

# HEARS JURIST OWNS HOUSE USED FOR VICE

**Aldermanic Committee Listens to  
Arguments for "Tin-Plate"  
Ordinance's Passage.**

**MINISTER AN OWNER, TOO**

**As Well as Chamber of Commerce  
Official and ex-City Controller,  
Says F. H. Whiting.**

Frederick H. Whiting, Secretary of the Citizens' Committee of Fourteen, declared yesterday at a hearing before the Committee on Laws and Legislation of the Board of Aldermen on the so-called "tin-plate" ordinance that among the owners of houses used as disorderly resorts in this city were a Supreme Court Justice, an official of the Chamber of Commerce, an ex-Controller of the city, and a minister from Connecticut.

This ordinance has been proposed by Alderman Stapleton, and provides that the names of owners of property and the holders of mortgages of more than 80 per cent. of the assessed valuation shall be displayed on the front of all buildings in New York City in letters at least one and one-half inches high.

The idea behind the ordinance is that many houses used for various illegal purposes are owned by persons in good standing in society, and that if their ownership of or interest in property is thus boldly displayed, they will realize a good deal more keenly their responsibility for the uses to which their buildings are put.

Alderman Nicoll presided at the hearing, and among those who appeared in favor of the resolution were the Rev. Father J. Curry of St. James's Church, Owen R. Lovejoy, General Secretary of the Child Labor Commission; the Rev.

Thomas R. Slicer, Jacob A. Ellis, Dr. James G. Walsh, Dean of the Medical School of Fordham University; John Lovejoy Elliott of the Hudson Guild, and the Rev. Dr. Thomas Hall of the Union Theological Seminary.

Father Curry declared that the little tin plate bill had brought consternation to the lawbreakers of the city, and asserted that there were more disorderly resorts on the west than on the east side.

The opponents to the proposed ordinance dwelt principally on the hardship of its requirements as regards placarding of the names of mortgagees. They stigmatized this as outrageous and a violation of personal privacy, and declared that it would make the holding of property very much less desirable. One speaker even expressed the opinion that with such an ordinance it would be impossible to give New York property away.

The committee made no intimation as to its probable action.