

If Miss Montgomery Only Hadn't Forgotten Her Lines-

"I Never Loved Him! Never! Never!! Never!!!" She Cried at Least 100 Times as the Stage Heroine of a Divorce Play When the Stage Lawyer Asked Her If She Loved the Stage Co-Respondent --and the Stage Jury Acquitted Her

"WELL," said Miss Mabel Montgomery, when papers were served upon her calling for her to answer to her husband's divorce suit in the New York Supreme Court, "well, that oughtn't to be very hard for me to do."

"In fact," she continued, "I shall know just exactly what to do. Lawyers won't be able to browbeat me. I won't be too much in awe of the court and I'll know just how to appeal to the jury. There's really nothing to it."

"I'll just go on the stand and testify in my own behalf," she concluded in a burst of confidence.

For had not Miss Montgomery appeared time after time as the unfortunate heroine, "Peggy Admaston," in Louis Waller's successful play of divorce, "The Butterfly on the Wheel," and matinee after matinee and night after night she had gone upon a stage stand in a stage court room and had explained away a whole series of compromising stage circumstances to the satisfaction of a stage jury, which had finally acquitted her triumphantly? She had indeed.

"What," said Miss Montgomery to herself, "what woman ever was so lucky. Here I know all about just what to say and what to answer and what to do. For of course what goes on the stage will go in real life. Isn't the stage just the mirror of real life anyway? Of course."

"Besides that," said a friend, "What they saw about you, Mabel, is just exactly almost what they said about Peggy. So you won't have to learn any new lines even, Mabel."

"Isn't it true? Lovely!" said Miss Montgomery.

But the fact remains that Miss Montgomery or Mrs. Augustus Gertenbach as she is in real life, lost! The real life jury didn't acquit her at all. Miss Montgomery, it can only be inferred, forgot her lines.

Miss Montgomery is a very fine actress indeed. She has played in the greatest of roles and is of sufficiently striking personality, which makes it all the harder to understand how she could forget. There was a buzz of interest in the New York court room when she took the stand.

"Butterfly on the Wheel!" went the whisper. John F. McIntyre, the famous attorney for former Lieutenant Becker and a figure in many other equally notorious cases, had the butterfly on his mind too, evidently. Miss Montgomery had started off all right, answering readily and with complete composure the questions hurled at her. Mr. McIntyre suddenly changed his line of cross questioning.

"A year or more ago you were engaged in the play called 'A Butterfly on the Wheel,' were you not?" he asked. Miss Montgomery flushed and paused.

"A. Yes, sir, she finally answered. The dialogue ran on.

"Q. You remember in that play there was a court scene and a divorce suit, do you remember?"

"A. Yes, sir.

"Q. And in that divorce scene you played and testified, did you not?"

"A. I believe so. I don't remember my parts very long. Mr. McIntyre, I have to study so many; I generally forget them as soon as I finish playing them. At that time I had to take up such big work.

"Q. In the play of 'The Butterfly on the Wheel' you took one of the principal characters in that play?"

"A. Yes, sir.

"Q. Among other things, you had to figure out how to lose prominently in the divorce scene that was staged in that play?"

"A. I believe so.

Here Mr. McIntyre dropped the subject—but right here Miss Montgomery seems to have begun to forget her course in the play. Perhaps Mr. McIntyre was, himself, satisfied that Miss Montgomery had really forgotten the lines. Had he pursued this line of examination further he would have developed that in many respects the part that Miss Montgomery took in the play was practically identical with the one she was then playing in actual life.



PHOTO BY WHITE, N.Y.

The Famous Courtroom Scene in "The Butterfly on the Wheel," the Divorce Play in Which Miss Montgomery Starred and Whose Incidents Were Afterwards Reproduced With Startling Exactness in Her Own Real-Life Divorce Case.

After her cross-examiner had brought out all the facts in connection with this incident, he put the following question:

"Well, does it not strike you, Mrs. Admaston, that anyone would have good ground for supposing that the accident which brought about the last of this series of innocent and pleasant reunions was in reality not an accident but deliberate design?"

And Peggy answered: "I see what you mean, but whatever any one thought, it WAS an accident!"

A similar situation was brought out in Miss Montgomery's real divorce case.

Here is the testimony:

"Q. Before the night of the raid did you have Jimmy stay out with you over night?"

"A. I remember one night. I was trying to hunt up a dressmaker, and she lived some place away out near Canarsie, and we had a great deal of difficulty in finding her, and I was out very late that night."

"Q. When you spoke to Mr. Gertenbach concerning that visit to Canarsie, did you tell Mr. Gertenbach the truth?"

"A. I did."

