returned by Mr. Sweeny to the proper person.

A brief discussion ensued as to whether Mr. Sweeny should be examined, but it having been conceded that his evidence would not be material to the issue of the case Mr. Sweeny left the court. A question then arose concerning the propriety of Mr. McKeon's appearance to assist the Assistant District Attorney.

Mr. MCKEON, in reply to Mr. Beach, who submitted that Mr. McKeon's absence would conduce to the peace of the examination, contended he had a perfect right to appear. The prosecution were dealing with men who thought they owned New York—that they owned Judges, and who had disgraced not only the city, but the whole State.

Mr. SPENCER asked what all this amounted to? He would suggest that all the "blowing" be done at once and have done with it.

Mr. FELLOWS explained that it had been the practice of the District Attorney to employ assistant counsel in certain cases.

Judge BIXBY, after listening patiently to a considerable amount of sparring, finally suggested the propriety of calling the witness, having received an intimation from Mr. Fellows that Mr. McKeon's assistance was desired.

EXAMINATION OF MRS. MANSFIELD.

Mrs. Helen Josephine Mansfield took a seat on the witness stand, and, in reply to Assistant District Attorney Fellows, very composedly testified as follows:—

Q. Mrs. Mansfield, have you heretofore made an affidavit in this Court against the defendant, James Fisk? A. I have.

Q. Will you please examine this paper and see if it is the affidavit you have made? The witness took the document and replied in the affirmative.

Q. Will you please state whether you ever had in your employ a person named Richard E. King. A. I had, sir.

Q. In what capacity? A. As a man servant in the house. He acted in the capacity of a waiter.

Q. How long was he in your employ? A. From September till March.

Q. At what time—in March of this year do you mean? A. Yes, sir.

Q. What time in March did he leave? A. About the 20th.

Q. Do you know where he went to? A. He went into the employment of Mr. Fisk.

Q. Please state the circumstances under which he left your employ.

Mr. SPENCER objected to the question, contending that the only questions that could be passed upon were, first, Whether the defendant published the alleged libel referred to in the complaint? That must be shown absolutely; secondly, if he did publish it were its contents true, and were they published with good motives and with justifiable ends, and, thirdly, was the publication privileged? Those were all the questions that are to be determined before the Court upon this traverse, and he, for one, was unwilling to go into the private history of the household of the complainant. They had nothing to do with the man King except in connection with the question whether he made the affidavit. After some further remarks counsel claimed that there might be a thousand reasons assigned for discharging a servant, such as spiling a glass of wine on a lady's dress or breaking a tureen. The question, at all events, was not material to the issue, and he therefore objected to it.

Mr. FELLOWS said he could well understand the objections on the other side to the introduction of certain testimony which the prosecution proposed to put before the Court in the interests of justice. He was not going to be guided by Mr. Spencer's desires in this matter, but refer the question to the arbitration of the Court. Nor would he be governed by their wishes as to the order in which the testimony would be presented. The prosecution proposed to show, first, that the affidavit was published; second, that it was not true, and, third, that it was not a privileged publication. After some further debate on both sides the objection was overruled.

Q. Under what circumstances did King leave your employment? A. He left without any notice or intimation whatever; while I was out driving one day he went off in a clarence and took his baggage with him; I owed him a month's wages; I had no fault to find with him; he did my work perfectly satisfactorily.

Q. There had been no previous notice given him to leave? A. None in the world; I had no idea of it.

Q. He went from your employ to that of the defendant? A. Yes.

Q. Mrs. Mansfield, since King left your employ have you seen an affidavit purporting to have been made by him reflecting upon yourself?

Mr. SPENCER objected. Objection overruled.

A. The affidavit, I believe, was served upon my counsel.

Mr. BEACH—What counsel? A. Mr. Courtney.

Mr. FELLOWS—Did you read that affidavit? (Affidavit produced). A. I did; yes.

