

MT. GREYNA 'BATTLE' SPOILED BY RAIN Annual Maneuvers Are Disappointing Climax to Week of Training

BREAK CAMP TOMORROW

Special Dispatch to Evening Public Ledger. Camp Major Marshall Henderson, Mt. Greytna, Pa., July 18.—Disgusted is the only word that expresses the feelings and sentiments of officers and men of the Pennsylvania reserve militia today. This was to have been the big day of the week, the occasion of the annual maneuvers to be held here every body had been studying and training since they came here, and it was all gummied up by showers, the third day to be thus spoiled.

An attempt was made this afternoon to put the fight across, but it lacked pep, for the details had been cancelled, and conditions throughout were anything but conducive to demonstration of the war lessons sought to be illustrated. Under the terms of the war game planned by the army instructors, Colonel John M. Groff and his First Infantry, together with two battalions of the Second Infantry, in command of Colonel Sterling E. W. Eyer, with cavalry and machine-gun auxiliaries, were sent into the Conewago valley as a Blue army to rout a Red force. The "Reds" were reported as guarding heavy stores at Conewago, the main proposition of the "Blues" being to capture the supplies. Colonel Franklin Blackstone, with his Third Infantry and detachments of cavalry and machine guns, proved to be "the enemy."

Jail and \$1000 Fine Faces Saloonmen

Continued From Page One. been so ill advised by counsel as to believe that because Judge Dickinson did not definitely commit the defendant in the Bergner & Engel Brewing Company test case, they were given license to sell 2.75 per cent beer, pending decision of the United States Supreme Court.

Kane Asks Orders. United States District Attorney Kane, after holding telephonic conversation with the Department of Justice at Washington and transmitting a copy of Judge Dickinson's opinion, is awaiting hourly word as to the course of action the government desires him to take. It is matter for the decision of United States Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer to act upon, and no United States district attorney in any district in the United States would presume to take the initial action without the advice of his superior.

Federal officials hold Judge Dickinson's ruling to mean that he is upon the defendant in the Bergner & Engel Brewing Company test case, they were given license to sell 2.75 per cent beer, pending decision of the United States Supreme Court.

The court, in its opinion, held that he concurred with the opinion of Judge W. H. S. Thomson, of the Western district of Pennsylvania. Judge Thomson held that the government was not obliged to prove that whatever beer was sold was intoxicating. He overruled the demurrers in a case analogous to that which came before Judge Dickinson. The only point of difference, Judge Dickinson pointed out in his opinion, between himself and his fellow jurist, was that the latter had seen fit to overrule the demurrers now, and he saw no reason for doing so at this time. He declared the demurrers would be disposed of at the time of trial.

The fact that Judge Dickinson held the question at issue to be "a trial question" is held by lawyers to mean that the question can be more properly raised when all the evidence is in, and cannot be raised as well in advance of the pleadings.

In the face of this important ruling by the court the wholesale and retail liquor license fees for August are being paid by dealers and are being accepted at the office of City Treasurer Shoyer. Payments commenced today by the decision of Judge Dickinson in accepting money for fees, Mr. Shoyer said.

"The opinion of Judge Dickinson in refusing to give a decision in the liquor case because he considered it a matter for the jury to decide makes it certain that the saloon men have a legal right to conduct their business in such a decision is given by a jury. "Therefore licenses will be issued to all those who desire them for the month of August. The last day that a license can be taken out is August 1."

Liquor Dealers' Association, of which Neil Bonner is president, to reopen all saloons for the sale of 2.75 per cent beer today is expected to result in drastic action on the part of the government. Wholesale arrests may follow.

Other procedure, planned by the Federal authorities, so soon as counsel for the Bergner & Engel Brewing Company withdraw the demurrers filed to the complaints against the brewers, or enter a plea to the complaints, may prove surprising to brewers, saloonmen and the general public.

Estimates made by men prominent in liquor circles today were that before night at least 80 per cent of the 1800 saloons in the city would be open for the sale of 2.75 per cent beer, and that 2500 bartenders, most of them members of the union, would be serving customers. Bartenders' Local No. 115, which has 2700 members, voted to return to work last night, following the decision of the Philadelphia Retail Liquor Dealers' Association to open saloons for sale of 2.75 per cent.

Philadelphia's hotels, which have strictly obeyed the law, will not sell beer, pending a final decision as to the legality of such sales.

Only Republicans for 100 Committee

Continued From Page One. apparent that August 1 will arrive before any decision will be made by citizens party to the municipal frays on candidates for Mayor. The situation is as badly muddled now as it was two weeks ago; in fact, more so.

What each side, the independents representing the various bodies that met yesterday to select a committee of one hundred members of the professions, and the Vare organization is searching for is an "available man."

There is no end of the "eminently respectable" men who are in a receptive mood. There are high class business men, several bankers and some eminent members of the professions whose names I know have been presented, discussed and rejected by the leaders on both sides.

Must Have More Than Name. The reason for the rejection is that these men are not "in touch" with the people. The men to be selected must possess something more than a name. I suppose the words "personal magnetism" might describe it. And so it comes about that the situation as to the selection of majority candidates has made no progress.

There is another reason. Both sides are jockeying. The Independents will hold off as long as possible to see whom the Vare people will name. The Vare leaders are doing the same in spite of the defiant assertion that they "don't give a damn" what Penrose does.

In the very inner circles of the last two days there has been a persistent rumor that, although his friends are active and earnest, A. Lincoln Acker will not be, when it comes to the test, a candidate for Mayor.

Some days ago I mentioned the fact that his friend and neighbors were arranging for a spectacular demonstration to select a candidate for Mayor. It is a matter for the decision of United States Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer to act upon, and no United States district attorney in any district in the United States would presume to take the initial action without the advice of his superior.

Objections Are Made. By the same token two other gentlemen whose names have been very prominently mentioned on the regular organization of the Vare side will be contentiously sidetracked. It is no fault of theirs. Tentatively they are candidates. But I understand that objections have been filed by objectors who are powerful in their own party against their candidacy.

It is the collective force of the above conditions that has put the majority situation into such a state of uncertainty. The matter of candidates is a game of "button, button, whose got a candidate?"

is there, Mr. Ford? "No but the head-line." "But you said that a headline shows what is in the body of the article, Mr. Ford."

This precipitated an argument in the course of which Attorney Murphy contended that it was the contention of the plaintiff that the headline was libelous standing by itself for the very reason that the text of the article related nothing anarchistic of Mr. Ford.

"It seems to me, your honor," said Mr. Stevenson, "that we have a right to know what the plaintiff himself thinks—just how he thinks he has been injured."

"I hardly ever read anything but the headlines," put in Mr. Ford. Judge Tucker took up a law book and Mr. Stevenson went on: "You will hardly deny the charge that you are an ignorant idealist, Mr. Ford? You said so twice yesterday."

"Well, Mr. Stevenson, you can get me to say Black is white," smiled the witness. "Why, Mr. Ford, haven't I been fair with you?" "Yes."

Mr. Lucking protested: "Mr. Ford is a man who hates to appear in public, who does not wish to be here. I submit that it is brutal."

"You don't think that, Mr. Ford, do you?" asked Mr. Stevenson. "I'm not brutal, am I?"

"He is talking through his hat, isn't he?" continued the Tribune lawyer. Witness smiled again, and Judge Tucker reminded Mr. Lucking that Mr. Ford could expect no different treatment from any other witness.

But he has had different treatment according to Attorney Stevenson, were assured by the writer that he would come here to testify, but later declined. Counsel for the Tribune, after the case had gone on hearing, took Mr. Reed's deposition.

Strike-off Right of '70' Questioned. Continued From Page One. stated that he may have moved next door or to any other place within the same district.

It was at this point in the argument that Mr. Woodruff stated the petitions should be more specific. The commission then gave Mr. Elliott an opportunity to answer Mr. Scott.

Mr. Elliott refuted a number of Mr. Scott's arguments. He endeavored to get Mr. Scott to agree that the men named in the petitions do not live at the addresses given for them on the assessment lists and that these men should make "personal application" to have their names replaced.

"It may be a hardship for some men to appear here because they or their advisors were asleep," Mr. Elliott stated. This statement brought Mr. Scott to his feet.

addressed, stated that he was not in a position to answer. Mr. Scott then contended that if the committee of seventy's petitions, which he termed illegal and defective, were accepted by the commissioners then the commissioners should grant time for a hearing and, when an answer is filed to the petition, give the man an opportunity to appear personally and show he is still a resident of that district.

Mr. Scott then criticized the use of the term "qualified voter" in the charter bill. The bill states that a strike-off petition must be signed by "qualified voters." Mr. Scott said that may mean a qualified voter anywhere in the state, adding that the bill should specify a qualified voter in the district in which the name is to be stricken from the lists.

In explaining a statement made the other day by him to the effect that the strike-off petitions were prepared by a cheat to cheat the people, Mr. Scott said he did not refer at that time to Thomas Raeburn White.

"Bigger Man Than White?" "It was a bigger man than Mr. White," Mr. Scott declared, in adding that he had the utmost respect for the man he called by name.

Mr. Woodruff then asked Mr. Scott as to whether or not he would strike off "D. I." from the list. A "D. I." stands on the assessment lists for a man who has "declared his intention" of becoming a citizen. Mr. Scott said that they should be left on the lists, as they were entitled to representation. He pointed out that the "D. I.'s" are compelled by law to do jury duty.

Mr. Scott said today he did not expect to announce the names of the five appointees before next Monday. He will have several conferences between now and then to discuss candidates.

It is not likely either that the hundred will be made public earlier than Tuesday or Wednesday. "There are so many names to select from," said Mr. Coles, "that it is difficult to make a final choice. The committee will be the highest type body of the sort ever organized in Philadelphia."

Lever for Farm-Loan Board. Washington, July 18.—Representative Lever, of South Carolina, has been nominated by President Wilson to be a member of the Farm Loan Board. Mr. Lever announced he would resign from the House on August 1 to accept the appointment.

Personal View of Justice. "Then you mean that these men should be deprived of their representation because their representatives at Harrisburg were asleep," he said, "that the Committee of Seventy's idea of justice?"

"That is my personal view," Mr. Elliott answered. This latter discussion hinted that the anti-Vare forces outwitted the Vares when they put through the assessment clause in the Council section of the charter bill.

Mr. Woodruff then stated that the people of Philadelphia had generally accepted the Council of twenty-one members, and he asked how important it was that the board of commissioners cut down the representation in any one district.

Mr. Elliott, to whom the query was addressed, said:

"I don't know," said the witness. "Mr. Delavigne was hired as an expert to handle my educational campaign. That is the only way I can get anything done, his experts. If Mr. Delavigne made mistakes why I can't help myself, I would prefer to be made like any one else. That's all I can say about this stuff."

Continued From Page One. After recess Mr. Stevenson read further from the editorial stating that the government had power to put Mr. Ford in uniform, or to commandeer his factories; and that Mr. Ford had not been called to the army because there were young men to go for him, "for said the editorial.

"Nothing about bomb-throwing in that?" said the attorney. "It's bad stuff," said Mr. Ford.

The Tribune lawyer read one of the Delavigne articles in which Mr. Ford was quoted as saying his anti-war education campaign had proceeded with such success that only ten of the 20,000 men then in this guard camp went to the National Guard encampment at that time.

Ford's Longest Answer. "I don't know," said the witness. "Mr. Delavigne was hired as an expert to handle my educational campaign. That is the only way I can get anything done, his experts. If Mr. Delavigne made mistakes why I can't help myself, I would prefer to be made like any one else. That's all I can say about this stuff."

This was said to be the longest reply in the manufacturer's testimony in the five days he has been on the stand. Mr. Stevenson quoted President Wilson as stating that he had not troops enough to prevent bandit raids across the Rio Grande and that it was very humiliating.

Differed With President. "Now," Mr. Stevenson continued, "at this very time you fathered propaganda to keep the President from getting these troops." "Well, we were on different sides."

Attorney Lucking repeatedly objected that there was no question of Ford's perfect right to differ with the President; it was a constitutional right questioned by no one in the case.

"It gives the jury a totally mistaken idea, as if Mr. Ford had committed an illegal act," said Lucking.

In reply Mr. Stevenson insisted that he had a right to the evidence to show an anarchistic tendency.

No "War" With Mexico. Objection was overruled and Mr. Stevenson asked if when he was opposing the President he knew that Americans were being murdered in Mexico.

"There was no war," said Mr. Ford. "Do you call that an answer, Mr. Ford?" "Well no war had been declared."

The original question was repeated and witness this time said "riots."

"Do you call the Villa raid on Columbus, N. M., a riot?" "Invasion," said the witness.

"Didn't you tell E. A. Sumner, of the American Radiator Company, that if one of your men went to a military training camp you would discharge him?" "We never discharge anybody."

"That isn't the question; did you say that to Mr. Sumner?" "But that's the way anybody, I don't remember what I said to Mr. Sumner, but it couldn't have been that."

Objections Clog Court Record. A statement that one-third of the record of the testimony of Mr. Ford has been taken up by the objections of counsel for Mr. Ford and the resultant arguments was made to Judge Tucker at the opening of court.

"Do you think the construction placed on Judge Dickinson's decision by the brewers and saloonkeepers is correct?" he was asked.

"No," he replied, "I certainly do not, for as I read the decision it is perfectly plain that Judge Dickinson is of the same opinion as Judge Thomson in the western district. Judge Dickinson declares himself in accord with the conclusion reached by his fellow jurist and says the only difference between them is that Judge Thomson saw fit to overrule the demurrers at this time."

"This means that when the case is called for trial the demurrers will be disposed of, and it necessarily means that the government would get to a jury with our evidence. In other words the government would get to prove that any beer sold had more than one-half of 1 per cent alcoholic content, we would not have to prove the beer was intoxicating. Of course, as there is now an appeal pending before the United States Supreme Court, the court may think that arrests for selling 2.75 per cent beer would be useless at this time in view of the court's attitude."

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail

Decision of the Philadelphia Retail