ubt that accused was of "sound mem- and discretion," I am compelled to e that no good and sufficient reason own to warrant interference with e sentence. W. B. DUNHAM,

Member Board Pardon Advisers.

Executive Office, Jan. 19, 1898.

The defendant, Eugene Burt, sentenced to be hanged for the murder of his wife, has applied through counsel for the commutation of the sentence to imprisonment for life in the state penitentiary, and the members of the board of pardon advisers, being divided in opinion on the merits of the application, my responsibility, already great, is increased and intensified. The gravity of the case, no less than this division of opinion, suggests that the reasons for the conclusion reached be fully stated. On the night of July 24, 1896, in the city of Austin, the wife and two infant daughters of defendant were brutally murdered in their home. Death was inflicted with a hatchet by crushing the right temple of each victim. Handkerchiefs were tied tightly around the neck of each, the hands and feet tied and the bodies, wrapped with blankets and clothing, were cast into the cistern on the premises and the cistern nailed up and securely fastened. The participation of defendant in the active homicide is absolutely certain, because, without reference to other testimony, the hatchet, nightapparel and bedding of the deceased, covered and saturated with blood, were soon afterward found at Houston in a closed box shipped there by him and directed to an unknown or fictitious person in the handwriting of defendant. The single ground presented in the application is that defendant was insane at the time of the homicide. While the question of sanity was fully considered and deliberately decided against defendant at the trial, and while neither the jury, district attorney, district judge nor either of the appellate judges have suggested that possible error was committed, the question is again presented and must be met. The general legal principles which should control in the consideration of the application, are clearly stated by Mr. Dunham of the Board of Pardon Advisers in the foregoing report.

Thomas vs. State, 40 Tex., 60.

Williams vs. State, 7 App., 163.

Buswell on Insanity, sections 10, 424 and 425.

1 W[illiams] on & Stille's Med. Jur., sections [illegible] et seq.

Taylor's Med. Jur., 717 et seq.

1 Russell on Crimes, 19 et seq.

Wi[illegible]thaus & Becker Med. Jur., 424, 441.

Upon the facts it is insisted that the insanity of defendant is shown in, (1) certain incidents in his life; (2) insanity in his family; (3) the active homicide itself, and (4) a want of motive, and they will be considered in this order:

Certain Incidents in His Life.

The principal witnesses who testified to incidents in his life, supposed to indicate insanity, were his two brothers and Rev. Dr. Smoot, who is a warm friend of the family. The brothers give instances of his taking money from their store when he was employed by them, committing forgeries and embezzlements, and lack of affection for them and their parents; but it is plain that while such conduct on the part of a brother and son may be unusual, it is not infrequent nor necessarily indicative of an unsound mind; and it is significant that neither of the brothers testified that he was in their opinion insane, though one of them said: "I have come to the conclusion that he was a little off for several years past." Dr. Smoot testified to an incident of cruelty to a rabbit when a child and to several instances of deceit, falsehood and peculation, but he admitted, and it is obvious, these do not prove insanity. In fact these incidents in his life as evidences of insanity may be dismissed because any suggestion prior to the murder that defendant was insane would have been justly regarded as absurd. Dr. McLaughlin, his family physician, testified: "I have never during my intercourse with defendant noticed any evidence of insanity, and I had not and would never have expected it." And Dr. Smoot, himself, said: "If he did not kill his wife and children, then I would not say he was of an unsound mind."

Insanity in His Family.

Proof of the insanity of members of the family of the defendant is only admissible in evidence when some evidence has been given that the defendant himself has shown signs of his own insanity.

Buswell on Insanity, section 235.