Q. Do you remember its contents? A. Some portions of it.

Counsel said he proposed to read and submit to the witness the affidavit incorporated in the original complaint, and ask if that were the affidavit referred to. The counsel for the defence had courteously furnished a copy of the original affidavit and admitted that it was a copy of the affidavit made by King, and that it was served by Mr. Courtney upon the witness. Counsel read the following portion of the affidavit:—"The principal subject of conversation between Mrs. Mansfield, Mr. Stokes and Mrs. Williams, who, I believe, is a cousin of Mrs. Mansfield and resides with her, from the time I went there until I left, was the manner in which they proposed to make money out of Mr. Fisk by means of letters from him to said Mansfield which she said she had, and statements by said Mansfield between Mr. Fisk and herself, by selling the same to the newspapers and compelling him to pay them money to prevent the same being made public, and they said they could get a very large amount of money out of Mr. Fisk in that way. I waited upon them at table at dinner and after dinner in their rooms, and heard much of their conversation upon the subject stated in this affidavit; and, among other matters, said Mansfield said to the said Stokes, in my hearing:—"I have the letters, and I will give them to you and let you use them to your best advantage, and make all you can out of Mr. Fisk, so you take care of me and stick to me through life, and I will do all I can to assist you in this matter. All I wish is to just get satisfaction of that fellow. Now the dogs won't look at me. I have to depend on all you can make, and it worries me to death."

A STOUT DENIAL.

Q. Now, Mrs. Mansfield, will you please tell us whether that conversation ever took place? A. Never in the world.

Q. Is there any part in it, from first to last, in so far as refers to the defendant and the possibility of exracting money from him, true or false? A. False in every particular.

Q. Are you certain that during the whole time King lived in your house no such conversation took place between yourself, Mr. Stokes and Mrs. Williams alluded to in the affidavit? A. Never.

Q. What relation is Mrs. Williams to you? A. She is my cousin.

This brought the direct examination to a close.

THE CROSS-EXAMINATION.

Mr. SPENCER then proceeded with the cross-examination, previous to which the affidavit was read, of which the following is the remaining portion:—One night, about half-past eleven o'clock, I was called up from sleep in the kitchen by Mrs. Williams, who said she wanted me to sign some papers. I said I did not want to sign any paper unless I knew what it was; she said it would not do me any harm, "and Mrs. Mansfield wishes you to sign it;" but I don't know what it is, except that I said it had some reference to Mr. Fisk coming there; I never would have signed it without reading it, except from the way Mrs. Mansfield talked; I was sure I would be discharged if I did not; one night Mr. Stokes said to me at the table, in presence of Mrs. Mansfeld, and Mrs. Williams, "Richard, have you ever been in court on my account?" I said, "No, sir." He then said, "How much money would you take to swear to a lie? Would you take $30?" I said, "No, sir." Then he said, "Would you take $3,000?" I said, "No, sir; I would not take anything." He left after he found he could not get me to the point, and could not get me to swear to a lie, and said, "Well, I believe you."

Q. What is your age, Mrs. Mansfield? A. I will be twenty-four on the 29th of December.

Q. How long have you resided in the city of New York? A. Since 1867.

Q. Where did you reside immediately before you came to New York? A. I don't understand you.

Q. You say you have resided in the city since 1867; where did you reside immediately before that? A. I was in Philadelphia a short time.

FISK TAKES HIS DEPARTURE

at this stage of the proceedings, on the plea of business at the Erie Railroad office, being allowed to retire, hurriedly left the Court.

Cross-examination continued—Q. Are you a married lady? A. I have been married; yes, sir.

Q. When were you married? A. I was married in San Francisco, in September, 1864.

Q. To whom? A. Frank Lajor.

Q. Is he now living? A. He is, sir.

Q. Had you been married before that? A. Never.

Q. How long did you reside in San Francisco? A. Only a few months when I was married; I was married in September and left on the 11th of January following.

A STRANGE STORY.

Q. Have you any recollection, Mrs. Mansfield, while you were in San Francisco, of Mr. Lajor placing a pistol at a man's head? A. Never, to my knowledge.

