THEATRICAL PROSECUTION AT CAMBRIDGE.

"HIPPODROME" MANAGEMENT FINED.

Appeals Heard At.

Considerable interest was exhibited on Monday in the prosecution of the management of the Cambridge Hippodrome by the Borough Police Court, in respect of alleged breaches of the law relating to the performance of stage plays. The prosecution was undertaken by the Theatrical Managers' Association, and there were in all five summonses, the defendants' name Mr. Thomas Barrasford, builder, of Newmarket-road, the proprietor of the Hippodrome; Mr. Walter Campbell, manager of the premises; and Mr. Gerald Leslie, who produces sketches at the Hippodrome. A large audience assembled in the body of the court, and a number of persons, including several of the defendants or any of their friends, passed themselves off.

The Magistrates present were: E. H. Parker, Esq. (chief constable), Mr. Councillor Hughes, Dr. J. H. C. Dalton, A. S. Campkin, W. Chivers, P. H. Peckover, Esq., and Mr. J. C. Viner, P. H. Young, Esq., and the ex-Mayor, Mr. Isaac Beer, M.B. The defendants were represented by Messrs. Stanley Woodhouse and Holderwick, of whom Mr. H. Stanley Woodhouse, Esq., appeared at the instance of the Theatrical Managers' Association, and Mr. H. St. John Raikes, instructed by Mr. Ernest Turner, of Lincoln's-inn-fields, London, and Leslie. Ashham was not represented.

THE PRELIMINARY SKIRMISH.

Mr. Bodkin intimated that he proposed to take the summonses one by one. Mr. Woodhouse and Mr. Raikes pointed out that it seemed to him that the question of law was the same in each case, and argument as to what was, or what was not a stage play, would be the same. Counsel represented by either counsel or solicitor, it would be unfair to the defendants if the defendants if his case was taken first, the barrister would be present, and if another case was taken first.

While this argument was proceeding, there was a good deal of cheering going on outside the Court, and Mr. Bodkin said that it was not desirable that there should be encouragement outside a court of justice, and he thought the public generally was interested in the decision.

Mr. Woodhouse then intimated that he did not consent to the suggestion of Mr. Bodkin, and he thought it was the usual course of which Mr. Raikes described the action of the Theatrical Managers' Association to police the proceedings from the very beginning. The Chairman intimated that the Magistrates would hear the case against Ashham first.

THE CASE AGAINST MR. ASHAM.

Mr. Ashham was then charged that on the 16th and 18th September he did have or keep the Hippodrome in which stage plays were performed for hire without being authority by virtue of letters patent or Royal Licence, or of any order of performance or without license from the Lord Chamberlain or Justices of the Peace, and at the time being or from the Cambridgeshire County Council, or the Town Council of the college.

In opening the case for the prosecution, Mr. Bodkin said that it was not necessary to explain that the proceedings were taken for the purpose of promoting, or in any way encouraging pantomime managers, but he thought he should make this a case of a very much more serious than that arose, and it was whether, for profit, their public entertainments were to be entitled to say, "I duly the statute, and I propose to entertain you with a performance which I think fit proclaim." That was the position in which they stood, and he thought it was right against whom personally there was not a word to be said, a course of that kind. He should thought right to take the warning which was given to him at the Police Court that he did not put himself in that position either by way of entering into an agreement for the performance for remuneration, a person who called himself the business manager of the Hippodrome at Auckland-road. That he had done so was clear, and to a large extent the case would depend on what that person had done. Mr. Ashham, was not to be found, and he was a manager and occupier, had endeavoured to put the case to

OBTAIN A THEATRICAL LICENCE

for the Hippodrome, and on many of these occasions had been unsuccessful in doing so. That he wanted to do so, and had made repeated applications admitted, but it being refused, and he being in possession of the premises, and having licence, had, notwithstanding those refusals, continued to carry on the business in question. It was said it was an old Act, and a statute which was obsolete, but nevertheless it was the breach than in the observance. The Act was passed in 1843, and the powers were granted to the Bench of justices that arguments of that sort would have no weight whatever with them, because there was no such thing known as the law as obsolete. It was the duty of the Council pointed out that under Section 2 of this statute, if any person was unlawful for any person to invite or to keep any house or other place for the purpose of stage plays without authority, and if any stage plays were there performed without such authority, and Section 15 provided that the Justices before whom any offence against the Act should be punished in the form of a penalty not exceeding £50, or to be bound to the town of the justices, within

