

RATHBONE GOES OUT

Temporary Successor Is Named as Director of Posts.

BRISTOW WILL RELIEVE HIM

Fourth Assistant Postmaster General to Go at Once to Cuba.

DIRECTOR'S GROSS EXTRAVAGANCES

Articles of Personal Wearing Apparel

Admitted to Have Been Paid for Out of the Cuban Funds—Marked Leniency Shown Toward the Ranking Postal Official on the Island in View of All the Ugly Facts Known in Washington—Department Believes that There Has Been No Crookedness in Porto Rico—Senator Bacon's Resolution of Inquiry.

Joseph L. Bristow, Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, has been ordered to take charge of the department of posts in Cuba, vice E. G. Rathbone, superseded. The appointment was announced late yesterday afternoon by Postmaster General Smith, at the conclusion of a two hours' conference at the White House, participated in by the President, Secretary of the Interior, General Griggs, and the Postmaster General. Mr. Bristow will leave tomorrow for his new post of duty. He has been granted indefinite leave of absence, and in the mean time the duties of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General will devolve upon Merritt O. Chance, the chief clerk of the office. In the course of time a successor to Mr. Rathbone will be appointed and then Mr. Bristow will return to Washington. The Postmaster General was asked yesterday afternoon whether Mr. Rathbone's successor had been selected, and replied that the matter had not yet been given consideration.

Praised as a Conscientious Officer.
Mr. Bristow has been in his present office ever since the incoming of the McKinley administration, and is universally praised as an efficient and conscientious officer. He comes from Kansas. His brother, who was formerly chief clerk of his office, went to Havana almost as soon as the postal service was inaugurated there, and it is believed will be able to give the new director general of posts some important information. Mr. Bristow has charge of the inspection service of the Postoffice Department. He said yesterday that the detail of post-office inspectors to go to Cuba had been made upon the request of the Secretary of War, as it was thought that these men were better equipped for such work than the military inspectors.

Gen. Bristow said that Auditor Reeves, who has been suspended, was selected by the assistant auditor of the Treasury for the Postoffice Department. He is a deputy auditor, although the appointment was made by the War Department. Assistant Auditor Lawshe, who has been sent to Cuba to investigate the accounts, will fill the position formerly held by Mr. Reeves. Mr. Lawshe, who is stationed at the auditor's office in Cuba, is of the belief that if the lines he laid down for the management of the office had been followed, no default would have been impossible.

Rathbone's Use of Cuban Funds.
It has been known ever since last Sunday, when The Post made the positive statement, that the official days of Mr. Rathbone in Cuba are numbered. There is still no charge against him, but the Postoffice Department authorities that he has been guilty of a criminal offense, such as would lead to his arrest, but the evidence of gross dereliction in the discharge of his duties is so overwhelming that the Postmaster General yesterday stated, when the matter was brought to his attention, that the accounts brought to Washington by Inspector General Reeves should be examined by Mr. Rathbone purely personal purposes. It was published yesterday that when Mr. Rathbone was allowed an official residence in Havana, he forthwith proceeded to furnish it at the expense of the Cuban fund, and that the itemized bill for these furnishings included hosiery and other articles of luxury. According to the printed story, the chairman will take up the matter and ask for the warrant for his arrest, but he refused to do so, on the ground that such practices were far beyond anything in the official extravagance under the Spanish regime. An American clerk in the office thereupon made out the warrant, which was countersigned by the auditor, approved by the military authorities and paid. The amount involved was \$2,000, and it is said the goods were purchased in Philadelphia.

Porto Rico Funds Honestly Handled.
Postmaster General Smith said yesterday that the postal funds in Porto Rico were honestly handled. "We had the same system of accounting as prevailed in Cuba, but in Porto Rico both sides were honest—that is, the administrative side, under the Postoffice Department, and the auditing side, under the War Department. There was no collusion between the officials as happened in Cuba, and which was the only way in which defaultations could occur. If the cashier and the teller of a bank are in collusion, they can rob the bank," added Mr. Smith, "notwithstanding all the ordinary precautions and safeguards which are adopted."

Mr. Smith said that there was nothing in the story that frauds had been discovered in the Philippines. Assistant Secretary Melicko was in conference for some time yesterday with Gen. Sanger and Col. Burton, of the War Department. The latter, respecting the Cuban postal funds, but there was no outcome. It is probable that the

subject of the conference in progress is the construction of an entirely new postal establishment under immediate army control to replace the present mechanism in Cuba.

The Assistant Secretary of War, who has had in charge the postal scandal, so far as it relates to the War Department, yesterday afternoon that he was certain that it would not be long before the department would be in possession of accurate information showing the extent of the peculations of Neely and his associates. At the same time, it is admitted by the department officials that they cannot give an exact estimate, nor can they do so until the accountants have completed their work.

\$400,000 in Stamps Unaccounted For.
The Col. G. H. Bristow, and his report to the War Department shows that a commission, of which Neely, the treasurer, and Reeves, the assistant auditor of posts, are members, was appointed to destroy \$400,000 worth of stamps which were subsequently found to be in circulation. Another phase of the matter which has yet to be accounted up relates to the deficit in the postal fund. In 1899, the deficit amounted to \$117,000, but the Cuban postal receipts always fell behind the expenditures, and it was necessary for Director Rathbone to make quarterly calls upon the general fund. The published reports of the War Department show that Capt. E. F. Ladd, treasurer of the island, paid Director Rathbone up to December 31, 1899, somewhere between \$100,000 and \$150,000. The Postoffice Department had no knowledge that a deficiency existed.

In making requisitions direct upon the governor general, administration officials say that they are handicapped in their efforts to obtain absolute information. At interior points in Cuba there are many postmasters who have no general credit stamps, but they have been given the money value of the stamps, which were valued at \$90,000, took them to the interior postmasters and disposed of them at half rate or less. This could very well have been done, as the transaction was approved by the Postoffice Department. The postmasters would hardly be willing to testify against the agents who sold them the stamps in view of the fact that they would thereby cast discredit upon themselves and their own honesty.

Dismissed Neely's Extradition.
The conference of the President and his Cabinet officers also related to the extradition of Neely. Attorney General Griggs is convinced that Neely will resist extradition proceedings, and he has advised the President to go to Cuba, but told the President that he had no doubt of defeating Neely's lawyers in any court.

The President directed the Attorney General to present the case to the court in the most favorable manner. It is the present intention of the administration to get Neely to Havana as speedily as possible, and he has made Mr. Thompson postmaster of Indianapolis, and he filled the position most creditably. He served in Gen. Harrison's regiment during the civil war.

Opportunities Offered to Neely.
Further examination into the methods of the post-office postmaster has revealed interesting disclosures. It was pointed out in The Post last Sunday that Mr. Rathbone had unlimited power to make contracts of all kinds. This authority, it is believed, will be able to give the new director general of posts some important information. Mr. Bristow has charge of the inspection service of the Postoffice Department. He said yesterday that the detail of post-office inspectors to go to Cuba had been made upon the request of the Secretary of War, as it was thought that these men were better equipped for such work than the military inspectors.

Rathbone's Use of Cuban Funds.
It has been known ever since last Sunday, when The Post made the positive statement, that the official days of Mr. Rathbone in Cuba are numbered. There is still no charge against him, but the Postoffice Department authorities that he has been guilty of a criminal offense, such as would lead to his arrest, but the evidence of gross dereliction in the discharge of his duties is so overwhelming that the Postmaster General yesterday stated, when the matter was brought to his attention, that the accounts brought to Washington by Inspector General Reeves should be examined by Mr. Rathbone purely personal purposes. It was published yesterday that when Mr. Rathbone was allowed an official residence in Havana, he forthwith proceeded to furnish it at the expense of the Cuban fund, and that the itemized bill for these furnishings included hosiery and other articles of luxury. According to the printed story, the chairman will take up the matter and ask for the warrant for his arrest, but he refused to do so, on the ground that such practices were far beyond anything in the official extravagance under the Spanish regime. An American clerk in the office thereupon made out the warrant, which was countersigned by the auditor, approved by the military authorities and paid. The amount involved was \$2,000, and it is said the goods were purchased in Philadelphia.

Porto Rico Funds Honestly Handled.
Postmaster General Smith said yesterday that the postal funds in Porto Rico were honestly handled. "We had the same system of accounting as prevailed in Cuba, but in Porto Rico both sides were honest—that is, the administrative side, under the Postoffice Department, and the auditing side, under the War Department. There was no collusion between the officials as happened in Cuba, and which was the only way in which defaultations could occur. If the cashier and the teller of a bank are in collusion, they can rob the bank," added Mr. Smith, "notwithstanding all the ordinary precautions and safeguards which are adopted."

Mr. Smith said that there was nothing in the story that frauds had been discovered in the Philippines. Assistant Secretary Melicko was in conference for some time yesterday with Gen. Sanger and Col. Burton, of the War Department. The latter, respecting the Cuban postal funds, but there was no outcome. It is probable that the

HONEYCOMBED WITH FRAUD

Further Disclosures of Rottenness in the Cuban Postal System.

Postmaster Thompson, of Havana, Under Detention, and as Wholesale Arrests Are Impending, a Fort Will Be Prepared for Prisoners.

(By the Associated Press.)
Havana, May 14.—The extent of the postal frauds is far greater than what was originally expected. Besides taking in the postal department, the frauds seem to include the local office at Havana and various other offices throughout the island, and also to have extended to outside points which have been used for the sale of some of the old issue of stamps that were ordered destroyed.

The result of the investigation at the local post-office is the suspension of Postmaster Thompson, who was installed in April of last year. He will remain at his own house for the present. Moya and Mascaro, stamp sellers in the main office, have also been arrested, and further arrests are expected tomorrow. As many as six others have been placed under the closest supervision, and they will be arrested as soon as their services can be spared. As a matter of fact, if they were all to be suddenly relieved of duty, it would not be possible to carry on the postal department of Havana.

Messrs. Reeves and Reynolds, the auditors of the postal department, are still under arrest at their own rooms, in charge of detectives. Special quarters will, however, be prepared in some fort, where all the prisoners connected with the frauds will be taken as soon as arrested.

Rathbone Denies Report of Friction.

E. G. Rathbone desires the Associated Press to say that there is no truth in the report, circulated in the United States, that there is friction between the military authorities here and the postal department. On the contrary, the most complete harmony prevails between Gen. Wood and himself, consultations taking place between them daily. He also says he does not consider it proper, in the present circumstances, to give out interviews for publication, and has so answered all applications for personal statements that have been cabled him from the United States.

To-day's arrests and the suspension of Mr. Thompson did not take place until after dark, and consequently these new features of the case are not generally known throughout the city this evening; but there is a perceptible excitement at the post-office, where no one knows who may be the next to be singled out.

Mr. Sheridan will temporarily fill Mr. Thompson's place. It appears that the frauds ramified in almost every possible direction, even the rented boxes having been made a source of illegitimate gain.

Every additional revelation increases the amazement of the Americans here. The Cubans seem to be immensely pleased. They declare that the Americans can no longer boast in Cuba of their superior honesty when in government employ.

Gen. Wood devotes several hours daily to postal affairs, hearing the reports of special agents and conferring with Mr. Rathbone and others having any knowledge of the matter. As yet it is impossible to say how many persons will be implicated.

o'clock last evening said that the accounts of the Havana office were certainly all right. Mr. Thompson had been connected with the Indianapolis post-office for twenty years, generally as assistant postmaster. Even under Democratic incumbents he was retained in a responsible subordinate capacity. When Mr. Harrison became President he made Mr. Thompson postmaster of Indianapolis, and he filled the position most creditably. He served in Gen. Harrison's regiment during the civil war.

NEELY STARTS EASTWARD.
Assures His Muncie Friends that He Will Be Home Again.
Muncie, Ind., May 14.—Charles F. W. Neely departed for New York late today to present at his preliminary hearing the Cuban postal frauds case Thursday. His departure is one day earlier than he had intended before he heard of the alleged confession of Corydon Rich, and his attorneys asked him to come on Monday.

Before leaving Neely assured his friends that he would be home again as usual, and quite a number were at the station to bid him adieu. He will arrive in New York at 3:30 to-morrow afternoon over the New York Central road.

A story is afloat here that Rich, a Muncie telling them not to be alarmed at anything that might happen in Cuba with which his name might be connected, as he was wholly innocent. This story has not been confirmed, the family refusing to give details. If they have them.

KILLED WIFE, THEN HIMSELF.
Wealthy Tennessean Had Accused Woman and Killed Her Alleged Lover.
Dyersburg, Tenn., May 14.—L. D. McAllister, a wealthy citizen of Heloise, tonight shot and instantly killed his wife and after an ineffectual attempt to slay his wife's brother, blew out his own brains.

About two years ago McAllister charged his wife with having improper relations with a man named Love. Later he killed Love and after a trial was acquitted. Lately McAllister had made further charges against his wife, and they had separated.

To-night he called upon her and insisted that she confess her alleged wrongdoing. The woman denied his charges, and McAllister killed her. Her brother saved himself by a hasty retreat. McAllister was a popular man.

Shot to Death by Florida Deputies.
Brooksville, Fla., May 14.—Yesterday a party made a search of the Dean scrub, near Weeks' turpentine camp. In this county, and found the decomposed bodies of two negroes tied together. These are the men who were arrested at the camp on May 8 charged with killing Cleland, a white man from ambush. The negroes were placed in the charge of deputies, and after an ineffectual attempt to slay them were taken into the scrub and shot to death.

Congressional Nominations.
Chicago, May 14.—Congressman James R. Mann was renominated to-day by the Republican convention of the First Illinois District.
St. Paul, Minn., May 14.—Congressman W. M. Miller was nominated by the Republicans of the Fourth Congressional District.
St. Paul, Minn., May 14.—Congressman F. C. Stevens, of this (Fourth) district, was to-day unanimously renominated by the Republican convention at Cambridge, Minn.

Mexico, Mo., May 14.—The Democratic Congressional convention of the Ninth district to-day renominated Champ Clark for Congress.

CUT IN THE CUBAN TARIFF.

Concessions Made with a View to Stimulating Imports.

The War Department has made public simultaneously here and in Havana the schedules of the revised Cuban tariff, which goes into effect June 15 to increase the Cuban effect with difficulty, and the schedules have traveled back and forth between Washington and Havana half a dozen times before they have been so far perfected as to be ready for promulgation. The revised tariff will, it is calculated, slightly increase the revenues of the island, which were last year approximately \$5,000,000.

The primary purpose of the revision of the original Porter tariff was not, as had been supposed, to provide against a deficiency in revenues, but rather to lessening the imports, and especially to stimulate participation in the United States. The trade between Cuba and the United States has not augmented since the American occupation, and even the application of the Porter tariff was not attended by any benefit in the increase of the aggregate volume of trade. In fact, Cuban merchants, being relieved from the Spanish obligation to purchase in one market, have not turned to the United States for their supplies, released from that obligation, and consequently, of the imports into Cuba, less than 50 per cent. originate in the United States.

The Porter tariff made sweeping cuts in the old Spanish tariff, and in the very beginning attention was directed to food products; it was felt to be just that these necessities of life should sustain a little the Cuban people. So cattle were admitted at a duty of 15 per cent. and food stuffs generally paid only 15 per cent. ad valorem. The military authorities in charge of the action were surprised to find the effect of these changes. The price of food did not go down in Cuba; in case of several staples, they actually advanced. Lack of competition and conservatism were the reasons assigned for this state of affairs. There may be a remedy in reciprocity with the United States. At any rate, Mr. Porter and the other tariff revisers felt that they could do little to meet this situation, and recommended that the few changes they submit be tested for another year before more radical measures are employed. Therefore, the only important reduction made by the new tariff schedules is in the duty on salt cod, and stock fish (largely consumed in Cuba), which is reduced from \$2 to \$1, and in the duty on wheat flour, reduced from \$3.20 to \$2.

There are many other changes in the other schedules, however, that are believed to be of the greatest importance to American exporters doing business with Cuba.

It has been apparent to all acquainted with the working of the Cuban tariff that the rates of duty put upon the schedule for machinery and railway materials and supplies, namely, 40 per cent. ad valorem, is too high. The effect of this has been to stop all importation of such articles, and the revenue from these schedules has been extremely small. In view of the necessity for the construction and reconstruction of railroads in Cuba, it is proposed to give by the various companies that if material for the construction and equipment during the slight waiting period, they will at once begin to import large quantities, a special provision has been made under the tariff which allows a free list and the original duty of 40 per cent. ad valorem. Some few changes have been made in the tariff, and the original duty of 40 per cent. ad valorem. Petroleum and other commodities are to be placed on a free list and the original duty of 40 per cent. ad valorem. Petroleum and other commodities are to be placed on a free list and the original duty of 40 per cent. ad valorem.

DEMAND MAYOR'S RESIGNATION.

Philadelphia Municipal League Acts on Mr. Wannamaker's Charges.

Philadelphia, May 14.—The sensation created last week by John Wannamaker's statements, in which he charged Mayor Ashbridge with Public Safety English with threatening to tarnish his personal character if he did not use his influence to have the new municipal attacks against the city administration stopped, and the Mayor's indignation meeting, but the matter has not yet taken definite shape.

Considerable interest was centered today in the action taken by the board of managers of the Municipal League, an organization founded for the purpose of advocating municipal reform and good city government, and composed of many influential citizens. When the subject was brought before the meeting there was about fifteen minutes' debate, and at its conclusion the following resolutions were adopted:

Resolved, that a charge has been made by Mr. John Wannamaker that the director of public safety of the city of Philadelphia, on Thursday, May 10, 1900, attempted, by threats of personal injury, to deter a newspaper in which he was alleged to have an interest from publishing an Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English; and Whereas such an attempt at intimidation of a private citizen by a public official is destructive of the constitutional guarantee of free speech and freedom of the press and the privilege of individual criticism of the official acts of public officials; and Whereas the said charge is of a nature to bring into disrepute the name of the city of Philadelphia, and to constitute an insult to the honor and individual integrity of the said Mayor, Ashbridge and Director English;