Q. Have you any recollection of a pistol being placed at a man's head in your presence? A. I cannot tell. I do not remember his name.

Q. Are you of opinion that you cannot recollect a pistol having been placed at a man's head unless you were to——

Mr. FELLOWS here interposed, and in the course of a very earnest appeal contended that these questions were not relevant to the case. Whenever there was any testimony introduced that could throw any light upon the question at issue he was more than willing it should be set forth. He submitted that it was not material to the issue now being tried whether any pistol had been presented. That had nothing whatever to do with the fact of Fisk publishing a libel against the witness. He would like to ascertain the purpose of the counsel in thus going beyond the limits of the case. Was it to impeach the credibility of the witness? If they were wandering outside the case for any other purpose he would strenuously object to it.

Mr. SPENCER admitted that he had propounded the question to the witness with a view of attacking her credibility. He contended he had a right to cross-examine the witness and she had a right to vindicate herself. He would ask his questions with every courtesy, but he had a duty to perform and he would carry it out fearlessly.

Mr. FELLOWS replied that the question was utterly immaterial. What they must proceed upon the facts set forth in the affidavit which the defence admitted had been made. They acknowledged the affidavit was made by the boy King. The only question to be presented was whether the affidavit having been made was maliciously published by James Fisk, and whether the matters contained therein were libellous. Those were the only two questions, how then could the credibility of the witness effect the issue at all? She had sworn that the conversation stated by King never occurred. For the purpose of attacking her credibility in that particular they made the proposition that she was a blackmailer. She simply said that the statement made by King and published by Fisk was libellous, and that was the issue before the Court. He was willing that Mrs. Mansfield, from the moment the boy entered her employment until he left, should set forth every single act and every single word. Beyond that every other question was immaterial. He did not know the

MYSTERIOUS COMPLICATIONS

of the lady's life, nor did he care to know so long as they were immaterial to the case. But he objected to the attempt to having the whole life of the woman unveiled when anything concerning it was not germain to the issue. He certainly would interpose his objection to questions that did not affect the case.

Mr. MCKEON also submitted that the witness might decline to answer any questions the replies to which might tend to degrade her.

Mr. BEACH said that the exigency which he anticipated had arisen. No gentleman of ordinary intelligence would fail to perceive that the complainant, who had presented herself as the accuser of Mr. Fisk for libel, had placed herself in an unpleasant and disagreeable predicament. It was quite possible her sense of

INJURY AND WRONG

might have dictated the proceedings. That it was greviously unwise and injudicious he had no doubt, and he personally deeply regretted that a lady of her appearance and demeanor placed in the position she occupied. She came guided by her protector and surrounded by her counsel. She came deliberately and made an accusation against a gentleman with whom she had maintained relations of the closest intimacy and regard. She must have known when she did that and assumed a position on the stand as a public prosecutor, that she would have to take all the hazards and contingencies of her action. Now it was not denied that the man King made the affidavit and that it was obtained by the lawyer of Mr. Fisk and served upon Mrs. Mansfield in due course. Counsel then proceeded at considerable length to dilate upon the fact of the boy's making the affidavit, arguing that although an humble negro he was entitled to be believed, as against the testimony of the witness, taking into consideration the entire surroundings of the case. He therefore insisted that in the cross-examination the credibility should be tested.

Mr. FELLOWS said the question was whether her veracity was to be confounded with her chastity. Counsel then, in the course of a very vigorous and eloquent address, laid down the principles of the law and proceeded to give the negro boy a terrible excoriation, denouncing him in severe terms for the part he had enacted. He dwelt severely upon the fact that after having accepted the price of his iniquity he fled to parts unknown, not daring to show himself in order to undergo an examination. He (counsel) sincerely wished that King could be produced in Court, and then it would be seen what would become of the statement in his affidavit. The boy had fled to avoid the responsibility of his crime, and dared not appear in Court. If he were present he would prove out of his own lips that he swore a lie, and he (counsel) would prove before the case closed that Fisk was the only person to be benefited by the affidavit in question. He appealed to the discretion of the Court not to allow the private life of the witness to be brought before the Court so long as the facts connected with it were not pertinent to the case. He objected strongly to having

A DISH OF SCANDAL

served up to gratify the voracious clamors of the public with matters which could not by any possibility affect the issue of the proceedings.