2 Lawson's Criminal Defenses, 864.

Testimony on the question of insanity in defendant's family was admitted, however, probably in abundance of caution, and that of consequence related to his mother and maternal grandfather. All the evidence adduced with reference to the insanity of his mother is purely hearsay, although throughout the time covered by the testimony she resided in Austin, and is to the effect that just previous to the birth of defendant, she was at times insane, requiring restraint and watching. The testimony of Dr. T. D. Wooten, which is not controverted, disposes of this contention: "Women are at times affected with a form of insanity at pregnacy, but there is nothing unusual about this form of pregnant insanity and it does not affect the child." On the subject of the insanity of his maternal grandfather, Dr. Smoot testified that "Dr. Burt told me that his wife's father, the grandfather of defendant, had been adjudged insane and was confined in a lunatic asylum in Georgia." Dr. Talley, a cousin of defendant, testified to the same effect. This testimony illustrates the looseness of all the testimony in the case on the subject of the insanity of the defendant. As a matter of fact, the grandfather was never adjudged insane and was never confined in an asylum. Counsel for defendant presented the pardon board with certificates of two physicians in Georgia, one to the effect that he was "totally deranged" and the other that he was at his death in 1888, and for several years previously "an imbecile." Since the board reported, counsel for defendant have submitted an affidavit of a former Ordinary in Hall county, Georgia, that in 1882 a son of Silas B. Palmour, the grandfather in question, caused papers in lunacy to be prepared charging his father with insanity, but he was not sent to the asylum because there was no room for that class of lunatics and the family was able to have him nursed and guarded. Dr. Bailey of Gainesville, Ga., who certified, as already stated, that Palmour was an imbecile, has subsequently informed me in answer to an inquiry as to the cause of insanity that Palmour was "a mono-maniac on the subject of money, constant dread of being swindled out of it by his son." The other physician answered that he did not know the cause of Palmour's malady. The clerk of the court there informs me that while lunacy proceedings were begun, no judgment was rendered because of the want of room in the asylum for that class of insane. An affidavit has been presented made by the grandmother, an aunt and two uncles of defendant residing in Georgia, stating that Palmour became violently insane in 1882 and remained so with a few lucid intervals, until his death in 1888. At my request this matter has been carefully investigated since the report of the board by a responsible citizen of Georgia, who reported as follows: "Silas B. Palmour resided and died in Dawson county. Injured leg some time before. Confined some time. Brooded over business until mind became undoubtedly unbalanced. Said to have attempted suicide. Family did not consider him dangerous, went about by himself, though for a time had attendant. Died rather suddenly from brain trouble, probably from kidneys. Physician at last illness dead." Of the collateral kindred mentioned by Dr. Talley in his testimony as being affected with epilepsy only the one at Bartlett, Tex, has been found. His family physician writes me that he has known him for the "past eight years; have attended him in sickness, as well as his father and sisters during that time. I have seen no evidence of his being afflicted with epilepsy at any time, nor have I ever heard of any such affliction from any member of the family or anyone else." A reputable and leading citizen of Bartlett writes me that he has known this party "for fifteen years and never heard of him being afflicted with epilepsy." It is evident from this statement of all the information at hand that the character and extent of the mental disorder of Palmour is uncertain; but accepting the opinion of Dr. Bailey, and admitting, for the purpose of this paper, that the grandfather was a monomaniac late in life, it does not appear to me sufficient for several reasons to justify interference with the judgment of the court. There is no evidence of the insanity of defendant—pretermitting for the present, insanity alleged to be shown in the enormity of the crime—and consequently the insanity of the ancestor is immaterial. Chief Justice Agnew declared the safe rule when he said: "The court is not bound to hear evidence of the insanity of a man's relatives or evidence of his proper instruction in morals and religion, or of the kind treatment of his relatives and friends, as grounds of the presumption of possible insanity, until some evidence has been given that the prisoner himself has shown signs of his own insanity."

Laros vs. Commonwealth, 84 Pa. St., 200.

State vs. Cunningham, 72 N. C., 469.

Snow vs. Benton, 28 Ill., 306.

Considering the accepted malady of the grandfather and the time of its manifestation, the defendant, the grandson, being then about 13 years of age, it is not probable he could have been affected by it. "As we might suppose children that are born before insanity manifests itself in the parents are less subject to the disorder than those who are born after, wards," and necessarily the probability will be still more remote with grandchildren.

Taylor's Med. Jur., 628.

