

THE EXTENSION OF CORPORATE LIMITS

Plan Submitted by Subcommittee of Council.

BENEFITS TO BE DERIVED
Population Will Go Above One Hundred Thousand Mark.

THE QUESTION OF TAXATION

President of the Board of Health Advocates Extension on Sanitary Grounds—Report to Be Fully Considered By Committee at Later Date—Other Meetings.

The report was received, but no action taken upon it. Upon motion of Mr. Mills, the papers embodied in the report were ordered to be printed and to be distributed among the members of the committee, and one sent to each of the heads of the Gas, Water, Street, Fire and Police Departments, with the request that they furnish to the committee estimates as to the cost entailed upon their departments by the additional amount of territory.

WORK OF OTHER COMMITTEES.

Several Meetings Held, All Devoted to Routine Business.

The Schools Committee met at 8 o'clock, with Messrs. Burton, Mills, Camp, Mann and Williams present. The action of the committee at its last meeting, in recommending an appropriation of \$200 for the Mechanics' Institute, was reconsidered upon motion of Mr. Mann and a resolution making the sum \$100 was adopted. This was done at the request of the Board of Directors of the Institute, who stated that the increased sum was necessary in order to carry on the curriculum of the institute for the present term.

WINDOW GLASS BROKEN.

Robbery Committed Within a Store's Throw of the Police Station.

A bold robbery was committed on Wednesday night between 8 and 9 o'clock at No. 154 East Main Street, the Union Clothing Company's store. The robbery was considered most bold from the fact that the Main Street Depot is just across the street, and people were passing in the neighborhood. A policeman was standing in front of the depot at the time, but heard no sound nor saw anything suspicious. The discovery was made by a pedestrian and reported at once to the police station. An officer went at once to investigate. He found a large pane of glass in the front window broken and several articles of wearing apparel are reported as missing.

GOOD ROADS TRAIN SEEMS CERTAIN

County Has Made Appropriation and the City Will Do Her Part.

It seems reasonably certain that the Southern's good roads train will be brought to Richmond. The meeting of the Chamber of Commerce Committee interested in the matter, held yesterday evening in the office of Colonel W. E. Cutshaw, did not result in anything definite in regard to the question, but from the general interest and much which characterized the statements made by Messrs. O. H. Funsten, T. A. Cary and T. M. Wortham, it is evident the matter is in good hands and will be successfully put through.

PROPOSED TERRITORY.

The proposed line runs from the present line and Mr. Calvary Cemetery to the west of Reservoir Park, and to within a short distance of the Belt Line Railway, and runs to the north of Brookland Park Boulevard, taking in Barton Heights, Chestnut Hill, Fairmount and the territory between the National Cemetery and the National Cemetery Road to Williamsburg Road, to Almond Creek, down Almond Creek to the James River, taking in all of Fulton and the manufacturing plants below Fulton.

MATTER OF TAXATION.

In presenting the report Chairman Walker stated that the arrangement of taxation would be advantageous to the county people, whom it is proposed to bring into the city. The rate of taxation in the city is \$1.40; that proposed for the territory is 80 cents. In the districts of Tuckahoe, Brookland, Barton Heights, Chestnut Hill, Fairmount, and Virginia the average taxation is 60 cents; in the districts of Brookland, Barton Heights, 42; Brookland Hill, 7; Fairmount, 44; Fairmount, 69; Virginia, 44. This taxation includes county schools and special taxation.

DR. OPPENHIMER FAVORED IT.

Dr. W. T. Oppenheimer, president of the Board of Health, spoke in favor of the adoption of the report on sanitary grounds. He was in favor of extending the corporate limits over the entire territory proposed for annexation, if for nothing else.

The territory proposed for annexation does not include the Dooley and Easley estates, the owners of which are opposed to annexation. This is considered a serious objection, as it indicates a desire to avoid all unnecessary friction.

FIRE SWEEPS NORFOLK IN THE EARLY MORNING

Columbia Building, Atlantic Hotel and Virginia Club Burned.

