The Washington Times
Published Evening and Sunday at
THE MUNSEY BUILDING,
Penn. Ave., between 13th and 14th Sts.

New York Office.....173 Fifth Ave.
Chicago Office....1710 Commercial Bank Bldg.
Boston Office.....Journal Building

Daily, one year.....$3.00
Sunday, one year.....$2.50

FRANK A. MUNSEY.

The Times is served in the city of Washington and District of Columbia by newsboys, who deliver and collect for the paper on their own account at the rate of 6 cents a week for the Evening and 5 cents a copy for the Sunday edition.
Entered at the postoffice at Washington, D. C., as second class matter.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 1907.

Going to the Suburbs.

Another aspect of country life in Massachusetts is the fact that country life is disappearing under influences that are too familiar to be mentioned—the electric car and the automobile. Urban and suburban life are becoming one. It is no empty dream that New York and Boston are destined to be united by a continuous chain of municipalities, of which even the remote hill towns will be the suburbs.

The day, auspicious or otherwise, is in sight when there will be no real country life in Massachusetts, and no country problems as distinguished from city problems. The macadam road, the trolley car, the automobile with gasolene or denatured alcohol as motive power will surely obliterate the distinctions between city and country.

Thus the Boston Globe.

A good many problems will be solved by the coming of such a condition.

There will be fewer farm women losing their senses from the monotony and seclusion of their lives.

There will be fewer boys and girls growing up to consumption and warped morals in the city slums.

There will be fewer city milk routes, and less crowding in the city markets, while more and more food will be produced at the consumer's own back door.

There will be less theater-going and more star-gazing, less entertainment and more thought.

There will be fewer diseases of the nerves and more sunburn and chilblains

We shall find ourselves, in short, working back to conditions that make health, and we shall be far the better for it.

"Dense Black and Gray Smoke."

Indianapolis and Chicago are having trouble with the same "dense black and gray smoke" which has been known to disturb Washington now and then.

In the great city by the lake the law was aimed at the evil, not the smoke. Light gray smoke was permitted at certain hours; dense black smoke was forbidden at all hours. But the new mayor was not satisfied. He decided that the ordinance interfered with business. So it has not lately been enforced. The result is precisely what was to be expected—the old order has come back, and the improvement is a sweet-smelling, clear-eyed memory.

In Indianapolis they are debating whether to try or to stand still. But they have come to realize from the experience of their neighbors in Chicago that the enactment of law is not enough. The real question is: Shall the law be enforced?

Washington offers evidence not only that the evil can be corrected, but that smoke can be practically abolished from city air. It does not undertake to prove the wisdom of such an extreme, however. Its experience is cited only to show that honest officials with a rigorous law can accomplish the abatement even of smoke. Lately its inspectors have been able to do this without resorting to the questionable practice of smoke and automobile inspectors everywhere else—proving their case on their own say-so. They have taken to photographing the smoke, and at sight of the negative even the most doughty defendant has been known to wilt.

Let Chicago and Indianapolis take heart, therefore. But let them not follow quite so far. For a little smoke is a mighty good thing for a city that would provide its boys with employment and keep the profit of manufacturing its supplies largely in home tills.

Wireless Telephony.

Wireless telephony comes home to a good many people. The telephone has become so tremendously popular since its development by Dr. Bell some thirty years or so ago that every advance, whether theoretical or practical, has distinct interest.

Roughly, about one person in twenty in the city districts is a telephone subscriber. Are they to be benefited by the wireless telephone? It doesn't seem likely. More plausible is the conclusion that telephony without wires will serve particular emergencies rather than the general intercommunication to which the Bell system has accustomed us.

It is the remarkably widespread and serviceable intercommunication furnished by the several great telephone companies that has made the telephone so popular in this country. But it has required no less skill to bring about this uniform service than it did to invent the telephone itself.

This leads to the point from which the weakness of all these twentieth-century novelties, such as the wireless telephone, becomes apparent. The beauty of telephone service lies in the system, not in any particular apparatus. It may, indeed, be possible some day to carry on spasmodic communication by wireless telephone between Washington and Chicago, but the world that the telephone serves is critical and arbitrary, and accustomed to the detailed and often valuable information which is furnished by the central exchanges.

The telephone service furnished today either at long distance or locally is by no means ideal. But the telephone is still young; it has faults that are being overcome little by little; every year brings some improvement. The wireless telephone will have its special uses, no doubt, but it can hardly ever supplant its more ordinary and tangible prototype.

Mr. Thomas' Point in Gas Case.

Corporation Counsel Thomas is going to the bottom of this gas affair in commendable fashion. He attacks the constitutionality of the law which a too-accommodating Congress passed, permitting the gas companies to impose extortionate prices on this community under a load of dishonest, fictitious, and unfair capitalization.

Mr. Thomas is right in recognizing that if this law is good law, it probably will justify the scheme which the gas companies have so skillfully organized. The members of Congress who were responsible for this legislative outrage would not have dared openly to advocate a like imposition on the people of their home communities. They would have known that the righteous and potent wrath of an enfranchised community would revolt against such a procedure. But the people of Washington have no means to protect themselves. If a complaisant Congress hands to a group of promoters a franchise to exploit the town, there is no help for it. Congress is the town council; and this piece of legislation is evidence that it is as likely to err as any other like body.

But in this case it happens that there was a bungle. The managers of the gas companies' legislation provided that the judiciary should make the valuation of the gas properties, to be used as the basis of the inflated capitalization. Mr. Thomas proposes to demonstrate that the law is unconstitutional. He maintains that making such a valuation is not a judicial function. The grant of powers by the Constitution to the judiciary included no such function as this. There is a long line of decisions, in State and Federal courts, which seems strongly to support this view. There is nothing in this procedure of making a valuation which brings it within the province of the court. There are no parties to the matter; it is not a litigation; no issue is joined. There is no court procedure for handling such a matter, and when it came to actually doing the work the court has turned it over to an auditor! There could hardly be better practical proof that it is not a judicial proceeding.

Mr. Thomas is entitled to the earnest support of the District government and of the people in the fight he has undertaken to overthrow this law. It will be a long contest, and before it is ended the indignant protests of the people of Washington ought to bring about repeal of the act and summary prevention of such legalized robbery.

Only fourteen babies in a year among 1,021 Milwaukee club women. They can never use the stork brand there on the product that made Milwaukee famous.

Walter Wellman has sailed for home, but not in an airship.

Mr. Bryan may find that halo an obstruction in coming under the wire.

It took an earthquake to haul down the American flag on the volcanic isle of Bogaslof in Bering Sea.

Isn't it about time to turn off the water in some of those immunity baths?

Has Senator Platt's declaration for Mr. Taft punched the final hole in that boom?

Third term talk—terribly troubling to the trusts.

THE REPORTER.

The man behind a newspaper
Is the man who gets the news,
Who reads the plot of human hearts
And tragedy reviews.

Who breasts the storm on winter nights
And rushes through the rain
To tell the sum of happiness,
Of sorrow and of pain.

No laurel ever crowns his brow,
The world declines to praise,
He moves unnoticed and unknown
In crowded human ways.

No soldier in the ranks more brave,
No patriot more true,
A rare devotion is revealed
In all he tries to do.

And while no bugle blare may lift
His merit to the skies,
The world has lost a hero when
A good reporter dies.
—Birmingham Age-Herald.

HE KEPT STILL.

"You say he is the wisest man you know?"
"I think so."
"But he never says a word."
"I know it."
"Then how has he gained a reputation for wisdom?"
"By never saying a word."—Houston Post.

Three of Jurors in Bradley Case

JOHN SWEENEY. WILLIAM E. REISS. JAMES L. FEENEY.

BRADLEY PROSECUTION RESTS, AND DEFENSE BEGINS FIGHT

(Continued from First Page.)

line the opening of the case for the defense.

It must be said that a portion of the Government's testimony has been favorable to Mrs. Bradley, considering the defense made, in that three witnesses have testified that Mrs. Bradley seemed either dazed, very nervous, or that her face was distorted.

Government's Star Witness.

James Rowan, who may perhaps be regarded as the star witness for the Government, was the first witness of the day.

The usual questions were asked concerning his residence, which he gave as Salt Lake, saying that on November 27 last he was employed by Senator Brown as a watchman to look after his grounds and residence.

Q.—When did you go to work on that date?

A.—At 5 o'clock in the afternoon.

Q.—Did any one come there on the afternoon of November 27, 1906?

A.—Yes; Mrs. Bradley.

Q.—About what time?

A.—Between 6 and 7 o'clock.

Q.—Tell what she did?

Accosted Mrs. Bradley.

A.—I heard her come through the front gate, and went up the front yard to see what she wanted. I saw her going up the front steps, and stopped her, asking what she wanted. I told her that I had instructions not to let any one in, and she said that she was Mrs. Brown, and that it was very strange that she was not allowed to enter her own home. I told her that she was not Mrs. Brown, for Mrs. Brown had been dead for a number of years. Then she wanted to go up on the steps and sit down, and I let her do this.

Q.—What did she do next?

A.—Then she rang the door bell and a man came to the door, and she asked to see Mr. Brown. He told her that she could not see Mr. Brown and shut the door on her. Then she went over and sat on the railing.

Q.—Did she have anything at that time, and did you see it?

Said He Saw a Pistol.

A.—Yes; I saw a pistol. I saw her take a pistol from out of her coat, or somewhere, and put it in her muff. Soon after this she started down the steps and left the place.

Q.—Did you ever see her about the place again?

A.—Yes, on the 29th of November I went out and found her around the back yard in a little alley between the Brigham Young retaining wall and Mr. Brown's coal shed. I asked her what she wanted, and she said that she wanted to see Mr. Brown through the window. Then she went around to the back-yard gate and tried to get in, and I told her that she could not come in. She said she would come over the coal shed, which she did. I said, "You got down, did you?" and she laughed, and said "Yes."

Q.—Did she ask you if you had told Brown anything?

Talked About Pistol.

A.—Yes, she asked me if I had not told Mr. Brown that she had had a pistol the other time she was there, and asked me why I did it. I told her that I thought it was my duty to tell him. I asked her what she had a gun for anyway, and she said that she had it for Brown. I said, "You would not hurt an innocent party, would you?" and she said that she would not unless someone came between Brown and herself, and then if they did they would "get it," for that she was "a vicious woman."

Q.—When did you next see her, if at all?

A.—I saw her at the Flats on December 2, when she and the children were out in a cart.

Q.—What did she say then, if anything?

A.—She asked me why I did not tell her that Mr. Brown was going to Washington. I told her that I did not know it, and she said that she did, and that things were coming her way now.

Attorney Powers Takes a Hand.

Attorney Powers, who assumed charge of the examination as soon as the first Western witness was called, reviewed the ground gone over in the direct examination and in addition brought out a number of points not touched upon by the witness before.

In reply to questions witness said he thought that both Arthur Brown and Montgomery Brown were with Mrs. Bradley on December 2, when she was out driving in the Brown pony and cart. He said the fact of her having a gun on the night of the 27th was not mentioned at this conversation, but only at the second conversation on the 29th.

Witness said it was rather dark on the porch the night of her first visit, and that while there was light in the streets none was shining upon the porch from the windows of Brown's residence.

Cross-Examined About Gun.

Q.—Can you describe the gun which you say you saw in her hands?

A.—It seemed to be a dark gun.

Q.—It was not a nickel-plated gun.

A.—I do not know exactly, I could not see it very well it was all done so quickly.

Q.—Who did she say she had the gun for?

A.—Arthur Brown.

Q.—Did she say she had had the gun since she and Brown were at Pocatella, Idaho?

A.—No, she did not say how long.

Listened for His Voice.

Q.—Now on the second visit, after Mrs. Brown had come into the back yard, she went over to the window and said she was listening for Mr. Brown's voice, did she not?

A.—Yes, she stayed there about five minutes.

Q.—Did she not say that it was because she loved to hear his voice?

A.—No, not that I remember.

Q.—Then what did she do?

A.—She went on round to the front part of the house.

Q.—Tell what she next did, just as it happened.

Threw Stones at House.

A.—She stopped a second and stood there, after getting around toward the front of the house. Then she went around the east side of the lawn.

Q.—She did not make any threats at this time?

A.—No. But she began to throw stones against Senator Brown's window. I knocked some of them out of her hand, but she threw several, I should say, eight or ten.

Q. What did she say?

A.—She said that she wanted to bother Brown, so that he could have a good night's rest. I asked her hom she knew his room, and she said that she had been through the house lots of times.

Said She Was "Vicious Woman."

Q.—What happened then?

A.—She then said that I had told Brown that she had had a gun, and it was then that I asked her what she meant to do with it, and she said that she was a "vicious woman" and that anyone who came between Brown and herself ould get it.

Q.—What then?

A.—Then she told me something about the relations between herself and Brown. She said that she was a poor woman and the mother of four children, and that two of them were Brown's. She said: "I have Brown about crazy now, and he will be in the asylum before long." I said: "If you don't mind, Mr. Brown will have you in the police station for destroying his property." She said: "No, I will never go to the police station or the penitentiary, but I may go to the asylum, but I will get out in a short time."

She Spoke to "Harry."

Q.—What happened then.

A.—The door was opened and a young man that worked in Mr. Brown's office came out. She seemed to know his name and called him Harry in speaking to him.

Q.—Do you remember on the second visit that she had a handabg and would you know it now?

A.—Yes, it was a red-looking or garnet handbag, I think.

(Witness identified a bag of this color, which he said seemed to be the one Mrs. Bradley carried on that date.)

Q.—Why did you not take the gun away from her on that first day?

A.—Because I did not want to. I had no right to take it away from her. I did not want it so long as she did not try to harm me.

A. H. Kelly Called.

Albert H. Kelly, also of Salt Lake, was called.

He said that he had known Mrs. Bradley for twenty years. That he had frequently been thrown with her in political matters, Utah being a State in which women voted and took active interest.

Q.—Did you see her at any time during the summer of 1906.

A.—Yes, about the middle of the summer, I believe.

Q.—Tell what occurred.

A.—I met her at the corner of Third street south and Third street west, I believe, greeted her and asked what she was doing. She said that she was working. I asked her if Brown would not put up the money for her expenses. She said that he would when he wanted to. She said further, though, that she did not want Brown's money, that she wanted him. Then she said that if he did not acknowledge the parentage of her children she intended to kill him. I told her not to do this, that her children already had trouble enough facing them on account of her being a "mistress" without adding to it by murder. She said that she would have to do it, if Brown did not do the right thing by them.

Had Known Her Long.

On the cross-examination Judge Powers brought out that Kelly had known Mrs. Bradley for a number of years, since she was a girl of fourteen; in fact, beginning at a time when he was a member of the Salt Lake council. Mr. Kelly could not fix the exact time of the conversation, except to say that it was in June or July.

Q.—Did she appear ill at this time?

A.—No; she looked as though she had been working hard.

Q.—Did you ask her on this occasion where she was living or working?

A.—I asked her when she told me she was working if Brown would not pay her bills. I told her that I thought Brown would give her any amount wanted.

Was Talking as a Friend.

Q.—Had you ever had a conversation as intimate as that before?

A.—No. She told me at the time that no other man had talked in this manner to her, and I told her that I was talking as a friend.

Q.—When she said something about killing Brown what did you do?

A.—That was about all, that she would the children were already handicapped by her being a mistress.

Q.—Whose mistress did you say?

A.—We were talking about Brown.

Q.—What else did she say?

A.—That was about all, that she would have to kill him if he did not acknowledge the child.

All She Wanted Was Justice.

Q.—Did she appear to be in earnest, and did she not say also that all she desired was that he should do the right thing by her children or child which he had brought into the world?

A.—Yes.

Witness said that he had taken no particular notice of her countenance at the time, but that she seemed in a determined yet pleasant mood.

Q.—Did you notice any different expression in her eyes when she talked of killing Brown than at other times when she was not talking upon such a subject?

A.—No; she seemed more determined.

Q.—Did you say that you advised her to take the money?

A.—Yes; I told her I thought that would be the better way, if the man would not stand up to their contract as she wished.

Q.—Did you gather from her conversation that there was a contract?

A.—Only by common repute. (This answer was ruled out by the court.)

Police Matron on Stand.

Mrs. Marilla Thornburg, police matron at the House of Detention, told of having been with Mrs. Bradley the night of the tragedy and of the visit of Detective Grant and other officers who came to get a statement. She told of the conferences of Senator Sutherland. Her impression was that after this Mrs. Bradley had said that she would talk to some of the officers, but did not remember her words.

Lieut. James Hartley testified that he had also been present a short while and that he remembered that Mrs. Bradley had said that she did not want to have anything to say about the case.

Detective Tells Story.

Detective Grant, who was not allowed to testify yesterday afternoon, was then put upon the stand and told of his interview with Mrs. Bradley. He said:

"She said that she was Mrs. Bradley, of Salt Lake, and had been a companion of Brown and had lived with him for a number of years. I asked her why she shot him, and she would not answer. I asked her where she had got the pistol and she said that se brought it with her from Utah in er satchel. I asked her if she had shot Brown on the impulse of the moment, and she said "No," that she had thought about it for a long time, and had made up her mind that if he did not do the right thing by her she would kill him."

Memory Unreliable.

Witness admitted on cross-examination that he did not remember Mrs. Bradley saying she did not want to talk. He was pressed by Mr. Hoover to tell how he remembered other things she did say and did not remember this. Asked by Mr. Hoover for the notes taken upon the occasion he said that they had been destroyed.

Dr. Charles S. White, of the Emergency Hospital, described the two wounds in the abdomen of Senator Brown, also the operation performed upon him. He said Brown died on the fourth day on account of congestion of the kidneys and uraemic poison.

Sergeant Lohman, of No 1 precinct station, and Officer Lamb were also called and went over the testimony given yesterday afternoon which was not admitted at that time.

Court Adjourns Early.

Court adjourned at 1:40 o'clock, as counsel for the defense were not prepared for testimony-taking today.

Attorney Hoover outlined the defense as soon as the afternoon session began. He declared the defense of the little woman would be insanity. Mr. Hoover said that Mrs. Bradley was struck a stunning blow when five years old and her mind had been affected ever since.

He said Mrs. Bradley became a mother in the spring of 1906 and that Brown was the father of the child which lived only two days. Counsel for the defense declared former Senator Brown had performed three criminal operations on Mrs. Bradley's life from the cradle to the present time. He told of the relations between the defendant and former Senator Brown and declared emphatically that Mrs. Bradley spurned his attentions but Brown wormed his way into her life against her will.

Lured on by Promises.

"When Mrs. Brown," died, said Mr. Hoover, "Senator Brown told Mrs. Bradley to go and procure a divorce. She did this, and the wedding was set for June, 1906. When that time came Brown put her off. She begged him to keep his promise, but he kept putting her off. In December he came to Washington, giving her no reason whatever for coming.

"He gave her $200 before leaving, telling her that was the last she'd get from him. We propose to show you, gentlemen, that Mrs. Bradley's injury at an early age and her physical suffering and mental torture at the hands of this man who lured her to her ruin unhinged her mind, dethroned her reason, and made her utterly incapable of relalizing the quality of her act."

Policeman Lamb testified that Mrs. Bradley appeared nervous after the shooting. "Her eyes had an unnaotural look," said the witness, "and her face was distorted." Lamb said Mrs. Bradley told him on the day of the shooting that she brought the revolver with her.

Controversy of Counsel.

After the closing of The Times report yesterday afternoon, the few moments remaining before the adjournment of court were mainly consumed in a controversy between counsel as to the admissibility as evidence of the statements alleged to have been made by Mrs. Bradley just after the shooting.

These admissions are said to have been made at the police station, the contention of the Government being that they were voluntary on Mrs. Bradley's part, while the defense claims that the officers insisted that she tell about the affair.

Sergeant Lohman said Mrs. Bradley admitted she had shot a man, but that she refused to tell anything about herself. She wanted to know how Senator Brown was, and he telephoned the Emergency Hospital. He ascertained over the phone also the identity of the prisoner, and she seemed surprised when he called her by name. It was then, he said, that he questioned her, but told her frankly that everything she said would be used against her.

Officers Don't Agree.

The testimony of Policeman Lamb, who arrested Mrs. Bradley and wife was heard in court in the room at the time, conflicted somewhat with that of Sergeant Lohman, as he said that Mrs. Bradley had been questioned before Lohman telephoned the hospital. Mrs. Bradley, he said, seemed extremely anxious to know of Senator Brown's condition.

Detective Clifford L. Grant had also endeavored to question Mrs. Bradley, and Attorney Hoover strengthened his position in objecting to this line of testimony when he asked:

"Despite your telling the woman, as you say, that anything she said would be used against her, is it not true that you were sent there for the very purpose of obtaining information to be used against her?"

"No, Detective Burlingame had been sent for that purpose," replied the witness.

"And Detective Burlingame having failed to get all information wanted, you were sent to complete the job, were you not?" pressed Mr. Hoover.

Looking for Information.

To this Mr. Grant said he was merely trying to get needed information as to the identity of the woman.

Justice Stafford said that he would not admit for the present evidence as to Mrs. Bradley's admissions on the day of the shooting until the subject was gone into further.

An important point brought out by Mr. Hoover in questioning Detective Grant was that Mrs. Bradley had hesitated in answering questions at first, but that later she seemed to rather recover her composure and talked better.

Officer Emett identified the pistol and two empty and three loaded shells taken from it the day of the shooting.

Clerks Holtzclaw and Gumpert, of the Raleigh, testified to such details connected with the tragedy as had practically been gone over by the other hotel witnesses at the morning session. Clerk Holtzclaw said Mrs. Bradley had made some voluntary statements, but seemed rather to be talking to herself, and that he had not questioned her. He believed she asked to send a telegram.

Boyish Looking Max Brown Learns Father's Hidden Life While Watching His Slayer

In the crowd of spectators who have attended the Bradley trial since its beginning, there is always one figure that stands out conspicuously. It is Max Brown, son of the man who was slain, who reached Washington shortly before his father died, and who has crossed the continent to aid in bringing his father's slayer to justice.

Young Brown always sits in the front row of spectators and a visitor to the court would never think to find in the slender, boyish fellow the one person in all the world who is, or should be, most bitter toward Mrs. Bradley. The first day he came and every day since, no one has even glanced at Brown in the desire to catch every flicker of emotion that passes across Mrs. Bradley's face, and in an effort to see if she will give some sign that may tell a morbid, curiosity seeker just how deep her feelings are—just how bitterly she is suffering for love and honor lost.

Looks Like College Student.

Max Brown looks like a college youth. One can almost see him in his sweater and cap singing the songs of his alma mater and cheering for his college team. His features are clean cut, his head is well poised, and his whole appearance is that of youth dragged from the full enjoyment of life, in all its brightest phases, and thrust into the center of one of the most sorrowful, one of the most tragic pictures Life could conceive. Brown is only twenty-five years old.

This straight, youthful, attractive fellow sits in the courtroom day after day hearing more of his father's unfortunate love affair with Mrs. Bradley than he probably ever dreamed of. Before the trial opened a deathbed scene was fresh in his mind. He had seen his father suffer all the agonies that finally sapped his life away—he had known from early youth that Mrs. Bradley had been the figure which first hovered over his home and then drifted into the lives of his parents only to part them, to bring sorrow to his mother and desolation to her own home.

Sat at Father's Deathbed.

When he came to Washington and saw his father, wounded, dying, he was told that the same women who had won him away years ago had stricken him down. When the last spark of life left his father's body, young Brown was, indeed, face to face with the grim tragedy. Life stared him in the face. As long as his father had lived, there was a hope that, perhaps, after all, everything would go right, and all might be well. But when death came young Brown knew that for his father the tragedy was over—and for him it had only just begun. As the body of the man was carried to the District morgue that night, the frail little woman whose hand had done the deed was taken to jail, and two days afterward Max Brown was on his sad journey West, taking back to the scenes of his greatest triumphs, his greatest failures, the body of the man who had helped a woman first to disgrace and dishonor in the eyes of the world, and then to the deary, dull, horrifying confinement in a prison cell.

So Max Brown sits today, with eyes fixed first on the jury which will either condemn Mrs. Bradley or send her out into the world a free woman, and then on the slight little figure in black around whom the dreadful story now revolves. No matter where Max Brown looks, either at judge, jury, counsel or witness, his eyes must pass that figure. She is always in front of him, always between him and the one to whom he directs his attention, always, always, always there—a grim reminder of his father's past—a weeping, sorrowful, lonely woman, thousands of miles from home, with every hope gone.

Expurgated Newspapers Given to Bradley Jury

In order that the jury in the Bradley murder case may not find life too monotonous during the trial, Judge Stafford yesterday gave them permission to read the newspapers after all stories relating to the case had been clipped from the papers. This is a great concession and the first time it has been accorded to a jury in Washington.

Samuel McC. Hawken, clerk to Judge Stafford, was detailed to censor the papers and it required several hours yesterday afternoon to complete the work of clipping the accounts of the trial.

Inasmuch as the case is occupying a great amount of space not only in the local papers but in out-of-town journals, the newspapers looked like a cyclone had struck them when Mr. Hawken got through.

However, the jurors were glad to get them as they were and sat up until 9 o'clock last night reading what news there was left.

HOSPITAL TOOK 800 "DRUNKS"

As indicating the extent of alcoholism in the District of Columbia, it is stated by George S. Wilson, secretary of the Board of Charities, that last year the several emergency hospitals and the Washington Asylum Hospital treated more than 800 such cases. This statement is contained in a report to Commissioner West.

Mr. Wilson states that there are no persons confined in St. Elizabeth's simply as inebriates, but are held there only when insane.

"In numerous cases," he says, "alcoholism is a cause of insanity, but, as I understand the matter, persons who are insane as a result of alcoholism are proper subjects for a hospital for the insane, and not for an inebriate asylum."

Referring to the number of cases of alcoholism in the District, Mr. Wilson says:

"There is no way of determining without an exhaustive examination how many of these cases are chronic, and it is not known known how many different persons were represented in these 800 cases. Doubtless there were very many repeaters, because it is a well-known fact that the same person is likely to turn up in the alcoholic ward again and again, so that the 800 persons do not represent anything like that number of separate persons. The board has never been able to make an investigation sufficiently exhaustive to determine with any degree of accuracy the number of persons in the District of Columbia who might be classed as 'chronic inebriates.'"

CHICAGO PIONEER DEAD.

CHICAGO, Nov. 15.—Col. John S. Cooper, lawyer, civil war veteran, and pioneer of Chicago, died early this morning at his home, 195 Thirtieth street. His wife is dangerously ill with pleurisy, and has told her friends that she does not desire to recover now that her husband is dead.

WALL ST. BANKS MUST DISGORGE

Western Senators and Representatives Call New York Financial Glutton.

Has New York city been a financial glutton?

Western Senators and Representatives, just arriving, and Western financiers who have been coming and going for the last few weeks, say yes.

A few days will likely disclose whether the metropolis must stand guilty as charged.

A small part of the many millions of the public money placed with its bankers is being withdrawn, and more must be yielded up later. If business conditions are not thereby disturbed, the amount New York holds will be steadily reduced. The money will be diverted into channels that have been waiting for many weeks to receive it.

It is pointed out that the financial kings of the metropolis have been given sufficient time in which to gain the mastery over an embarrassing situation. Notwithstanding the fact that they have had nearly $50,000,000 from the Government since late summer, and have taken out increased circulation to the amount of $5,000,000 since November 1, it has required several "suggestions" from the Secretary of the Treasury to make them let go. All this time Treasury experts were striving to devise means to meet pressing demands to aid in the movement of crops and to keep factories in operation.

At the moment when Secretary Cortelyou called on the New York banks for 10 per cent of the Government funds deposited therein, the Treasury's working balance had shrunken to a little more than $7,000,000. Certain public men, who have charged unjustifiable greed on the part of New York money kings, have figured out a connection between the causes leading up to the present situation, and the $50,000,000 anti-Roosevelt conspiracy given publicity from the White House in the early spring.

They are imputing bad motives on the part of certain "masters of industry" and declare that the recent lack of confidence that forced such tremendous withdrawals from banks has been brought about largely through the creation of a false spirit of unrest by those who have been fighting the Administration's anti-trust policy.

Secretary Cortelyou would countenance no such belief if such an expression should reach him. He is not trying to discover the origin of the disease. He is merely meeting a condition that exists, and is applying medicine in allopathic doses to cure the ailment. He purposes to continue to the full extent of his power in using the resources of the Government to extend all possible monetary relief to legitimate business interests anywhere in the country.

FARMS IN CANAL ZONE BIG MONEY-MAKERS

—*E. W. Bucklin*

E. W. Bucklin, of Jamestown, N. Y., a former Rough Rider, and now an employe of the Panama Canal Commission, called at the White House today to say good-by to the President before leaving for the Isthmus.

"This will be my second visit to the canal zone," said Mr. Bucklin, "and I will be glad to go. The isthmus is becoming more and more like part of the civilized world. I expect to become interested in agriculture down there, after my work with the commission is finished. The Chinese gardeners in the zone are now growing rich from their little plots of land. There are unlimited possibilities, too, in cocoanut cultivation."

WATERS FREEZING STREET; DRIVER LOSES HIS PLACE

Louisiana avenue, from John Marshall place to Seventh street, resembled the surface of an ice pond this morning because a driver of a sprinkling cart emptied the contents of his wagon on that thoroughfare on his return trip to the stable. The mercury was at that time below the freezing point, resulting in the ice and several minor accidents to teams. John T. Twohey, Superintendent of Street Cleaning, thereupon became busy and, after investigation, directed the discharge of the driver responsible for the conversion of the avenue into a skating pond.