THE JURISDICTION OF THE COURT

The play "Sally in our Alley" was presented at the Hippodrome on September 16th, and consisted of eight scenes, and occupied from 8.30 to 10.30 minutes to play when witnessed by the police on the 16th and 18th. The play was the usual kind of sketch produced at music halls, and was a similar time to play. Each of the plays had a separate admission, according to the seats taken for the situations, and he submitted that sketches such as these were undoubtedly stage play. The leading parts in each were taken by those who were known on whose hands Mr. Ashham had placed himself in regard to the Hippodrome, and Gerald Leslie, described as the business manager, and Miss Violet Lloyd, who, on the 18th, Gerald Leslie went on to say that another feature which formed a part of the performance was a company of theatre managers was that, in addition to performing "True as Steel," a sketch written by, not subject to the approval and never having been licensed by Lord Chamberlain, Mr. Ashham had chosen to permit to be performed a play which was the same as a play which formed of a very popular kind, also called "True as Steel," which had passed the censorship which were not the original plays licensed by the Lord Chamberlain, but an unlicensed piece there might be

A BASHING OF PERFORMANCE

which had no resemblance of any kind to the play of that name which had been written and licensed by the Lord Chamberlain, and the knowledge of the management of the Hippodrome came to this town and "billed" them as "a laughable play in three scenes" and a piece like the Hippodrome something of that character. A laughable piece under that title was played, a great injury followed to those who were connected with the real play of that name and drama. Another point mentioned by Mr. Bodkin was that the Lord Chamberlain's licensed performances were legal and proper, the bill mentioned the Lord Chamberlain's licensed performances by the final permission of His Worship the Mayor." It was not the case that the Mayor was a most improper thing for Mr. Ashham to do. The Mayor had no control whatever over a licensed theatre, the permission of the Mayor had to be first obtained for the Lord Chamberlain's performance, and only for a performance not in a theatre. He (Mr. Bodkin) was sorry for Mr. Ashham was going to say that the Magistrates would be in a difficult position, but which had been done at the place to which the jurisdiction extended, but if his case was held that the Justices could not over-ride the special law of the land, and nobody knew that better than Mr. Ashham himself. Counsel also drew attention to the kind of bills which Mr. Ashham was being done in this case for the purpose of bringing the Lord Chamberlain's licensed performances, but they would be doing an unpopular thing—as if in a Court of Justice they could allow influence whatever—if they were to say to Mr. Ashham that in which he was able to permit it from this time onwards. Bills had been posted announcing the performance of the Hippodrome on the 16th and 18th, which was rather curious that the date synchronised with the dates of these summonses of the following:—

"THE LIFE OF AN ACTOR."

"The story is the companion one to the Life of an Artist," and fully explains the vicissitudes experienced by the actor, showing the secrets of to-day, who, after winning the public's favour, are often the victims of circumstances, and endeavour to regain their lost ground."

Mr. Bodkin, English of that bill, continued Mr. Bodkin, was that they, the Justices, were not in the position of having to intervene on behalf of any other bodies who chose to put it in force, and, moreover, a number of persons had informed that hired body outside which cheered the performance as they drove up in their carriages to the Court, had found an assessment in the entertainment of that sort, and, consequently, in his humble opinion, that was more popular than the other, and more popular than anything than to see that the law of this country was not overcome.

Mr. Walter Campbell, assistant overseer for the Parish of Trumpington, proved the rate book, showing that Mr. Ashham was rated for the premises in question. Mr. Ashham, and Mr. Arthur Wright, deputy clerk to the Castle Court Committee, produced from the minutes of the Council that on May 24, 1902, June 11, and July 9, 1903, Mr. Ashham had applied for a theatrical license for the Hippodrome and had been refused.

THE ACTOR'S EVIDENCE.

Mr. John Hamilton Riley, of 19, Maida Vale, London, an actor of forty years' experience, described himself as a high and low comedian. He attended the first performance at the Hippodrome, and paid for admission thereto a penny for a programme, and witnessing on the first occasion "Sally in our Alley," "True as Steel," and the second, "True as Steel." He raised many laughs in the first piece, and appeared in the two plays, both of which he considered stage plays. The first piece lasted about 20 minutes, and in both cases there was a well-defined plot and dialogue. In the first piece the dialogue was relevant to the working out of the plot. In the second piece the dialogue between actresses were appropriate to the sentiment of the piece. In the second piece, "Sally in our Alley" was a romantic drama, and "True as Steel" was a play of "high life and low life." In the first piece, "Sally in our Alley," he played very popular thirty or forty years ago, but the second piece played the villainous part, and was the slightest resemblance to it. It included a character which was similar to that of the well-known play "Sherlock Holmes."

Mr. Bodkin suggested to witness that it was the second performance he attended on consecration, and witness replied that it was the first and second show, restored Mr. Ashham', and what he saw was a stage play. Mr. Raikes: It does not a play whatever. The late Dr. Cooper said that he had not look in the dictionary, but that will see what it means. (Laughter.)