GUESTS THOUGHT TO HAVE ESCAPED

(Special to The Times Over Long-Distance Telephone Line.)

(Special Dispatch to The Times.)
NORFOLK, Va., Jan. 31, 4 A. M.—The most disastrous fire in its history, fanned by a stiff westward breeze, swept Norfolk this morning, wiping a block out of the heart of the city and causing a loss of over half a million dollars. At this hour—4 A. M.—it is not subdued, and the loss may be magnified many times.

ARE PANIC-STRICKEN.

The entire business section is threatened and a panic has invaded property-owners, who are rushing their valuables out of the path of the devouring flames. The entire fire department of the cities of Norfolk and Portsmouth is fighting heroically, and with the help of the wind will probably subdue the fire demon without further success.

SO FAR AS IS KNOWN.

No loss of life is reported, and it is hoped that none has occurred. This is true, however, is not known absolutely. Every precaution was taken by the Atlantic Hotel management to awaken all asleep in the house. It is hoped this was accomplished.

THE DETAILS BY PRESS.

Story of the Fire up to the Time the Operators Had to Flee.

(By Associated Press.)
NORFOLK, Va., Jan. 31.—At 2:10 o'clock this morning fire was discovered in the first floor of the Columbia building, on Granby Street, owned by Lowenberg and occupied by Brown's saloon, Neddo's restaurant, and on the upper floors by about 150 offices. In fifteen minutes the flames were bursting through the roof and the rear wall had fallen in. Explosions of whiskey barrels in Brown's saloon blew out the front of the first and second floors and scattered the flames across the street.

REAL MURDERERS ARE HERE

The Supporters of Administration Policy in the Islands Real Slayers of the Troops.

Termed the Pending Bill a Departure From Every Principle That is Right.

SCHLEY'S TOUR.

Enthusiasm Displaced Over the Admiral in Kentuck City.

(By Associated Press.)
LOUISVILLE, Ky., Jan. 29.—Admiral Schley was to-day the guest of the Louisville Knights Templar. At 10 o'clock, in company with the members of the order, he was brought to the city by a special train. At the depot he was given an enthusiastic greeting. At 11 o'clock Admiral and Mrs. Schley were entertained at breakfast by Mr. and Mrs. T. L. Jefferson at their residence, and at 1:30 o'clock the Admiral rode in state to the Masonic Widows and Orphans Home.

TRIGG'S CONDITION.

Mr. William R. Trigg's condition yesterday was unimproved. His improvement has been so marked during the last few days.

The Columbia office building is destroyed. The fine Atlantic Hotel is a mass of ruins. The Virginia Club is no more, and other large business houses are burned to the ground, while the flames are devouring others.

CONTINENTAL SELLS ITS PETERSBURG PLANT

S. W. Venable Branch Goes to American Cigar Co.

FACTORY HAS CLOSED DOWN

The American Cigar Company May Take Care of the Hands Thrown Out of Employment, But Will Move the Machinery to One of Their Other Plants—Will Employ Many Hands.

(Special Dispatch to The Times.)
PETERSBURG, Va., Jan. 29.—The S. W. Venable branch of the Continental Tobacco Company in this city closed down today by direction of the head office in New York, which telegraphed these orders. The plant has been purchased by the American Cigar Company, which is now operating a plant in this city in buildings adjoining those of the plant just purchased.

REAL MURDEROUS.

The effort to treat the Filipinos as chattels is a crime, he declared, was "damnable," and he charged the majority side with being the "real murderers of our troops in the Philippines."

FOR HOME CONSUMPTION.

While Mr. Tillman was speaking several Senators engaged in conversation among themselves. To these Mr. Tillman objected because of interruptions, and he requested that the Senators so engaged retire to the cloak room. For once, he said, he was making a speech for home consumption.

PRINCE HENRY INVITED.

Governor Montague Extends Him a Cordial Invitation to Richmond.

Prince Henry will be invited to visit Richmond on his Southern trip. And if he accepts, he will be given a royal welcome.