Judge Bixby finally ruled that questions not relevant to the case should be asked.

MORE ABOUT THE PISTOL.

Cross-examination resumed by Mr. Spencer.—Q. Can you tell me whether, while you were in San Francisco, a pistol was presented at a man's head in your presence? A. There was a circumstance of that kind happened, I don't deny.

Q. I have not said you did. A. I know it.

Q. Was it pointed at a man named Perley? A. Yes; D. B. Perley.

Q. Was it pointed by a person named Warren? A. It was.

Q. Where was Mr. Perley at the time the pistol was presented at him? A. In the parlor of my mother's house.

Q. Did he sign a check before he left? A. I believe he did, but I did not see it.

Q. Do you know for what amount the check was signed? A. I do not know, not having seen it.

Q. Was it for $30,000? I have not heard the amount at all.

Q. Did you have the amount demanded? A. No.

Q. Was there a relationship existing between yourself and Mr. Warren? A. He was my stepfather; the difficulty was one between Warren and Perley, in which I was not concerned.

Q. Where was he when the pistol was fired? Was he standing up or lying down? A. I suppose he was standing; there was nothing to lie upon but two or three chairs.

Q. Were you and Mr. Perley in the room before Warren came in? A. Yes, he called upon me.

Q. What did Warren say when he came into the room? A. I don't remember what passed.

Q. Do you recollect, madam, Mr. Warren coming into the room charging Mr. Perley with having criminal intercourse with you and saying,

"YOU MUST BE SHOT

or pay?" A. Nothing of that kind passed at all.

Q. Where did the check come from? A. I don't know that there was a check.

Q. Did Mr. Warren shoot? A. No.

Q. Did Mr. Perley escape from the room finally? A. There was no escape about it; he went out through the door.

Q. At the time he went out of the door did he have anything on him except his shirt? (Laughter.) A. He had.

Q. Didn't he run through the street in his shirt? A. No, he was dressed in the usual manner; I think he had his overcoat on.

Q. Can you tell us why that pistol was pointed at Perley's head? A. I don't understand what it was about.

Q. Have you any recollection what you heard said in your presence? A. I don't recollect anything about it except what some person may have told me.

Q. Did Warren say anything at the time? A. I don't recollect.

Q. Did Mr. Perley say anything at the time? A. I don't recollect what he said.

Q. Did you learn afterwards that the check was stopped? A. I don't know anything about it.

HISTORY OF THE HEROINE.

Q. What was your maiden name? A. Helen Mansfield.

Q. Your name was the same as it is now? A. Yes, sir.

Q. You have already said that Mr. Warren was your stepfather? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you ever gone by any other name than that of Mansfield or Lajor? A. No, never; I have my husband's name and I have my own.

Q. You got a divorce from Mr. Lajor? A. Yes, in New York city.

Q. What was the name of the lawyer? A. Mr. Howes, I think.

Q. You saw an advertisement in the paper? A. No; I did not.

Q. You got the divorce in New York? A. Yes; Judge Barnard signed the divorce.

Q. What was the name of the referee? A. Tracy, I think.

Q. Were you present at the hearing? A. What do you call a hearing?

Q. Were you present on any occasion when the referee took testimony? A. Yes, I was there.

Q. How often? A. I don't know.

Q. Did you hear any witnesses give their testimony? A. Certainly I did.

Q. What witness gave his testimony against your husband? A. The lady that kept the house, Mrs. Hoffman.

Q. Was your husband in the city? A. He may have been. I only saw his counsel, Mr. J. H. Coleman.

Q. Were you born in this country? A. In Boston, Massachusetts.

Q. How old were you when you left Boston? A. Sixteen.

Q. Then where did you go? A. To San Francisco, to join my mother.

Q. How long did you remain in San Francisco? A. I arrived there the day before Christmas, 1863, and 11th of January, 1864.