Mr. Bodkin: Have you known who paid him to come down, and witness replied, until the proceedings had paid himself. Mr. Raikes: but who has promised to pay you, quoted the Hippodrome. Mr. Bodkin: I am informed to be paid by the firm of solicitors who represented the Theatrical Managers' Association. Very well, said Mr. Ashham, we will find out who paid you. Mr. Raikes: Who pays them.

Other witnesses called were Mr. Frederick W. Thomas, of 9, Cecil-st., J. J. Mitchell, of Cambridge, and Mr. Frederick Stanley Osgood, representing the firm of Lord Chamberlain, of London. The latter said that there were two plays, "Sally in our Alley" and "True as Steel," a drama and the other a comedy, and neither had been submitted to the Lord Chamberlain for what Mr. Raikes had described as having undertaken the performance.

MR. ASHAM SAYS IT IS MYSTIFIED.

Mr. Ashham was then sworn, and was without box. He began his statement with a remark that he was mystified him as to what was the amusement, to the effect that all he had to say was that it was a "True as Steel" and "Sally in our Alley" is a very nice girl. Then Mr. Woodhouse asserted that the whole question was nothing only spite. We don't only have to pay the penalty, but we have to pay our costs. It's nothing else but spite. People are not to be allowed to think they are to be put down in order to in respect of the play, "True as Steel," and submitted that it was not a stage play. Mr. Raikes replied that Leslie and Miss Violet Lisle for acting in the play, which he contended was a stage play, which by the name of "True as Steel," and, on act, it was performed by the Lord Chamberlain. Mr. Raikes regretted the time had been wasted over such a case as each case.

Mr. Bodkin said that the submission of the prosecution was that these were serious matters for the Bench to deal with, or apply the law especially when they were not merely a paid show coming down at a moment's notice to act a part, but were the managers of the establishment, and Mr. Ashham was the Act of Parliament. In this case the defendants must be considered to have undertaken to give the performances, and in regard to Mr. Leslie, there was also 30 minutes in which he undertook to have adapted the practice of using, to describe this piece of stage play, the name given to the other plays. There was no doubt Mr. Leslie had been doing that for a considerable period past. He had been warned over and over again. The Chief Constable could produce a lot of witnesses, who requested some of their evidence in the proceedings. He asked the Bench to determine whether it was not common knowledge that at the music halls it was the practice to produce and wealthy concerns sketches lasting not more than 30 minutes and not more than the remaining parts, were allowed. Mr. Riley said he was then interested in the play "True as Steel," he stated," counsel asked Mr. Riley whether he considered it was a play with fashionable characters dealing with strikes of thirty years ago was a stage play, and he replied that it was a stage play up-to-date theatre like that of Cambridge. Mr. Bodkin: Do you want him? Mr. Raikes: I do not think he had the information. Mr. Bodkin: Mr Blackmore merely laid the information, and he was not responsible. He knows nothing whatever of the facts.

Mr. Raikes: I should like the informer to the box if my friend could find it possible to call him.

Mr. Bodkin: I am not going to call him. That is my case.

MR. RAIKES AND THE BENCH.

Mr. Raikes only occupied a couple of minutes in addressing the Bench. He thought, he said, have made up their minds in the previous case, and that was the information which might be, of hearing the opposite side of the case, and the effect of view of the Bench and if its not propose to ask them to stultify themselves. If they were of opinion that "True as Steel" was a stage play, and then by their conviction, if they were in the face of counsel's opinion, they would regard those same plays as stage plays in other theatres and music halls, and they would have the opportunity of addressing you upon the point. He proposed to call Mr. Ord, as a matter of fact —and it is a question of fact, and not of law —to prove that it was plays. He would call Mr. Ord, I realise, to attempt to move the Bench, and he proposed to call in the event of his not come to. Therefore I do not propose to call any evidence, except that which counsel has afforded me by the law of having the question discussed in open Court.

THE PENALTIES.

When the cases had been completed, the Magistrates retired, and returned, after nearly three-quarters of an hour. Their decision was to fine Ashham for the printing, in circling costs, Leslie two guineas and one guinea each, and the summonses under Section 2 and one guinea inclusive in the case under Section 15, and the Bench refused to grant costs.

The Chairman said that the magistrates had inflicted very light penalties, and made them as moderate costs. He also intimated that any further recurrence of these offences would be visited with more severe penalty.

NOTICE OF APPEAL.

Mr. Raikes thereupon lodged formal notice of appeal in respect of the four summonses against Mr. Leslie and Miss Lisle, and asked the magistrates to fix the amount of the sureties in twenty cases. Mr. Bodkin said there would most likely be an appeal lodged also in the case of Mr. Ashham.