GOVERNOR MONTAGUE EXTENDS HIM A CORDIAL INVITATION TO RICHMOND.

Prince Henry will be invited to visit Richmond on his Southern trip. And if he accepts, he will be given a royal welcome.

GOVERNOR MONTAGUE EXTENDS HIM A CORDIAL INVITATION TO RICHMOND.

Prince Henry will be invited to visit Richmond on his Southern trip. And if he accepts, he will be given a royal welcome.

GOVERNOR MONTAGUE EXTENDS HIM A CORDIAL INVITATION TO RICHMOND.

Prince Henry will be invited to visit Richmond on his Southern trip. And if he accepts, he will be given a royal welcome.

The Continental Company, since they became owners, have spent \$25,000 on improvements alone. The company has recently purchased plants in Alabama, Ohio, and other States, and expects to dispossess of some of them. The factory in Petersburg was not one of the plants the company desired to dispose of, and no negotiations had been going on for its sale.

LIQUOR DEALERS WANT TO CLOSE MOVEMENT ON FOOT TO PUT A STOP TO THE SUNDAY BACK-DOOR BUSINESS.

WANT TO CLOSE

Movement on Foot to Put a Stop to the Sunday Back-Door Business.

A movement was set on foot last night by the liquor dealers of Richmond who are opposed to keeping their saloons open on Sunday, which, if carried out, will, in their opinion, place the liquor traffic on a higher plane.

LIQUOR DEALERS WANT TO CLOSE

Movement on Foot to Put a Stop to the Sunday Back-Door Business.

LIQUOR DEALERS WANT TO CLOSE

Movement on Foot to Put a Stop to the Sunday Back-Door Business.

LIQUOR DEALERS WANT TO CLOSE

Movement on Foot to Put a Stop to the Sunday Back-Door Business.

LIQUOR DEALERS WANT TO CLOSE

Movement on Foot to Put a Stop to the Sunday Back-Door Business.

LIQUOR DEALERS WANT TO CLOSE

Movement on Foot to Put a Stop to the Sunday Back-Door Business.

LIQUOR DEALERS WANT TO CLOSE

Movement on Foot to Put a Stop to the Sunday Back-Door Business.

The liquor dealers of Richmond who are opposed to keeping their saloons open on Sunday, which, if carried out, will, in their opinion, place the liquor traffic on a higher plane.

THE LOOP BROUGHT UP AGAIN

COURT'S OPINION IS QUOTED THAT BROOKLYN LAST DISTANCE BY MAKING IT ALSO DELAYED

(The Credit—Say Question Is Not of Texas—But Course of Admiral Schley.)

(By Associated Press.)
WASHINGTON, D. C., Jan. 30.—The comment of Judge-Advocate-General Lemly and Solicitor Hanna upon the appeal of Admiral Schley as submitted to the President by Secretary Long begins with the statement that Admiral Schley and his counsel have shifted their ground. They say the chief features of the case were "the retrograde movement," "disobedience of orders," "inaccurate and misleading official reports," "failure to destroy vessels of the enemy lying within sight" and "injustice to a brother officer." These matters are all grave. The first was that the finest aggregation of American naval vessels under one command was by Schley's direction turned about and headed for Key West, more than 700 miles distant, when within twenty-two miles of Santiago, where the enemy's ships were.

THE LOOP AGAIN.

It is admitted that the precept is broad enough to have permitted the court to go into the question, but it is recalled that although the judge-advocate expressed a willingness to go into the question, he did not deem it necessary or proper to do so. The judge-advocate, they say, might have shown that it was Admiral Sampson's plan of night blockade that forced Cervantes to come out in the daylight, and Captain Clark is quoted as saying that Admiral Schley's opinion is quoted to the effect that the American ships charged in "according to the original plan to sink the enemy in the channels," and that "that plan failed because the enemy had succeeded in passing the blockade line." They ask why did the enemy succeed, and declare "the Brooklyn, having abandoned its position on the left of the line, thereby left an unguarded opening along the western shore, through which the Spanish fleet passed our ships and attempted to escape." The court's opinion is quoted to the effect that the Brooklyn lost distance in position by the "loop" and delayed the Texas. To sustain their contention that Sampson was in command, the commentators quote from Schley's report of July 6, 1898, as follows:

THE LOOP AGAIN.