Q. Did you have any intimacy with Mr. Perley? A. None whatever.

Q. And when you left San Francisco who accompanied you? A. I came to this city with my husband in the steamer.

Q. Where did you go to from New York? A. I visited Albany.

Q. How long was it after that that your husband and yourself ceased living together? A. In 1866.

Q. Then where did you go? A. I went to my relatives in Boston and tried to obtain a divorce, but because I did not live in the State I was obliged to come to New York. I returned to my husband in March, but finally parted from him in July, 1866.

Q. Where did you go to then? A. I remained in Philadelphia; my husband went away with another lady.

Q. Where did you live in Philadelphia? A. I lived in Chestnut street, at No. 1,312; we had rooms there.

Q. Who kept those rooms? A. My husband and myself.

Q. After he left? A. No one but myself.

Q. How long did you live there alone? A. I don't think I was there over a week alone; I went to the country in July and in the latter part of August came to New York.

Q. Where did you go? A. I resided with a lady there, Mrs. Rynders, who is now dead; the house was No. 27 Amity street.

Q. How long did you live there? A. I lived there until I got my divorce; I believe I got my divorce in November.

Q. Was there nobody living there except you and this lady? A. She kept a lodging house for Southern gentlemen.

Q. Any other ladies there? A. No; she and I lived together and slept together.

Q. Then where did you go—did you go to a house owned by a woman called Bell Adams? A. No; in the latter part of December I went to No. 42 Lexington avenue; the house was kept by a lady called Mrs. Bishop; I took a suit of rooms there.

Q. Where were you between November and the middle part of December? A. I remained with Mrs. Rynders.

Q. How long did you remain at Lexington avenue? A. Until the 3d of November of the next year.

Q. Then where did you go? A. To the American Club House corner of Broadway and Seventeenth street; I never knew such a person as Bell Adams in all my life.

Q. Did Mr. Fisk meet you the first time at Adams' house? A. I never heard of such a person.

WHERE THEIR EYES FIRST MET.

Q. Where were you the first time you saw Mr. Fisk to your knowledge? A. I met him at the house of Miss Annie Wood, in Thirty-fourth street.

Q. Did the lady have furnished rooms? A. No; she didn't have anything of the kind.

Q. Were there any other ladies in the house? A. I think not; she was a lady with a large family, an actress and a friend of mine.

In reply to further questions the witness proceeded to state that she lived in Jersey City nine weeks, subsequently went to Boston and afterwards returned to the Clarendon Hotel and No. 18 West Twenty-fourth street; her present residence is No. 359 West Twenty-third street; she became acquainted with Mr. Stokes in Philadelphia; received letters from Mr. Fisk during that time. The witness was then interrogated at great length about her property, and how she had become possessed of funds, to which she replied that she had speculated in stocks and had in that manner accumulated funds. Fisk, she supposed, furnished the money for the operations, as it did not come directly from him.

Counsel on the other side objected to going into this subject as the examination tended to develop matters pertinent to another suit against Fisk, now pending. The witness stated that she had invested $15,000 in government bonds. Fisk, she claimed, borrowed that sum for further speculation. It was subsequently invested in the purchase of a house in West Twenty-third street. She then went on to explain that she had used her exertions with Mr. Tweed to use his influence with Mr. Fisk to put an end to the litigation then pending, and to which Mr. Stokes was a party.

In reply to further interrogations the witness stated she had given up some of the letters she received from Fisk, but not all. She desired to put an end to any exposures until Fisk began to persecute; then she showed fight.

After some further questions a postponement was suggested and agreed to, and the case was accordingly adjourned till the 9th of December.

BROOKLYN IMMORALITY.

Scenes in a House of Assignation—Descent by the Police—The Inmates Pray To Be Let Off.

