

SEEKS CONVERTS IN INDIA BY LIVING LIFE AMONG PEOPLE "AS JESUS WOULD"

CHURCHMAN HAS DIVINE FAITH

E. H. Stokes Goes Forth on Remarkable Mission in the Far East.

(Staff Correspondent of The Journal.) Philadelphia, Jan. 30.—The story runs like a continuation of the life of St. Francis of Assisi. It sounds afar off, medieval note scarcely in consonance with this materialistic, self-vaunting age; for here is a level-headed man of good family and ample means, qualified to achieve for himself at least the average man's career, who has elected to "bury" himself in India as a new sort of missionary, unaided, unassisted, unaccompanied, finding his "field" in plague villages and pest camps and leper asylums, content to be the servant of the meanest and of the most scornful, living on food cast to him as a crust to a cur; reviled and spat upon by the very people who have been trained for a century to regard all white men as "sahibs," and therefore their superiors.

An American Friar. E. H. Stokes, who is a devoted young churchman, had gone to India at his own charges, to enter upon missionary work. After a time he became impressed with the fact that although there are innumerable varieties of missionaries and mission work in India, there is no one who is undertaking to live forth the life of the Nazarene, in the way that St. Francis undertook to live it. Stokes has practiced his theory for about two years, and now he tells of it in a British missionary publication, for although an American, he is at present to the use of the bishop of Lahore. He declares that this kind of work is "practically possible, as well as theoretically."

Plainly, Stokes is enamored of the conception of a friar. He says, "He only can hope to make a true friar who becomes one in order to conform his life to that of the master. The individual who enters upon such a life because he feels that it is a good method will only find his happiness in it if he sees that it produces results. The man who becomes a friar in order to conform his life to that of the master, who is a closer companionship with Jesus, who was often weary and who had nowhere to lay his head, will be content with Jesus only, and will work on in the face of apparent failure, leaving all results to him who has called him to a life of poverty and service." To such a one, he declares, there are a thousand doors open in India which are closed to the ordinary "sahib."

Gave Away His Goods. To those who know India, the most extraordinary feature of the whole story lies in the fact that it was in this, of all countries, that the experiment was undertaken. India is the land of caste distinctions; and where the caste above all castes is that of the white man. The present unrest in that country is largely due to the pride and arrogance and scorn with which the "sahibs" treat the natives. Therefore the contrast made by Stokes' experiment is really incomprehensible to an occidental.

Literally, though, he set out to follow the friar's way. In August, 1906, at his home in the hills of the Punjab, he distributed all his goods among people who had need of them, and after three days spent alone in prayer, assumed the friar's robe and the obligation of a friar's life as he understood them. The vows are his own, taken of his own initiative, and with no compulsion other than that of his own will. It is worth noting in passing that in this great experiment Stokes had none of the stimulus of a great brotherhood to uphold him. Rather, he had constant reminders of the white man's repugnance against putting himself socially beneath a colored man, and accepting the latter as his master.

Some Immediate Results. In the neighborhood where Stokes began his work missions had been established for sixty years. During the past twenty years there had been only one or two converts, and those from among the outcasts. Yet at the very beginning of the friar's work a young man of very high caste—a rajput, which means king's son, and is one of the two highest castes in India—became a fearless Christian, enduring every kind of insult and hardship for the sake of his new faith. At length, the young man's life being endangered, Stokes and he es-

WHAT STOKES UNDERTOOK TO WIN

The widely discussed attempt of a company of Cleveland young women to live as Jesus would have them do is by no means the new experiment that some reports would seem to indicate. The idea and the endeavor are as old as Christianity. This very pledge is a fundamental part of the Christian Endeavor covenant, which millions of American young people have signed during the past 25 years. Dr. Charles M. Sheldon's book, "In His Steps," which was sold by millions of copies in this country and Great Britain, was based on the ever-recurring question, "What would Jesus do?"

But it has remained for a young Philadelphian to give the most dramatic and radical illustration of what this theory may involve in present-day life. In the case of this man, E. H. Stokes, a devoted Protestant Episcopal, and a member of a well-to-do Germantown family, the fulfillment of this ideal has meant becoming a wandering "holy man" in the Indian Punjab, dependent upon native charity for his food, and suffering such privations as probably no other white man, or "sahib," in all that land is called upon to endure.

camp morning and evening, although it was more than a mile from their college. In addition, they fitted up a vacant hut where they might talk with the friar. Nightly companies of students would come out to converse with him upon many subjects. "I had made it a rule never to talk about Christ unless questioned about him." But the Hindu, Sikh, Mohammedan, the "holy men" and even the members of the Arya Samaj, a bitterly hostile sect, constantly visited the friar to talk about his religion.

For many months the friar lived at a leper asylum, taking care of the lepers, and with his own hands dressing their ulcers. There is no need of preaching on these occasions, for the actions speak louder than words. A strange fact stated by Stokes is that when he was in America his health was so poor that he was kept on a diet list. In India he was given a maximum amount of life. It is that the physicians, unless he should return home. Yet he finds that by simply yielding himself to all the hardships he had to come to India, he has steadily improved in health. His plea for an order of friars in India is that the method conforms to the native idea of a "holy man," that it convinces them of the disinterestedness of the missionary, that it supplements existing religious agencies. Stokes has returned to India and expects to be joined by a number of members of some of the branches of the Anglican church, who will extend the experiment throughout India.

Spreading his blanket on the ground beneath a banyan tree—for he was equipped only with a water jar, a few medicines, a blanket, and a Greek New Testament—Stokes began to read to himself, waiting for the villagers to come to him and thus afford him an opening. They were not long in making inquiries. He explained that he was a man who devoted his life to religious exercises, and had come hoping to serve them. They agreed to let him try his dress upon the same day.