It is admitted that the precept is broad enough to have permitted the court to go into the question, but it is recalled that although the judge-advocate expressed a willingness to go into the question, he did not deem it necessary or proper to do so. The judge-advocate, they say, might have shown that it was Admiral Sampson's plan of night blockade that forced Cervantes to come out in the daylight, and Captain Clark is quoted as saying that Admiral Schley's opinion is quoted to the effect that the American ships charged in "according to the original plan to sink the enemy in the channels," and that "that plan failed because the enemy had succeeded in passing the blockade line." They ask why did the enemy succeed, and declare "the Brooklyn, having abandoned its position on the left of the line, thereby left an unguarded opening along the western shore, through which the Spanish fleet passed our ships and attempted to escape." The court's opinion is quoted to the effect that the Brooklyn lost distance in position by the "loop" and delayed the Texas. To sustain their contention that Sampson was in command, the commentators quote from Schley's report of July 6, 1898, as follows:

THE LOOP AGAIN.

It is admitted that the precept is broad enough to have permitted the court to go into the question, but it is recalled that although the judge-advocate expressed a willingness to go into the question, he did not deem it necessary or proper to do so. The judge-advocate, they say, might have shown that it was Admiral Sampson's plan of night blockade that forced Cervantes to come out in the daylight, and Captain Clark is quoted as saying that Admiral Schley's opinion is quoted to the effect that the American ships charged in "according to the original plan to sink the enemy in the channels," and that "that plan failed because the enemy had succeeded in passing the blockade line." They ask why did the enemy succeed, and declare "the Brooklyn, having abandoned its position on the left of the line, thereby left an unguarded opening along the western shore, through which the Spanish fleet passed our ships and attempted to escape." The court's opinion is quoted to the effect that the Brooklyn lost distance in position by the "loop" and delayed the Texas. To sustain their contention that Sampson was in command, the commentators quote from Schley's report of July 6, 1898, as follows:

THE LOOP AGAIN.

It is admitted that the precept is broad enough to have permitted the court to go into the question, but it is recalled that although the judge-advocate expressed a willingness to go into the question, he did not deem it necessary or proper to do so. The judge-advocate, they say, might have shown that it was Admiral Sampson's plan of night blockade that forced Cervantes to come out in the daylight, and Captain Clark is quoted as saying that Admiral Schley's opinion is quoted to the effect that the American ships charged in "according to the original plan to sink the enemy in the channels," and that "that plan failed because the enemy had succeeded in passing the blockade line." They ask why did the enemy succeed, and declare "the Brooklyn, having abandoned its position on the left of the line, thereby left an unguarded opening along the western shore, through which the Spanish fleet passed our ships and attempted to escape." The court's opinion is quoted to the effect that the Brooklyn lost distance in position by the "loop" and delayed the Texas. To sustain their contention that Sampson was in command, the commentators quote from Schley's report of July 6, 1898, as follows:

THE LOOP AGAIN.

It is admitted that the precept is broad enough to have permitted the court to go into the question, but it is recalled that although the judge-advocate expressed a willingness to go into the question, he did not deem it necessary or proper to do so. The judge-advocate, they say, might have shown that it was Admiral Sampson's plan of night blockade that forced Cervantes to come out in the daylight, and Captain Clark is quoted as saying that Admiral Schley's opinion is quoted to the effect that the American ships charged in "according to the original plan to sink the enemy in the channels," and that "that plan failed because the enemy had succeeded in passing the blockade line." They ask why did the enemy succeed, and declare "the Brooklyn, having abandoned its position on the left of the line, thereby left an unguarded opening along the western shore, through which the Spanish fleet passed our ships and attempted to escape." The court's opinion is quoted to the effect that the Brooklyn lost distance in position by the "loop" and delayed the Texas. To sustain their contention that Sampson was in command, the commentators quote from Schley's report of July 6, 1898, as follows:

THE LOOP AGAIN.

