(Continued from page 1.)

WHAT'S A BULLDOZER.

said he was a legally qualified and registered voter of the Fourth precinct, and that was as far as he cared when Judge Henderson objected on the ground that what Arthur Brown may have done in regard to other voters had nothing to do with this case.

A lengthy argument ensued and the court sustained the objection but allowed counsel on the other side to submit authorities on the point this morning, to which time the submission was taken.

H. F. Taylor was recalled to the witness stand upon the remembering of the court this morning. There was an issue of fact as to the voter on the poll-book which he voted by the plaintiff's counsel and searched yesterday afternoon, in reference to the witness having been informed from a voter at the Fourth precinct poll of Mr. Brown. At the time of his vote, Jesse Powers mentioned to the witness that at the time of the 1892 election he was a voter in the Fourth precinct and a democratic citizen. Question after question was put by the judge, objected to, objections sustained, and in each he gave an evasive answer. Something like twenty questions were taken up by the court in the way in which witness, in the length of answer was concerned. The witness could be heard in every good long minute across the Fourth precinct in the day of the election that Brown was a bulldozer.

Counsel then wanted to learn from the witness whether he saw any other voters present on that same day by Arthur Brown, but the interlocutory was the same as those which have gone before. The judge's object was to show the Brown acted engaging and a bulldozer. Witness said he never a good deal of conversation as to Mr. Brown's conduct on election day.

Too-examined by counsel of Mr. Taylor was taken up by Judge Henderson, and then to counsel Judge Powers's direct point in his view of objection. In some cases of issue he (Powers) in cases he was overruled and again the exceptions went in. Nothing important was elicited from the witness.

Harry T. Hall was then called by Judge Powers. He was living at point 1, Fourth precinct, on the day of the city election in 1892. Some fifty or sixty voters were registered at the poll, including Hegeny's. Witness knew the poll book. No question was asked by the other side.

Patrick Hegeny was recalled and Judge Henderson, pointing to Mr. Hall, said: Was that the man who met you on the sidewalk and ordered you out of the place?

"Oh, no, sir," responded Hegeny; "not at all."

Hannah Wells, another of the Fourth precinct judges, was asked to step forward. The same question was asked of Hegeny, and the same answer was given.

Joseph Lippman, answering Judge Powers, said he has lived in this city about twelve years. He was secretary of the Liberal city committee at the time of the election in question. Witness wrote that advertisement which appeared in the Tribune calling on Mr. Brown, and it was supposedly directed to that gentleman. The Tribune people had nothing to do with the advertisement beyond their insertion as such. There was considerable excitement and talk of that at the polls in the Fourth precinct consequent upon the injection of the bulldozer in voters. He heard Arthur Brown spoken of around there as a bulldozer and an outcast that was his reputation there on that day.

This latter answer was subsequently ruled out.

Witness, continuing, was prepared to tell what Brown's general reputation was in this community in the year 1892.

"What was it?" queried Judge Powers.

Witness—I'd say he was a bulldozer. He was in a position to have an opinion during summer about him.

Cross-examined by Attorney Rawlins, Mr. Lippman said he had known Brown since about twelve years. The idea of "the Tribune calling attention" the plaintiff's character did not affect his opinion at all.

Asked to define the meaning of the word "bulldozer," as he had mentioned it, witness said he considered a bulldozer to be a man who by superior weight of physical strength has the power to intimidate others, or in some cases gives him a feeling of superiority over the ordinary run of "ingenuous" men (Laughter). A man who exercises that superiority in a manner in an unfair way he looked upon as a bulldozer.

"Had you heard on Mr. Brown exercise an unfair way in the exercise of his power?" (Laughter.)

"Yes."

"Often?"

"Oh, in a general way in the course of conversation."

"Have you heard other people talk about him as a bulldozer?"

"Yes, in a general way." He had not, however, met any of his followers who told Mr. Brown was a bulldozer.

Asked in what way these people said Arthur Brown's conduct had been such as to make him a bulldozer, he said:

Witness answered—In attempting to compel people to do things they did not want to do—to do something against the exercise of their free will.

"Are you a bulldozer?" (Laughter.)

"No, I am not."

"Do you think you have the right to be a bulldozer?"

"No, I think not." (Laughter.)

"Do you think it would damage a lawyer's name to call him a bulldozer?"

"Yes." Recalled Mr. Rawlins with a heavy sigh.

"You never told other people what you think about Brown?"

"Yes."

"Have you told other people that you thought Brown was a bulldozer?"

"I do not remember. I may have said it, that in my opinion he was a bulldozer."

"Did he ever mention anything about your, or any voters in your district?"

"I have heard him talk to other people—not to Mr. Jones's back."

"When was the?"

"Two or three years ago."

"In what way was the conversation directed?"

"I was in the conversation."

"In what sort of a way?"

"Well, it was without a doubt a conversation of which I was a party, you might say."

"As the result of that bulldozing," pursued Mr. Rawlins somewhat, "did McCulloch pass up anything?" (Laughter.)

"No, I think not." (Renewed laughter.)

"Mr. Brown has an arrogant offensive way of speaking?"

"Yes, sir."

Cross. Redd, recalled by counsel by Judge Powers as to Mr. Brown's general reputation, said—"In answer to the word 'bulldozer,' for the case very appropriately!"

Joe Bush, ex-deputy U. S. Marshal, said he was in the polling-room when Mr. Brown was acting as judge at the Fourth precinct election, 1892. There was a good deal of excitement around there. The judge was about to put another question which was objected to and which the court sustained.

James Lobb was called by Judge Powers—Prior to 1892 were you acquainted with the general reputation of Mr. Brown as to his being a bulldozer or a bulldozing character?

Lobb—Witness answered yes—that he was very aggressive.

J. Q. Cannon testified that he resided in the Fourth precinct and was there at the February election, 1892. Considerable feeling seemed to prevail in regard to Mr. Brown having joined the Salons of certain voters. He had been acquainted with Brown ever since he had been here. The latter has the general reputation of being "very aggressive in his disposition and disposed to bulldoze."

Cross-examined by Attorney Rawlins—Witness said that the opinion on what the Tribune had said of him, had been generally.

Mr. Rawlins was about to ask a question the witness upon what he or Tribune had stated concerning "Brown and his bulldozing," and he was whether he did not regard that as a form of hearsay, but the other side objected and the judge sustained.

Judge Hage also testified that he was at the polls in the Fourth precinct on the memorable occasion of the spoiling. It was a very exciting time. Witness was asked by Judge Powers to whether prior to and during the day of election he had heard the general reputation of Brown as being a bulldozer or a bulldozing character.

Judge Hage replied that he had heard the same, prior to being not sup. to a general way.

"Do you think it would damage a lawyer's name to call him a bulldozer?"

"Yes." Recalled Mr. Rawlins with a heavy sigh.

"You never told other people what you thought