Mann's Med. Jur., 128.

Finally, the indications are that the dementia of Palmour was connected with old age and improbable of transmission. On this character of disease, the most recent writers say: "The most common symptoms associated with it are suspicion of the nearest and most dear, hallucinations of hearing and of sight and delusions which are often of a persecutory character. There is frequently a great fear of impending poverty or ruin."

Witthaus & Becker Med. Jur., 360

The Homicide to Prove Insanity.

It is urgently insisted that the act of defendant in murdering his wife and children is in itself evidence of insanity. Murder of the wife by the husband without even an intimation of insanity has often enough occurred that this phase of the case need not present serious difficulty. Undoubtedly the experience of mankind shows that the murder of the offspring by persons of sound mind is far less frequent than the murder of the wife, but the question is, is it so impossible, so contrary to observation, so utterly unnatural and shocking as in itself to establish insanity? If sane men in the past in wicked passion have destroyed their infant children, may they not do so now? The act of Hawes in murdering his children in Alabama a few years ago, when unquestionably sane, is fresh in the minds of thoughtful students of criminal law. Law reports and treatises on medical jurisprudence furnish ample proof that while happily rare, sane men and women have been found cruel and godless enough to destroy their own.

2 Lawson's Criminal Defenses, 856.

Ray's Med. Jur., section 13.

Russell on Crimes, 23-24.

Detected in falsehood and deceit, moneyless and out of employment, threatened with ejection from rented premises, in the toils of the law, and with domestic disturbance possibly impending, may not the defendant have consciously and deliberately preferred the destruction of his family and flight to the probable alternative? Hopeless and desperate, may he not have intended to destroy his family and himself but finally recoiled from the last? Far in the night of this fearful murder, a neighboring lady heard "a deep horrible sound" and then a "child scream once" in this man's house. May he not, originally intending upon some pretext or motive to kill only his wife, have been terrorized by this cry and then destroyed even child evidence of his guilt? If the mother was to be murdered, why leave the children to ask for her in the morning and embarrass his plans and his flight? While in the light of history, crimes like this are not necessarily the result of unsound minds, the doctrine contended for that the enormity of the crime is alone evidence of insanity is fraught with great danger to society. If such shall become the law the perpetration of crimes will be excused by their very wickedness and atrocity. It is the crystallization of enlightened jurisprudence, therefore, that where no more than the homicide is proved, "the barbarity of the act will not be evidence of insanity, for then the more unnatural and brutal the crime the stronger will be the ground of defense."

Buswell on Insanity, section 225.

1 Russell on Crimes, 21 et seq.

2 Lawson's Criminal Defenses, 5, 164.

Ibid., p. 856.

The Want of Motive.

It is strenuously claimed that the defendant had no reason or motive for the crime, and therefore is insane. This but begs the question. In the preceding paragraph it has been shown that several motives not in themselves necessarily indicating or proving insanity, may have actuated the defendant. In addition to this it is well to recall the testimony that in the afternoon previous to the tragedy the voice of a woman pitched in a high key in the house of defendant declared, "I will not stand this any longer." Only two women resided there, the servant and Mrs. Burt, and the former left the residence between 2 and 3 o'clock in the afternoon with the two children and did not return until 8 or 9 o'clock that evening. It is true there is no positive proof that this was the voice of Mrs. Burt, but all the facts and circumstances render it probable. Did the husband and wife quarrel? Because of his repeated misconduct or for other causes did she threaten separation, and if so, was the motive destruction of the family rather than submit to this? This is not improbable when we remember on the day following the murder, stopping for a time the work of boxing the bloody garments, he was found by the servant in the dining room "sitting down with his head hanging down and looking as though he was crying." But if it be admitted that no motive is proven, does this necessarily show that it was wanting or carry presumption or proof of insanity? Chief Justice Gibson well stated the danger of such a doctrine: "It is urged that the want of motive is evidence of insanity. * * * But a motive need not always be shown—it may be secret; and to hold everyone mad whose acts can not be accounted for on the ordinary principles of cause and effect would give a general license. The law itself implies malice where the act is accompanied with such circumstances as are the ordinary symptoms of a wicked, depraved and malignant spirit, a heart regardless of social duty and deliberately bent upon mischief."

Commonwealth vs. Mosler, 4Pa. St., 264.

Buswell on Insanity, section 230.

To the same effect is the opinion of a great English jurist which is now accepted law: "It has been urged that no motive has been shown for the commission of this crime. It is true that there is no motive apparently, but a very inadequate one; but it is dangerous ground to take to say that a man must be insane because men fail to discern the motive for his act. * * * It would be a most dangerous doctrine to lay down that because a man committed a desperate offense * * * he was therefore insane, as if the perpetration of crimes was to be excused by their very atrocity.

Reg. vs. Stokes, 3 C. & K., 185.

1 Russell on Crimes, 23.

Taylor's Med. Jur., 657, 658.

Looking to the whole case, there is, in my judgment, not only a failure to establish insanity, whether the foregoing propositions be considered singly or together, but there is evidence strongly tending to show that defendant is feigning insanity. There is an entire absence of any delusion as to facts, intelligent efforts were made to conceal the crime, yet "the presence of delusion has been said to characterize an act of homicidal monomania while premeditation, precaution and concealment have been considered the essential features of the act of a sane criminal."

Taylor's Med. Jur., 659.

Buswell on Insanity, section 13.

The defendant carefully planned and executed an escape from the state and has never admitted his guilt, yet an insane criminal "seeks no escape, delivers himself up to justice and acknowledges the crime laid to his charge."

Taylor's Med. Jur., 658.

Mann's Med. Jur., 138.

On the trial, while affecting not to notice the proceedings, defendant prepared entirely rational notes in his cell on the testimony given in the court room, some of them referring to his mental condition. Dr. Graves testified that on a visit to the jail, defendant "was talking of his insanity all the time which attracted my attention," yet experience shows that in "real insanity the person will not admit he is insane; in the feigned state all his attempts are directed to make you believed that he is mad, and an imposter may be induced to perform any act if it be casually observed to another in his presence that the performance of such an act will furnish strong evidence of his insanity."

Taylor's Med. Jur., 629.

Dr. Worsham testified that "it is the rarest thing for an insane man to admit his insanity." In connection with the concluding paragraph above from a standard authority the testimony of the jailer is important to the effect in taking him to and from the court room during the trial, defendant for the first time struck his head against the window after one of the physicians testified it was indicative of insanity. The testimony of a majority of the physicians who were called as witnesses in the case tends to show that the supposed insanity of defendant is unreal and a sham. Dr. Worsham, superintendent of the Austin Insane Asylum, testified that "defendant is simulating in his actions" and [illegible] he has recommended commutation sentence, this should be consider connection with his well known [illegible] tion to capital punishment. The [illegible] of many others to the same effe[illegible] be detailed, but it will suffice to refer to critical examinations made by several physicians. Before the trial and at the request of the defense, these physicians made a thorough examination of defendant in which he met every test of sanity. Subsequently and after the trial begun, a second examination was made, and while it is admitted on all sides that there has been no change in his mental condition, he failed on several tests which were used at the first examination. The physicians state emphatically that he was shamming and the following statement of one of them because of the intrinsic merit of the criterion is almost conclusive of the question. "In every test beyond his control the test resulted the same as at the first time; but in all the tests within his control the results were very different."

The case has been carefully and thoroughly considered in all its phases with full appreciation of its importance and gravity. The friends and brothers of defendant have my profound sympathy, but I am an instrument of public law. It would be a relief to feel that through the influences of civilization and religion sane manhood were lifted above such depravity but this is contrary to human experience; and believing that defendant committed this murder when rational, interference with the province of the jury to assess the penalty is unwarranted and the application is denied.

C. A. CULBERSON,
Governor.

Murdered Infant Found.

San Antonio, Tex., Jan. 19.—(Special.)—The dead body of a ten-day's old infant was found in a privy vault at 625 Refugio street this morning. On examination by Coroner P. H. Shook it revealed evidence of murder, and later the police arrested Ada Banks, who lives next door to where the body was found, and she was committed to jail without bond on the charge of murder. The woman is a negro and the child a mulatto.

Wants a Receiver.

Montgomery, Ala., Jan. 19.—B. A. Bullock, who owns nine shares of stock in the South and North Railroad, has asked for a receiver of that road, alleging that the Louisville and Nashville road, which operates the south and north, is appropriating the property to its own use. The bill has been on file some time, but was not made public before today. Railroad officials here pay but little attention to the suit.

Death at Lockhart.

Lockhart, Tex., Jan. 19.—(Special.)—Mrs. Jas. F. Ellison, who has been sick for some time, died yesterday morning at her home in this city and was buried at Martindale today. She leaves a husband, many children and relatives to mourn her loss.

A TRIBUTE PAYER.

She Was Released From Custody by the Court of Appeals.

Dallas, Tex., Jan. 19.—(Special.)—Sheriff Henry Thomas of Galveston county was before the court of criminal appeals today to show cause why he restrained Lilly Smith of her liberty. In 1895 she was arrested in Galveston on a charge of keeping a disorderly house, was tried, found guilty and her fine and the costs amounted to $470.

The woman on the day of her conviction slipped out of the court room and managed to get out of town without being seen. A few days ago she returned to Galveston and was placed under arrest. A writ of habeas corpus was applied for a week ago and yesterday it was argued. The woman was discharged and the following order filed: "We hold that the criminal district court did not have jurisdiction of this offense and that the conviction of applicant in said court was without authority of law and void."

THE HAWAIIAN ANNEXATION

SENATOR MORGAN IN ADVOCACY OF THE RATIFICATION OF THE TREATY.

THE RESOURCES OF THE ISLANDS

They Can Be Made to Produce Coffee Enough to Supply the United States—Honolulu to Be a Great City.

Washington, Jan. 19.—Senator Morgan resumed his speech in advocacy of the ratification of the Hawaiian annexation treaty in the executive session of the senate today. He announced at the conclusion of today's session that he would probably require one more day in which to complete his presentation of the subject. Senator Morgan dealt today with the question of agricultural and commercial possibilities of the islands, with the character of the present government and with the position of the residents of the islands on the subject of annexation. He repeated his assertion that President Cleveland was favorable to the acquisition of the islands, and expressed the opinion that it was his intention to have restored Queen Liloukalana and would have negotiated with her a treaty of annexation. He elaborated his views on this subject at length, saying that while he believed it was Mr. Cleveland's intention to have annexed the islands, he naturally changed his intention to do this through the restoration of the queen. When she made known her bloodthirsty disposition towards those who had dethroned her. He expressed the opinion that Mr. Cleveland would have never taken such a positive position as he did against the Dole government and in opposition to annexation but for the antagonistic and misleading report of Commissioner Blount.

Mr. Morgan took up the criticism upon the present government of Hawaii, defending it in strong terms and eulogizing Mr. Dole as one of the most competent rulers of the time. He reviewed Mr. Dole's history and said that gentleman's record showed that he would be a creditable head of any nation. He controverted the idea that the present government was a revolutionary government, claiming it was in every way staunch and enterprising and abreast of the times. He said that the people naturally sought a close alliance with the United States because they had always had the friendship and support of the people of this country.

Speaking of the resources of the islands, Mr. Morgan said they were manifold and that the time would come when they would produce enough coffee to supply the demands of all the people of the United States, while he said the sugar production had already reached its limit. He concluded that the resources of the country were such as to insure a very prosperous future and predicted that Honolulu would some day in the not distant future attain to great commercial prominence, equal, in all probability, to that of Hong Kong or other cities of equal magnitude.

KANSAS POPULIST

Cold-Blooded Facts Intelligent Men.

[illegible].—President Ripley of [illegible]ka and Santa Fe Railway has written a letter to the editor of a Kansas populist paper replying to a publication in that paper printing the number of people killed by the railroads in the United States and giving that as a reason why the railroads should be controlled by the government. Mr. Ripley points out that the railways carry the whole population of the state of Kansas two and a half times over before one passenger is killed, and that last year the trains on the railways in Kansas ran over 800,000 miles, yet only one employe's life was sacrificed for every 431,000 miles. Of 4406 others killed in the United States in 1896, the report shows that 3811 were trespassers; that is to say, out of every twenty-two persons killed nineteen were killed because they were breaking the law and were in places where the railway people had no reason to expect to find them.

Mr. Ripley warmly defends the railroad employes against the charge of negligence in the exercise of their duty, saying that statistics show fewer lives are lost by railroad transportation in proportion to the miles traveled than by any known method of locomotion. He draws the conclusion that the plea of government ownership because of the number of persons whom the railways kill is entirely worthless.

Coming to the question of ownership, he says that to himself and other railway officials it is a matter of entire indifference.

As to the question whether the owners of railways are opposed to government ownership, he points out that the strongest plea made in behalf of government ownership is that of T. B. Blackstone, president of the Chicago and Alton, who urged it as a measure of justice to the railway investors. There is no holder of railway securities, he says, who does not believe that those securities would be advanced in value if there was any prospect of the government buying them.

Mr. Ripley says if he is opposed to government ownership it is not as a railway man, but as a citizen. The argument has been made that the government should have charge of the railways because private administration of them is unsatisfactory. As a matter of fact, however, he says, the best managed railways of the world are the English. They are all owned and operated by private companies. Next to them in good management, he states, are the privately owned lines of Holland and France, while the government-owned lines in France are very bad.

It is easy to talk, he says, of the government giving better service, employing more men, lowering rates and still making money. As a matter of fact, government management of anything can never be as economical as private management, and to earn the interest on its investment (six to fifteen millions of dollars) the government would have to increase the rates for service, as has been done on the government-owned lines of Australia; cheapen the service, employ fewer men and let things generally get into disrepair, as is done on the government-owned lines of Italy, or face an annual deficiency and rely on taxation to make up the deficit, as is done in India.

The most serious considerations are, however, Mr. Ripley says, political ones. There are 850,000 railways employes in the United States. Under government ownership each of these would be a political appointee. This, he says, would not only lower the character of the service, but would be appalling in the tremendous political supremacy which those 850,000 employes would give to the party in power.

Worse still, he says, would be the political results of the contracts for the construction of new lines, etc. The scandals and jobbery of the river and harbor appropriations or of the tariff bill would be nothing compared to the field which would be open to spoilsmen by the railways. The building of new lines would depend entirely on "political pull," districts or states of a political complexion opposed to that of the party in power would have to wait until the crack of doom for any new lines, and in districts where the friends of the administration came from there would be lines as thick as stripes on a cat's back.

Necessity and Diplomacy.

Senator Wolcott settled down as soon as he read the returns from home that Colorado led in the union of states for 1897 in gold product, with the sum of $22,000,000. A country's necessity is greater than its diplomacy.—Galveston News.

M'MILLIN LEADS.

Bob Taylor Away Behind for the Senate in Tennessee.

Nashville, Tenn., Jan. 19.—The democratic members of the legislature held a caucus tonight for the purpose of nominating a candidate for United States senator. The hall of representatives was crowded and great interest was manifested. Ex-Senator Turley, Congressman McMillin and Governor Taylor were placed in nomination. The first ballot stood: McMillin, 39; Turley, 30; Taylor, 19. Seven ballots were taken without essential changes and the caucus adjourned until tomorrow. Forty-five votes are required to nominate. The last ballot was the same as the first.

Brann Arrested.

Waco, Tex., Jan. 19.—(Special.)—W. C. Brann returned from his lecturing tour today and was served with four warrants from San Antonio, charging him with criminal libel. He gave a $200 bond in each case. The alleged libelous article was published in the January Iconoclast, but the warrants received here do not give the names of the complainants.

Board Adjourned.

Bryan, Tex., Jan. 19.—(Special.)—Maj. U. R. Cavitt was tendered the temporary presidency of the Agricultural and Mechanical College, but declined for the reason that he could not accept the place and retain his position as local director and secretary of the board, which he preferred to the temporary presidency. Vice President R. H. Whitlock was then elected president pro tem. The board has completed its labors for the present and adjourned.

A COMMERCIAL CONGRESS.

The Governor of Florida Wants Delegates Appointed to Attend.

Tallahassee, Fla., Jan. 19.—Governor Bloxham issued the following invitation today:

We respectfully extend to the governors of the southern and western states an invitation to attend the fifth annual session of the South and West Commercial congress, to convene at Tampa, Fla., February 8, 9 and 10, 1898.

We also respectfully request the governors of the southern and western states to appoint delegates to this congress, which should command the earnest attention of all good citizens. Trusting that this congress will receive the consideration it deserves and prove beneficial to all concerned, I am yours truly,

W. D. BLOXHAM,
Governor of Florida.

The principal objects of the congress are to consider the means to increase the interchange of all merchandise and manufactured articles between the south and west, and to promote the movement of grain and other products of the western states to southern distributing markets and through southern ports for export.

All the governors, commercial organizations, municipal governments, transportation companies of the south and west have been requested to appoint delegates to this congress. A great many have already responded and the success of this congress is now assured. Excursions to points of interest in the republic of Mexico and other forms of entertainment will be provided for the delegates and their friends.

The congress will convene on Tuesday, February 8, at the Tampa Bay hotel auditorium, and the sessions will continue three days.

For general information communicate with H. Cunningham, secretary of the Tampa Board of Trade, Tampa, Fla.

THE STRIKE CENTER.

Latest News From the Great Cotton Mill Section.

Boston, Mass., Jan. 19.—The news from the New England cotton manufacturing centers, New Bedford, Biddeford and Lewiston, in which strikes are in progress, is to the effect that everything is quiet. Secretary Hart of the New Bedford union says he looks for no particular change for at least two weeks, and it is thought unlikely that the situation in the smaller places will be altered until action is taken in New Bedford. At the latter point today small crowds of operatives and sympathizers gathered on a number of streets in the vicinity of the mills at the hour the machinery was usually started, but none of the gates were opened and there was no sign of a demonstration of any sort. At Biddeford both sides were still maintaining a waiting attitude, each determined not to yield any ground until a mutual understanding of some sort is brought about.

At Lewiston the Androscoggin mill management is improving the opportunity to make repairs. Two meetings of the operatives were held today, but nothing was done. In Fall River the carding and weaving departments of the King Phillip mills are beginning to feel the effect of the strike in the spinning department, and operatives are being forced out owing to a lack of material.

The carders at the Shive mill have become dissatisfied with their pay and have authorized their secretary to confer with Treasurer Rounsville to determine the attitude of the mill in regard to concessions. They claim that they have been reduced more than 11 1-9 per cent.

The White Rock cotton mill owned by D. B. and R. Knight at Westerly, R. I., shut down at noon, owing to a strike of 150 weavers and spinners. The strike was caused by a reduction in wages amounting to from 8 to 15 per cent. When running full the mill gives employment to 375 hands. The reductions went into effect on Monday.

Joined the Others.

Brunswick, Me., Jan. 19.—The operatives in the weave room, card room and spinning rooms at the Cabot cotton mills have struck on account of reduction of wages. Out of a total of 16 looms only 165 were left running.

More Strikers.

Fall River, Mass., Jan. 19.—The frame spinners at the Harvers No. 1 and the Laurel Lake mills joined the list of strikers today. The trouble at both places is over the new wage schedule.

Carter's Court Martial.

Savannah, Jan. 21.—The court martial of Capt. O. M. Carter dragged along slowly today. Mr. A. S. Cooper, assistant engineer under the accused, was on the stand all day. His most interesting testimony was that the Atlanta Contracting company boosted Capt. Carter into an appointment at the court of St. James. He reiterated the statement that the work on the harbor was not up to specifications and he called Capt. Carter's attention to this without effect. The court meets again tomorrow.