It is admitted that the precept is broad enough to have permitted the court to go into the question, but it is recalled that although the judge-advocate expressed a willingness to go into the question, he did not deem it necessary or proper to do so. The judge-advocate, they say, might have shown that it was Admiral Sampson's plan of night blockade that forced Cervantes to come out in the daylight, and Captain Clark is quoted as saying that Admiral Schley's opinion is quoted to the effect that the American ships charged in "according to the original plan to sink the enemy in the channels," and that "that plan failed because the enemy had succeeded in passing the blockade line." They ask why did the enemy succeed, and declare "the Brooklyn, having abandoned its position on the left of the line, thereby left an unguarded opening along the western shore, through which the Spanish fleet passed our ships and attempted to escape." The court's opinion is quoted to the effect that the Brooklyn lost distance in position by the "loop" and delayed the Texas. To sustain their contention that Sampson was in command, the commentators quote from Schley's report of July 6, 1898, as follows:

The court's opinion is quoted to the effect that the Brooklyn lost distance in position by the "loop" and delayed the Texas. To sustain their contention that Sampson was in command, the commentators quote from Schley's report of July 6, 1898, as follows:

CLAIM THAT SCHLEY HAS SHIFTED GROUND

Comment of Judge-Advocate Upon Admiral's Appeal.

QUESTION OF COMMAND

Attempt to Prove from Schley's Dispatches It Was Sampson.

THE LOOP BROUGHT UP AGAIN

Court's Opinion Is Quoted That Brooklyn Last Distance by Making It Also Delayed

(The Credit—Say Question Is Not of Texas—But Course of Admiral Schley.)

(By Associated Press.)
WASHINGTON, D. C., Jan. 30.—The comment of Judge-Advocate-General Lemly and Solicitor Hanna upon the appeal of Admiral Schley as submitted to the President by Secretary Long begins with the statement that Admiral Schley and his counsel have shifted their ground. They say the chief features of the case were "the retrograde movement," "disobedience of orders," "inaccurate and misleading official reports," "failure to destroy vessels of the enemy lying within sight" and "injustice to a brother officer." These matters are all grave. The first was that the finest aggregation of American naval vessels under one command was by Schley's direction turned about and headed for Key West, more than 700 miles distant, when within twenty-two miles of Santiago, where the enemy's ships were.

THE LOOP AGAIN.

It is admitted that the precept is broad enough to have permitted the court to go into the question, but it is recalled that although the judge-advocate expressed a willingness to go into the question, he did not deem it necessary or proper to do so. The judge-advocate, they say, might have shown that it was Admiral Sampson's plan of night blockade that forced Cervantes to come out in the daylight, and Captain Clark is quoted as saying that Admiral Schley's opinion is quoted to the effect that the American ships charged in "according to the original plan to sink the enemy in the channels," and that "that plan failed because the enemy had succeeded in passing the blockade line." They ask why did the enemy succeed, and declare "the Brooklyn, having abandoned its position on the left of the line, thereby left an unguarded opening along the western shore, through which the Spanish fleet passed our ships and attempted to escape." The court's opinion is quoted to the effect that the Brooklyn lost distance in position by the "loop" and delayed the Texas. To sustain their contention that Sampson was in command, the commentators quote from Schley's report of July 6, 1898, as follows:

THE LOOP AGAIN.