"Where will you lodge," they asked. "I assured them that I was quite comfortable under the tree, and would live there if they had no objection. 'And food?' they inquired. 'God will supply food,' he replied. After spending a part of the day with the outcasts, one of the village head men came to Stokes and with contemptuous looks, shouted at him to follow. The friar obeyed and was led to a booth where a large number of men were assembled, and these began to sneer and laugh and taunt. At last one brought a filthy old brass dish, and throwing it at Stokes' feet, ordered him to wash it in the pond nearby. The friar did so. When he brought it back, they threw some stale food into it, and ordered him to eat it. He did so, while the natives stood around and stared. After eating the food and washing the dish, he reclined on beds and chairs.

For three days he was subjected to these indignities. At last, convinced of his sincerity, the opposition suddenly broke down. They explained that the villagers had not believed there could be a "holy man" among the foreigners. "Now we know that you are truly one, because you are gentle, and when men insult you, you do not become angered. Moreover, you love everyone, even the low caste and the children, and speak mildly to those who torment you." Thus the village adopted the American friar as their "holy man," and lavished upon him all manner of attention. This, he is remembered, was at a period when all India was seething with unrest and opposition to the white man.

In the Pest Camp. While visiting Lahore, the friar found the authorities perplexed because one of the college boys had been stricken with smallpox, and they did not know what to do with or for him. The friar straightway offered to become his nurse, and they were removed to a pest camp outside the city and lodged in a hut made of bamboo sticks with rushes. Here again another triumph for his religion was achieved. At length, the young man's life being endangered, Stokes and he es-

caped from the place one winter night. They walked all night and part of the next day, over fifty miles of mountain road to the plains and put into school, and the testimony is that he has continued in his Christianity, and that his character has been marvellously transformed.

Some Immediate Results. In the neighborhood where Stokes began his work missions had been established for sixty years. During the past twenty years there had been only one or two converts, and those from among the outcasts. Yet at the very beginning of the friar's work a young man of very high caste—a rajput, which means king's son, and is one of the two highest castes in India—became a fearless Christian, enduring every kind of insult and hardship for the sake of his new faith. At length, the young man's life being endangered, Stokes and he es-

FINE POINTS OF LAW CAUSE TILT

Senators Hart and Abraham at Cross Purposes Over Measures.

(By Journal Leased Salem Wire.) Salem, Or., Jan. 30.—Tilting between Senator Hart of Baker and Senator Abraham of Douglas has become one of the popular diversions of the legislative session. On the floor and in the committee room they have fenced and parried, and their colleagues are kept wondering from day to day what new turn the little feud will develop. It all happened because of the jolts that were given to Abraham's bills in the committee on judiciary. Abraham is a lawyer, and he has several ideas as to reforms to be injected into the code. Hart is of the conservative type, and believes it is his duty to sit coolly but firmly on many proposed innovations.

Indeed, Hart has said on the floor of the senate that it would be better if three-fourths of the bills introduced were killed, and that it might be better yet if the legislature did not meet, so there could be no tinkering with the code.

Abraham had one little bill making it manslaughter to kill a deer by mistake. Hart, as chairman of the judiciary committee, made an unfavorable report, and the bill failed to pass by a tie vote.

Abraham had another bill to increase the pay of the state librarian. This got through the revision of laws committee with a favorable report, but it was killed when a vote was taken, and Hart did his part to put it asleep.

Now Abraham has another bill, in which he is said to take the greatest pride of all, by which he proposes to abolish nonsuits in personal injury cases and allow all such cases to go to the jury, giving the judge the privilege of setting aside the verdict afterward if he thinks the evidence insufficient. This bill also came from the revision of laws committee, of which Abraham is a member, with a favorable report, and succeeded in having it referred to a joint committee composed of the judiciary and revision of laws committee.

That committee has not yet made its report, but it is reported to stand 4 to 4 against the bill. Abraham and Hart again had a lively session. Abraham hints that there can be no objection to the bill except from corporation attorneys that want no limitation of the power of courts to take damage cases from the jury. Under his bill he would have all the testimony taken and let the jury act. If it found for the defendant it would be ended. But if it found for the plaintiff, the judge set aside the verdict and the plaintiff win on appeal, it would not be necessary to secure another jury to go over the whole ground again, as must now be done. The verdict given by the jury would stand and become enforceable as soon as the supreme court reversed the judge below.

Abraham is preparing to make a hard fight when the bill comes up for passage, which will be in a few days. Hart will be there, too, and warring words are predicted.

Get a Prize. Read the jingle pages of The Journal today. Contest closes next Thursday. Write a jingle about any one of the firms represented, or for several of them.

Experiments with the new army rifle show that the erosion with nitroglycerin powder is three or four times as rapid as with nitrocellulose powder, notwithstanding the fact that the charge of the former powder is much less.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

FIVE MURDERS TO HIDE ONE

Alabama Farmer Confesses Wiping Out Whole Family—Wife Informs.

(United Press Leased Wire.) Huntsville, Ala., Jan. 30.—Robert Clements, a farmer, confessed today to having murdered the entire Morgan family of six members last November. He was arrested on information given the authorities by his wife, who is believed to have turned against him through jealousy.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.

She said he then killed all the other members of the family, who had witnessed the first murder, and burned the house, hiding his crime. The fire incinerated the bodies, and not until recently have the authorities even suspected foul play.

Mrs. Clements alleges that her husband was discovered with Morgan's wife and that in a quarrel that followed he killed Morgan.