The City of Churches has always been looked upon as a place of model morality, yet disclosures are occasionally made which do not reflect creditably upon it. It has recently been discovered that there are several houses of assignation in the city which are frequented by men and women who move in fashionable circles and are considered highly respected. Married women, who live in brown stone fronts on fashionable streets and avenues, have been followed to these dens of assignation, and their names are in the hands of the police. A house of this description has existed for some time past under the shadow of the Fleet street Methodist Episcopal Church, and has been the source of annoyance to the respectable residents of that street. The men and women who have been observed going in and out of this house are considered respectable, and the fact of their having proved false to their marriage vows are unknown to their families. It has been the habit of some women, while their husbands have been absent in New York on business, to spend two or three hours a day in the house above mentioned. Last week the house was complained of by Mr. Harris, sexton of the Fleet street church, and on Friday night Detectives Van Wagner, Folk, Corwin, Finehout and Vidito made a descent on the house and arrested Mrs. Sinclair, the proprietress, and some half dozen men and women who happened to be in the place at the time. One of the ladies who was fashionably attired, and who dreaded the exposure which would follow an arrest, nearly went into hysterics, and offered the officers her set of diamond jewelry to let her go. There were also two or three well known city officials present, and they were greatly astonished at the appearance of the police. The parties were taken before Justice Walsh, and all with the exception of Mrs. Sinclair were discharged on their own recognizances.

HORRIBLE CASE OF CHILD MURDER.

An Infant Found with its Throat Cut—Coroner's Investigation.

For some time past the city seems to have been comparatively free from infanticide cases, which induced the belief that murder of the innocents had ceased. Yesterday morning, however, a horrible case of infanticide was brought to the attention of Coroner Herrman, at half-past seven o'clock A. M. As officer Flannery, of the Twenty-seventh precinct, was on duty, his attention was called by two strangers to a parcel lying in the gutter in the rear of Trinity church. On making an examination officer Flannery discovered the dead body of a well developed male child, apparently of recent birth, envelopen in a woman's calico dress, and partially covered over with leaves which had been thrown from the church-yard. A more minute inspection of the body revealed the horrible fact that the infant's throat had been cut, besides which it had a deep gash on the left side of the face, thus leaving no doubt that the child had been brutally murdered.

The remains were taken to the station house, and immediate efforts made to obtain information concerning the parentage of the child, by whom it had been murdered, &c., but without success. The body was sent to the Morgue to await the result of an investigation, and in the meantime Captain Cherry, of the Twenty-seventh precinct, will make vigilant efforts to find the murderer, although at present he seems to have no clue upon which to work. A post-mortem examination to be made on the body by Dr. John Beach will determine the probable age of the child and the cause of death.

ANOTHER DEAD INFANT FOUND IN THE STREET.

At eight o'clock last night Officer Handy, of the Eighteenth precinct, found the dead body of a female child in front of 313 East Fourteenth street, wrapped in fine linen underclothing. The child apparently had been born but a short time. The body was removed to the Morgue and the Coroner notified.

THE DEATH OF THE INEBRIATE SULLIVAN.

Coroner Schirmer yesterday morning investigated the case of John Sullivan, late of Newark, who was found intoxicated in the street with a fractured skull, whose death has already been published in the HERALD. Officers Pierce and Oates, of the Twenty-seventh precinct, deposed that they found deceased lying on the pavement in front of the Western Hotel, West street, on Wednesday evening, last week, much under the influence of liquor, and assisted him to the station house. The officers say there had been no quarrel with any one near where deceased was found, and could not have been without their knowledge. Sullivan made no complaint about being injured, and on admission to the station was laid on the floor outside the cell and a pillow placed under his head. Doorman Peabody saw deceased about twenty times during the night, and at six o'clock the next morning he arose, entered a cell, the door of which was opened, and lay down on a bench. He afterwards complained to the doorman of feeling bad, owing to being on a drunk. Two hours later deceased complained of having a headache, and on making an examination doorman Peabody found a small cut on the top of his head, which he said he received on election day.

Sergeant Moloney, of the Twenty-seventh precinct, on duty when the deceased was admitted, much under the influence of liquor, said he had been on a spree; visited him three times before midnight, when he made no complaint of being sick, but the next morning, Sullivan appearing to be sick, a surgeon was called, who recommended his removal to the hospital.