It is admitted that the precept is broad enough to have permitted the court to go into the question, but it is recalled that although the judge-advocate expressed a willingness to go into the question, he did not deem it necessary or proper to do so. The judge-advocate, they say, might have shown that it was Admiral Sampson's plan of night blockade that forced Cervantes to come out in the daylight, and Captain Clark is quoted as saying that Admiral Schley's opinion is quoted to the effect that the American ships charged in "according to the original plan to sink the enemy in the channels," and that "that plan failed because the enemy had succeeded in passing the blockade line." They ask why did the enemy succeed, and declare "the Brooklyn, having abandoned its position on the left of the line, thereby left an unguarded opening along the western shore, through which the Spanish fleet passed our ships and attempted to escape." The court's opinion is quoted to the effect that the Brooklyn lost distance in position by the "loop" and delayed the Texas. To sustain their contention that Sampson was in command, the commentators quote from Schley's report of July 6, 1898, as follows:

THE LOOP AGAIN.

It is admitted that the precept is broad enough to have permitted the court to go into the question, but it is recalled that although the judge-advocate expressed a willingness to go into the question, he did not deem it necessary or proper to do so. The judge-advocate, they say, might have shown that it was Admiral Sampson's plan of night blockade that forced Cervantes to come out in the daylight, and Captain Clark is quoted as saying that Admiral Schley's opinion is quoted to the effect that the American ships charged in "according to the original plan to sink the enemy in the channels," and that "that plan failed because the enemy had succeeded in passing the blockade line." They ask why did the enemy succeed, and declare "the Brooklyn, having abandoned its position on the left of the line, thereby left an unguarded opening along the western shore, through which the Spanish fleet passed our ships and attempted to escape." The court's opinion is quoted to the effect that the Brooklyn lost distance in position by the "loop" and delayed the Texas. To sustain their contention that Sampson was in command, the commentators quote from Schley's report of July 6, 1898, as follows:

THE LOOP AGAIN.

It is admitted that the precept is broad enough to have permitted the court to go into the question, but it is recalled that although the judge-advocate expressed a willingness to go into the question, he did not deem it necessary or proper to do so. The judge-advocate, they say, might have shown that it was Admiral Sampson's plan of night blockade that forced Cervantes to come out in the daylight, and Captain Clark is quoted as saying that Admiral Schley's opinion is quoted to the effect that the American ships charged in "according to the original plan to sink the enemy in the channels," and that "that plan failed because the enemy had succeeded in passing the blockade line." They ask why did the enemy succeed, and declare "the Brooklyn, having abandoned its position on the left of the line, thereby left an unguarded opening along the western shore, through which the Spanish fleet passed our ships and attempted to escape." The court's opinion is quoted to the effect that the Brooklyn lost distance in position by the "loop" and delayed the Texas. To sustain their contention that Sampson was in command, the commentators quote from Schley's report of July 6, 1898, as follows:

THE LOOP AGAIN.

It is admitted that the precept is broad enough to have permitted the court to go into the question, but it is recalled that although the judge-advocate expressed a willingness to go into the question, he did not deem it necessary or proper to do so. The judge-advocate, they say, might have shown that it was Admiral Sampson's plan of night blockade that forced Cervantes to come out in the daylight, and Captain Clark is quoted as saying that Admiral Schley's opinion is quoted to the effect that the American ships charged in "according to the original plan to sink the enemy in the channels," and that "that plan failed because the enemy had succeeded in passing the blockade line." They ask why did the enemy succeed, and declare "the Brooklyn, having abandoned its position on the left of the line, thereby left an unguarded opening along the western shore, through which the Spanish fleet passed our ships and attempted to escape." The court's opinion is quoted to the effect that the Brooklyn lost distance in position by the "loop" and delayed the Texas. To sustain their contention that Sampson was in command, the commentators quote from Schley's report of July 6, 1898, as follows:

THE LOOP AGAIN.