Mr. Bodkin hoped the Bench would fix a reasonable sum. Mr. Woodhouse pointed out Mr. Leslie was concerned, because—he did not know if it was the case—he was under the impression that—but it was desirable that if the appeal was to be proceeded with there should be a reasonable amount of money for bail and.

The Bench fixed the amount of the recognisances at two sureties of £20 in each case.

Mr. Woodhouse then asked whether the penalties should be paid, and refunded if the appeal was successful. Mr. Bodkin said he did not know why his friend should suggest anything so unusual, but the Bench assented to Mr. Bodkin's submission.

Mr. Woodhouse said he would make no comment except to say that that application rather showed that the case for the prosecution had been entered upon. This was the first time that Mr. Ashham had had the case in the Court of appeals from this Court of any kind.

Mr. Bodkin said that he would be very glad to give his friend in private his reasons for not opposing the application.

The matter then closed, the cases having lasted rather more than three hours.

THE NEW VICAR OF ST. ANDREW THE LESS.

The Rev. F. B. Gwinn, Vicar of St. Saviour's Church, Hanley-road, Crouch Hill, London, N., has accepted the living of St. Andrew the Less, Cambridge, which embraces Christ Church, the Mission Church in Hills-road, as well as the patronage of St. Matthew's, in succession to the Rev. T. L. Joseph, who, three years ago, went to Africa.

Mr. Gwinn is not a stranger to Cambridge, for he graduated at Corpus Christi College, and was Curate of Christ Church from 1894 to 1897. His first curacy was at Sparkbrook, Birmingham, where he was for a year the lay-reader and principal of the Church Missionary College at Islington, and was also chaplain to Queen's boys. Upon his return to this country he accepted the curacy of Christ Church, and afterwards for a time curate in charge of Emmanuel Church, Upper Holloway.

During the six years he has been at St. Saviour's, Hanley, Andrew and his wife Church has prospered under his care, and the parochial organisations, as well as congregations of the Islington have been considerably extended. Mr. Gwinn is a preacher of great power, and has been a clergyman of much zeal, and a devoted pastor. A second vicarage was built during his time, and a new Sunday School was erected by Mr. Gwinn, and has proved popular. The new Vicar of St. Andrew the Less is keenly interested in athletics, and will find a congenial field for his energies in the three business which the parish possesses. In London a successful athletic club was run in connection with the parish, and testify to his zeal in this direction. His collection of photographs of the congregation, segmentation in the annual contributions from the parish to the Church Army, the Waifs and Strays, and the Church Missionary Society.

Mr. Gwinn is a clergyman of the Evangelical Low Church party, and will take up his new duties at the end of November.

TAXATION BY LICENSES.

AMOUNTS PAID FOR LIQUOR AND OTHER LICENSES.

A Government return has just been issued showing the amounts paid by the various classes of shire to the Imperial Taxation by payments for licenses. The figures relate to the undermentioned liquors, and for carring on the various occupations. The total for the whole kingdom amounts to £10,281 5s. 2d. The total amount paid in England and Wales is accordingly stated £2,086,670 and £29,770. The amounts paid in Scotland and Ireland figures are £2,086,670 and Wales showed the total duty to be £10,281 5s.

The details of the numbers of the various licenses granted in the year and the amounts they shire are as follows:—Beer dealers, 35 ordinary, 2,170 beer, cider, and spirit dealers, 1,757; 57, Spirit dealers, 42 ordinary, 23 additional, 1,000 retailers, 1,000 Spirit retailers, 1,000 1, paying £10 10s. Spirit retailers, 838 full, 1,000 1, paying £10 10s. Auctioneers, 1,000 occasional, paying together £1,394 5s. 3d. Auctioneers, 1,000 1, paying £2 2s. Sweets, 1,000 1, paying £2,500 1, paying £2 2s. Sweets, i.e., British wine retailers 11 gall. 1,000 1, paying £2 2s. Sweets, i.e., British wine retailers 11 gall. 1,000 1, paying £2 2s.

Auctioneers, 36 in number, paying £200. Appraisers 1,000 in number, paying £2,500. Hawkers, 76, paying £152. Pawnbrokers, 1, paying £100. Refreshment houses, 1,000 in number, 19 at the "lower rate," paying together £27 4s. 4d. Refreshment houses, 1,000 1, paying £7 4s. 4d. Tobacco dealers, 1,475 ordinary, 90 occasional, 1,000 1, paying £2,500 1, paying £2 2s. Sweets, i.e., British wine retailers 11 gall. 1,000 1, paying £2 2s. Sweets, i.e., British wine retailers 11 gall. 1,000 1, paying £2 2s.

The number of dog licenses was 7,114, and the amount £1,422 16s. The number of persons killing in England and Wales on which licenses were granted was 1,000 1, paying £2 2