It could not be learned how deceased had been injured, and the jury found "that he died from fracture of the skull from injuries received in some manner to them unknown, but believed by a fall on the pavement while intoxicated."

ATTEMPTED MATRICIDE.

Francis Golden, twenty-six years of age, visited his mother's residence, 188 North Seventh street, Williamsburg, yesterday, for the purpose of taking away some furniture that he claimed as his property. His mother resisted him, and he seized a large knife and attempted to kill her, exclaiming as he approached her, "I will cut your heart out if you interfere with me." The ruffian's arm was stayed before he consummated his sanguinary threat and he was arrested. Justice Voorhees committed him to await the action of the Grand Jury.

THE GAS QUESTION.

The Consumers Still Unsatisfied and the Gas Still Unimproved.

What an Expert Has to Say—A General Opinion of Gas, Burners, and Gas Companies' Trickeries—The Remedy for the Evil.

The fact that the gas companies now express a willingness to tell all they know about the management of their gas manufactories and the means they employ to make the gas they supply the city with is a pretty good evidence that they are at last beginning to smart under the lashing they have been subjected to by the HERALD during the past few days. At least such willingness seems to be a fact, inasmuch as a HERALD reporter, who yesterday went on a tour of information, found no difficulty whatever in obtaining reasonable answers to questions he saw fit to ask concerning the manufacture of the gas, the coals used and the appliances had to make the article of the best quality. But few of the officials, however, were come-at-able, and those who were simply stated in a general way what they have all along claimed—that the companies used the best of coals, and consequently made the best kind of gas. In his travels about town to gather all the additional information possible concerning the gas question, and to find the real

UNDERLYING CAUSE OF THE DARKNESS

which prevails where light should shine, the reporter came across a gentleman—a gas expert he might be called—who for the past twenty-five years and more has made the manufacture of gas his study.

"What do you think," inquired the reporter, "is the real cause of the bad gas people are complaining about so much?"

"In the first place," was his reply, "I do not admit that the gas is so very bad as compared with other coal gas manufactured in other cities in Europe. It is, in my opinion, better than the gas in general use in London. But let me give you a few facts about the way the companies here manage to

SWINDLE THEIR PATRONS."

"Do you mean they swindle with intent to swindle or unwittingly?"

"With intent, most assuredly. I once had a conversation with Joseph Nason, the president of the Baltimore Gas Company. He spoke to me about the quality of the gas manufactured at the time in the district of the Manhattan Gas Company. I told him I lived in that district and used their gas, as also that of the New York Company as he also did. But I also told him when he complained about the quality of the gas that my views of the subject were not entirely identical with his, for I believed that the gas manufactured is good, and that between the qualities of the gas furnished by the various companies there is but little if any difference."

"You certainly have not examined the coal they use at present?"

"Well, that may be; but the time I allude to as having had this conversation with Mr. Nason was not so very long ago. I told him I could show him why the gas at his house of which he complained was better than he thought. I went to the house and simply put different burners on than he had in use, and he had abundance of light where before he had barely enough to read by. It's really the burners that are at fault, after all."

"What difference was there between the burners Nason used and those you put on the jets?"

"Well, they were the ordinary argand burners he used. They were corroded and ill adapted to the jets. Burners should not be made of iron or brass, but of some material that will not corrode from the heat or the action of the gas itself."

"What kind of burners are in general use in this city?"

"I really do not know. Many are the ordinary iron or brass kind, but they should be earthen or clay, or what is called lava."

"Well, then, if it be a fact that the lava burners are the best material to use, how is it that some of them give good light while others do not?"

"There is a difference in the quality of the gas, very often owing to the weather."

"How can such weather as we are now having have any effect, good or bad, on the gas?"

"The weather does affect the pressure. The remedy for the evil of the 'bad gas,' as the miserable show we have of it is called, is to secure enough gas to supply the demand; that is, supply every gas burner up to the 7.10 pressure. In order to insure a good light to a burner that supplies a quarter (they say that the tubes are now mostly of three-eighths) capacity is to have at least a six foot long tube to it from the pipe."

"How do you account for the fact that in one block you find a lamp burning well and in another the light is dim?"

"Let me explain by telling you how the Manhattan Company managed to pull the wool over the eyes of the Legislature, and then you can judge of how it may be that some lamps give good light and others do not. When it was learned that the Legislature was going to investigate the doings of the companies a few years ago, the Manhattan and the New York put six foot burners on the lamps, placing them over a plug or three foot burner. You see they were required by contract to give at least three feet an hour, but they knew their three foot burners didn't come up to the mark. When the investigation was made the Legislative committee found out that there was good light from the lamps, but the fact was that there was less gas, although there was more light. After the investigation, of course, the stop cock business was made to do its work, and the three-foot burners acted the part of plugs, and the companies lost nothing and lose nothing by apparently giving more gas than they are required to give—in fact, they give less."

"I can't see where the advantage of that was."

"It was just this:—The small burner underneath the six-foot burner acts as a sort of permanent check on the other. When there is a full pressure of gas it gives three feet, but when at half pressure it doesn't give half the quantity."

"How can such tricks be done away with?"

"There ought to be an official, whose duty it would be to

INSPECT THE GAS AND THE BURNERS

every week. He should be not only an honest man, but a man of common sense and a scientific man."

"In your opinion the great remedy, then, is——"

"A uniform supply of gas to the burners in the houses and the streets. This would save the consumers a great deal of money; but of course the companies make more money when there is an unequal pressure on some burners of a dwelling."

"How so?"

"By the waste which results. The consumer wonders how his bill is so large when he apparently uses but little gas. The secret is the unequal pressure, or rather the waste which results to certain burners. This can be prevented by having a self-cocking faucet on each floor, or each pipe that leads to a burner, for that matter. Let me give you an example. A large establishment in this city sent for me to give them more light. Their bills were growing higher and higher, and they did not use as much gas as usual during the months that their bill were the highest."

"Well, how did you account for it?"

"The whole thing was the result of the sheer

WEAKNESS OF THE SUPPLY,

and not in the quality of the gas. They told me the gas did not give as much light as usual, and that some of the burners would not light at all. I found that the gas was too strong in some burners and that others that were defective had very little. The companies are to blame for this kind of thing. They could avoid it all by making a uniformity of pressure and adapting burners throughout so as to give an abundance of light in every part of the premises, and not a strong light in one part and a feeble one in another. The fact is, the system of supplying the gas by the companies is a bad one. They aim to deliver it at the one inch pressure all over the city, but they take no means to insure this result other than by putting certain sized pipes in the street and recommending burners that must necessarily receive the gas and discharge it at an immensely varied pressure. This was demonstrated before the Legislative Committee by the companies themselves. General Roome himself testified before the Board of Aldermen that the pressure varied from two tenths of an inch to three inches, giving scarcely any light by the first, and an excessive waste of gas being the result of the other."

"Will putting up new burners supply the defects of the present bad gas?"

"No, not altogether by any means. I see some people make a mistake when they think the gas will give light enough if they get larger burners—we'll say two-thirds of an inch. That kind of a thing would in a large establishment where there are very many burners take up more gas than the pipes supply. The consequence would be they'd have, if they had any, more gas on the upper floors of the building than below, or rather, in nine cases out of ten, they'd have none below at all."

"Are the pipes in the streets as a general thing large enough?"

"Not by any means."

The gentleman then denounced the use of naphtha, as it is being used by some large establishments to lend greater brilliancy to the gas, on the ground that it is very dangerous. His idea as to the quality of the gas being almost unexceptionable will not hold good in the face of palpable facts. His views as to burners are very good in their way, but he certainly has outgrown the subject of the gas supplies lately to consumers, that attention he might have, else he would be more accurate in his estimate as to what the quality really is.

A Consumer's Ideas.

NO. 205 EAST