It is admitted that the precept is broad enough to have permitted the court to go into the question, but it is recalled that although the judge-advocate expressed a willingness to go into the question, he did not deem it necessary or proper to do so. The judge-advocate, they say, might have shown that it was Admiral Sampson's plan of night blockade that forced Cervantes to come out in the daylight, and Captain Clark is quoted as saying that Admiral Schley's opinion is quoted to the effect that the American ships charged in "according to the original plan to sink the enemy in the channels," and that "that plan failed because the enemy had succeeded in passing the blockade line." They ask why did the enemy succeed, and declare "the Brooklyn, having abandoned its position on the left of the line, thereby left an unguarded opening along the western shore, through which the Spanish fleet passed our ships and attempted to escape." The court's opinion is quoted to the effect that the Brooklyn lost distance in position by the "loop" and delayed the Texas. To sustain their contention that Sampson was in command, the commentators quote from Schley's report of July 6, 1898, as follows:

The court's opinion is quoted to the effect that the Brooklyn lost distance in position by the "loop" and delayed the Texas. To sustain their contention that Sampson was in command, the commentators quote from Schley's report of July 6, 1898, as follows:

CLAIM THAT SCHLEY HAS SHIFTED GROUND

Comment of Judge-Advocate Upon Admiral's Appeal.

QUESTION OF COMMAND

Attempt to Prove from Schley's Dispatches It Was Sampson.

THE LOOP BROUGHT UP AGAIN

Court's Opinion Is Quoted That Brooklyn Last Distance by Making It Also Delayed

(The Credit—Say Question Is Not of Texas—But Course of Admiral Schley.)

(By Associated Press.)
WASHINGTON, D. C., Jan. 30.—The comment of Judge-Advocate-General Lemly and Solicitor Hanna upon the appeal of Admiral Schley as submitted to the President by Secretary Long begins with the statement that Admiral Schley and his counsel have shifted their ground. They say the chief features of the case were "the retrograde movement," "disobedience of orders," "inaccurate and misleading official reports," "failure to destroy vessels of the enemy lying within sight" and "injustice to a brother officer." These matters are all grave. The first was that the finest aggregation of American naval vessels under one command was by Schley's direction turned about and headed for Key West, more than 700 miles distant, when within twenty-two miles of Santiago, where the enemy's ships were.

THE LOOP AGAIN.

It is admitted that the precept is broad enough to have permitted the court to go into the question, but it is recalled that although the judge-advocate expressed a willingness to go into the question, he did not deem it necessary or proper to do so. The judge-advocate, they say, might have shown that it was Admiral Sampson's plan of night blockade that forced Cervantes to come out in the daylight, and Captain Clark is quoted as saying that Admiral Schley's opinion is quoted to the effect that the American ships charged in "according to the original plan to sink the enemy in the channels," and that "that plan failed because the enemy had succeeded in passing the blockade line." They ask why did the enemy succeed, and declare "the Brooklyn, having abandoned its position on the left of the line, thereby left an unguarded opening along the western shore, through which the Spanish fleet passed our ships and attempted to escape." The court's opinion is quoted to the effect that the Brooklyn lost distance in position by the "loop" and delayed the Texas. To sustain their contention that Sampson was in command, the commentators quote from Schley's report of July 6, 1898, as follows:

THE LOOP AGAIN.

It is admitted that the precept is broad enough to have permitted the court to go into the question, but it is recalled that although the judge-advocate expressed a willingness to go into the question, he did not deem it necessary or proper to do so. The judge-advocate, they say, might have shown that it was Admiral Sampson's plan of night blockade that forced Cervantes to come out in the daylight, and Captain Clark is quoted as saying that Admiral Schley's opinion is quoted to the effect that the American ships charged in "according to the original plan to sink the enemy in the channels," and that "that plan failed because the enemy had succeeded in passing the blockade line." They ask why did the enemy succeed, and declare "the Brooklyn, having abandoned its position on the left of the line, thereby left an unguarded opening along the western shore, through which the Spanish fleet passed our ships and attempted to escape." The court's opinion is quoted to the effect that the Brooklyn lost distance in position by the "loop" and delayed the Texas. To sustain their contention that Sampson was in command, the commentators quote from Schley's report of July 6, 1898, as follows:

THE LOOP AGAIN.