But "I Don't Understand the Question," Was All She Had to Say in Her Own Real Life Divorce Case When the Same Question Was Asked Her by a Real Lawyer and Almost Exactly the Same Court Room Situations Confronted Her--and a Real Jury Found Her Guilty

Q. Or didn't you suppress the truth?"

A. Why, he was there to meet me when I came home.

Q. Did you tell James not to tell that, or something like that?"

A. There was nothing not to tell.

Q. I say did you tell Gertenbach all the truth?"

A. Yes, I tried to explain to him as I remember, just what it was.

Q. What time did you get home?"

A. It was quite late, I know, because it was after I put the children to bed. We started very late, and I had no idea of the distance we were going. The weather was frightful and the roads were in a terrible condition. I know we got out of the way which led to Canarsie. We had no idea the distance was like that when we started. Finally it was so far that we could not locate the road."

A number of witnesses testified to incidents at the Gertenbach home, which seemed to indicate unusual familiarity between Miss Montgomery and her chauffeur, but Miss Montgomery endeavored to explain them all satisfactorily. The most damaging evidence produced against her, no doubt, was that of witnesses who testified to a raid upon her room after she had separated from her husband, at which time Mooney was found in her company.

The jury brought in a verdict of guilty and Gertenbach was granted a divorce.

Whether or not the lines of the play might have brought about a different result if Miss Montgomery had recalled and used them is, of course, problematical, but Miss Montgomery herself is inclined to believe that the case was hopeless for her anyway, in view of the testimony brought against her.

"It was my word against that of others," she declared, "and you can never tell how a real jury will decide. No matter how much perjury is committed, a jury may not regard it as such, and then the righteous will suffer and the wrong prevail! Peggy was innocent and the jury believed her. I was innocent and the jury didn't believe me. That's all!"



Miss Mabel Montgomery, Whose Real Life Divorce Suit Turned Out So Differently from Her Stage One.

Robert Fyfe started a question thus: "Now, Mrs. Admaston, do you state that you and your lover?"

Peggy burst out with the following indignant answer:

"Peggy: How dare you suggest that I have never loved him, never, NEVER! If I had loved him do you think I would be here now? For months and months he begged and entreated me to let my husband divorce me so that I could marry him. If I had loved him, do you think that I would have faced this horrible place? I have never loved him. I have been foolish. I have loved his admirer. I have played with him."

The case against Miss Montgomery was based upon her friendship with James Mooney, her chauffeur. It appeared that after she and her husband had separated, she had started Mooney in the gasoline business. She declared that it was

never knew that the law—man's law—made no difference between the opportunity to do wrong and the giving way to it. Some day men who know women will make other laws, but some of us must have our lives broken first. In the face of the evidence, no man would believe me, whatever I say, but I swear before God I have done nothing wrong—nothing—but no one will believe me—no one!"

The case against Miss Montgomery was based upon her friendship with James Mooney, her chauffeur. It appeared that after she and her husband had separated, she had started Mooney in the gasoline business. She declared that it was

purely a business relation that existed between her and "Jimmy"—they were business partners.

The line of testimony brought out to show how closely their relationship brought Miss Montgomery and Jimmy together was not very unlike the testimony in the play to show that Peggy and the co-respondent were passionately in love with each other.

In the play, too, the whole case against Peggy was founded upon an incident which brought her and the co-respondent, Collinswood, together in a Paris hotel. Peggy claimed that that incident was an accident. Her husband produced strong testimony to show it was designed.

The Most Humane Way of Breaking a Setting Hen

By JOHN T. TIMMONS, The Distinguished Horticultural Expert.

ALL sorts of methods have been advanced and tried for breaking a hen of her desire to set, and some have been fairly successful, but none has proven as humane and successful as the method employed by a poultryman in eastern Ohio.

Certain breeds of poultry are more determined to set than others, and it seems almost impossible to break the hens and cause them to return to laying again.

Alarm clocks which would ring a bell every minute for a long time, and dollar watches with a loud tick were used with more or less success, and chestnut burrs with very sharp thorns were placed in the nests with good effect. The latter were not considered humane, however, because of the very tender skin on the breast of the setting hen. A more humane method was desired, and to find out just the best method a number of different kinds of coops or prisons were built, and setting hens were confined to ascertain which way was the most effective.

After a number of interesting tests of coops one was selected. It was plain and square, with a roof that would shed the rain. It had open slatted sides, with a floor made of very narrow strips set a half inch apart, to permit a free circulation of

air through the coop, and beneath the hen if she decided to set on the floor of the coop.

An ordinary board gathers the heat from the body of a setting hen, and it only requires a few minutes for the spot where she is setting to become warm. With the open cracks between the narrow strips the heat from the hen escapes, and the wind coming up through the openings in the floor of the coop reduces the desire to set.

To get the best results the little prison should be placed on four legs at least two feet from the ground floor of the poultry house, permitting a free circulation of the cool air beneath the floor of the coop containing the hens that want to set.

Actual experience shows it will take much less time to convert a setting hen into a laying one in such a device than in any other form of coop, or by the use of any of the numerous and very unique ways of getting the hen out of the notion she must set.

One of the secrets in breaking a setting hen lies in taking advantage of an early start. If she is broken of the desire to set just as soon as she begins to cluck and shows a desire to remain on the nest, she will lay more eggs in a given time than if she is taken later. The slatted coop described will aid in her production.