It is admitted that the precept is broad enough to have permitted the court to go into the question, but it is recalled that although the judge-advocate expressed a willingness to go into the question, he did not deem it necessary or proper to do so. The judge-advocate, they say, might have shown that it was Admiral Sampson's plan of night blockade that forced Cervantes to come out in the daylight, and Captain Clark is quoted as saying that Admiral Schley's opinion is quoted to the effect that the American ships charged in "according to the original plan to sink the enemy in the channels," and that "that plan failed because the enemy had succeeded in passing the blockade line." They ask why did the enemy succeed, and declare "the Brooklyn, having abandoned its position on the left of the line, thereby left an unguarded opening along the western shore, through which the Spanish fleet passed our ships and attempted to escape." The court's opinion is quoted to the effect that the Brooklyn lost distance in position by the "loop" and delayed the Texas. To sustain their contention that Sampson was in command, the commentators quote from Schley's report of July 6, 1898, as follows:

THE LOOP AGAIN.

It is admitted that the precept is broad enough to have permitted the court to go into the question, but it is recalled that although the judge-advocate expressed a willingness to go into the question, he did not deem it necessary or proper to do so. The judge-advocate, they say, might have shown that it was Admiral Sampson's plan of night blockade that forced Cervantes to come out in the daylight, and Captain Clark is quoted as saying that Admiral Schley's opinion is quoted to the effect that the American ships charged in "according to the original plan to sink the enemy in the channels," and that "that plan failed because the enemy had succeeded in passing the blockade line." They ask why did the enemy succeed, and declare "the Brooklyn, having abandoned its position on the left of the line, thereby left an unguarded opening along the western shore, through which the Spanish fleet passed our ships and attempted to escape." The court's opinion is quoted to the effect that the Brooklyn lost distance in position by the "loop" and delayed the Texas. To sustain their contention that Sampson was in command, the commentators quote from Schley's report of July 6, 1898, as follows:

THE LOOP AGAIN.

It is admitted that the precept is broad enough to have permitted the court to go into the question, but it is recalled that although the judge-advocate expressed a willingness to go into the question, he did not deem it necessary or proper to do so. The judge-advocate, they say, might have shown that it was Admiral Sampson's plan of night blockade that forced Cervantes to come out in the daylight, and Captain Clark is quoted as saying that Admiral Schley's opinion is quoted to the effect that the American ships charged in "according to the original plan to sink the enemy in the channels," and that "that plan failed because the enemy had succeeded in passing the blockade line." They ask why did the enemy succeed, and declare "the Brooklyn, having abandoned its position on the left of the line, thereby left an unguarded opening along the western shore, through which the Spanish fleet passed our ships and attempted to escape." The court's opinion is quoted to the effect that the Brooklyn lost distance in position by the "loop" and delayed the Texas. To sustain their contention that Sampson was in command, the commentators quote from Schley's report of July 6, 1898, as follows:

THE LOOP AGAIN.

It is admitted that the precept is broad enough to have permitted the court to go into the question, but it is recalled that although the judge-advocate expressed a willingness to go into the question, he did not deem it necessary or proper to do so. The judge-advocate, they say, might have shown that it was Admiral Sampson's plan of night blockade that forced Cervantes to come out in the daylight, and Captain Clark is quoted as saying that Admiral Schley's opinion is quoted to the effect that the American ships charged in "according to the original plan to sink the enemy in the channels," and that "that plan failed because the enemy had succeeded in passing the blockade line." They ask why did the enemy succeed, and declare "the Brooklyn, having abandoned its position on the left of the line, thereby left an unguarded opening along the western shore, through which the Spanish fleet passed our ships and attempted to escape." The court's opinion is quoted to the effect that the Brooklyn lost distance in position by the "loop" and delayed the Texas. To sustain their contention that Sampson was in command, the commentators quote from Schley's report of July 6, 1898, as follows:

The court's opinion is quoted to the effect that the Brooklyn lost distance in position by the "loop" and delayed the Texas. To sustain their contention that Sampson was in command, the commentators quote from Schley's report of July 6, 1898, as follows: