Cameron, daughter of Sir Roderick Cameron, are to wear exquisite bridesmaids' dresses of heavy white cloth trimmed with bands of black sable fur; their big picture hats of black velvet will be loaded with black plumes, and they will carry bunches of lilies of the valley and orchids. The groom's gift to them are pins made of the monogram G. C., set in flashing diamonds.

The bride will wear white satin as stiff and lustrous as satin can be. The gown is cut in princess fashion, and the only trimming for the full, plain skirt is a frill of marvelously beautiful lace falling from wreaths of orange blossoms. The train is four yards long. It will be almost covered by the exquisite point lace veil, which is to fall from a coronet of emeralds and diamonds, the gift of Mr. and Mrs. George J. Gould. The corsage is made with high neck and very full, long sleeves.

Catching the lace on her bodice, the gift of her fiance will show with dazzling effect. The gift was designed by Count de Castellane, and it is regal in its beauty. Two hundred and fifty large diamonds and two immense emeralds, the latter costing $14,000 each, are used. There is a central piece nearly as large as a woman's hand in an elaborate diamond-crusted design inclosing one of the emeralds. Double chains of diamonds run right and left, fastening high up on the shoulders, caught at one end by three diamond feathers and at the other by a small copy of the center piece, also holding an emerald.

From the necklace of diamonds which Miss Helen Gould has given, among many other gifts, will hang a pendant, another gift from the groom. It is an emerald as nearly flawless as those stones ever are, and the largest for depth and brilliancy that has ever been seen in New York. It is suspended in a hoop of picked white diamonds. Besides her bouquet of white lilies and orchids, she will carry a fan of point lace made in the same pattern as her veil and the lace which drapes her gown.

Her going-away gown is a thing of beauty. The material is heavy ribbed dark green silk, almost the color of an ivy leaf. The skirt fits snugly about the waist, but flares in the most approved French fashion at the foot. A band of dark mink fur runs around the skirt, and upon it is a black silk guipure entredeux laid over a band of white satin two inches deep. The skirt is plain in the front and at the sides, but falls in a deep series of godet pleats at the back. The corsage is of a quaintly shaped coat opening over a waistcoat of tight-fitting ermine, with a high military collar outlined by a narrow band of mink. The coat has a broad collar and a wide revers of white satin overlaid with the black guipure, and the sleeves are voluminous affairs of the silk, trimmed with a tiny band of mink at the waist. The crowning glory of this costume are the buttons, all of wedgwood ware, having a design of white Cupids on a green background, set in a rim of flashing rhinestones. The gloves are white, and the picture hat of green velvet is trimmed with a bunch of green ostrich tips in front and a great loose bunch of violets on one side, looking as though they were, like the other flowers, freshly gathered at the conservatories at Lyndhurst.

In the twelve big trunks which will accompany the Countess de Castellane across the seas are dresses to walk in, to dance in and talk in, and especially dresses in which to do nothing at all. A beauty which she will wear in the early spring is of Narcissus green cloth braided all over in a ribbon design in fine silk braid of a walnut tint, entwined with threads of iridescent metal. The capote is of Narcissus velvet with wings of bronze.

A gown of purple cloth has a triple-pleated blouse of purple Lyons velvet, with a collar and narrow braces of ermine, and a black silk brocaded in roses and forget-me-nots, has a waist of pink chiffon over pink silk, touched with bands and bows of rose pink velvet. There are velvet and silk gowns for carriage and reception wear, brocaded and lace-covered silk gowns for balls and parties, dinner dresses and house dresses in almost endless variety of coloring and combination.

Just to think! There are three dozen tea gowns and matinees in the trousseau, and each one cost away up in the hundreds. One of the prettiest is of rich white satin, made with a very full plain skirt. The bodice ends at the waist, where it is finished by an empire belt of folded white satin. The novelty of the gown is the arrangement of a deep pleating of white chiffon, which falls almost like a cape from a yoke of white silk guipure and bands of sable fur. An exquisitely dainty gown is of pale salmon brocade with a net front worked in small pearls and bordered with pearl embroidery. The corsage is cut low in the neck, and is trimmed with chiffon and bows of green velvet matching in tone the green in the brocade.

The prettiest of all the house gowns, to my mind, is one of rich dahlia-colored velvet. The waist band is fastened with diamond buckles; and the tight-fitting waist, as well as the front of the gown, is trimmed with white satin covered with filmy black lace. The sleeves are of the satin, with broad epaulets of the dahlia-colored velvets.

It would have done your eyes good to have seen the exquisite hand-made lingerie, all ruffled and embroidered. Every article ruffled, fine and soft enough for any baby in the land. Three dozen of every article was ordered, and the bill for these cobwebby garments was $3,000. Silk skirts were ordered of every hue, ruffled and embroidered. Every article was of silk, and the colors included every shade of the rainbow.

Many people thought that, owing to the short time between the announcement of the engagement and the marriage, Miss Gould might utilize the trousseau she purchased in Paris a year ago, when she was engaged to Oliver Harriman. The breaking of this engagement made the trousseau useless. But Miss Gould is not an ordinary young woman in the matter of wealth or disposition, and a new trousseau was determined upon, with gratifying results, that can easily be seen.

From a financial standpoint the wedding will be a credit to the name of Gould. The trousseau, the gifts of the family and friends and the other incidentals will represent in the aggregate an expenditure of something like $160,000. MILDRED MOORE.

CONSUMPTION

To the Editor: Please inform your readers that I have a positive remedy for the above-named disease. By its timely use thousands of hopeless cases have been permanently cured. I shall be glad to send two bottles of my remedy free to any your readers who have consumption if they will send me their express and postoffice address. T. A. Slocum, M. C., 183 Pearl St. New York.

LADIES' MALYDOR INJECTION FEMALE THE 1 to 4 DAY CURE. MALE
CURES UNHEALTHY DISCHARGES. PREVENTS PRIVATE DISEASES. IS SURE, CLEAN AND WITHOUT BAD EFFECTS. At Druggists or sent with Syringe for $1.00. "Injection Malydor is THE BEST of all similar remedies." Dr. HENRY BENY, Biddeford, Me. MALYDOR MFG. CO., Lancaster, O., U. S. A.

MINNEAPOLIS.

MINNEAPOLIS GLOBULES.

"The Girl I Left Behind Me" will be the attraction at the Bijou this week.

Rice's Surprise Party in the big burlesque "1492" will hold the boards at the Grand all of this week.

At St. Charles' church this morning Father Cleary will speak on "Temptation." In the evening on "The Savannah Mob and ex-Priest Slattery."

The Swedish Free Mission Church association will build a splendid new brick church at the corner of Seventh street and Tenth avenue south, at a cost of $20,000.

H. M. Deitrich yesterday made an assignment of his saloon property at 316 Hennepin avenue to Emile J. Rose. The assets in the assignment are estimated at from $6,000 to $8,000.

The work of repairing Asbury hospital, which was recently damaged by fire, will be commenced at once. Subscriptions are being taken in furtherance of the plan to erect a new building.

The report of the police department for February shows but 305 arrests during the month, of which 86 were for drunkenness. During the same month in '94 there were 125 drunks recorded.

The mail carriers will draw lots some day this week to learn the dates of their respective vacations this year. Each carrier is allowed two weeks' vacation during the summer and early fall months.

A petition asking for the reinstatement of James Coleman, fomerly bridge tender at Washington avenue bridge, has been received by the city clerk. The petition complains of the work of the present tender.

Mrs. Hannah Valentine died a few days ago while giving birth to twins, that survived her but a few hours. The father, Erik Valentine, is on his way home from Buffalo, N. Y., whither he expected his wife to join him.

Marquis de Chambrun, consul of the French legation at Washington, was a guest at the West hotel yesterday. The marquis is one of a party of tourists including E. H. Dahlgren, of New York, and Samuel Hill, of this city.

Yesterday a building permit was taken out by the H. F. Lillibridge estate to rebuild the old Centenary church on Seventh street and First avenue south, which was recently damaged by fire. Another story will be added.

Commissioner De Laittre, who scolded the court house commission for accepting electric elevator bids, expects to make a sensation at Tuesday's meeting of his colleagues. The commissioner will state his reasons for preferring hydraulic machines.

The board of trade will hold a meeting next Friday evening to consider a plan for aiding the poor by securing the use of vacant lots for farming purposes. The meeting will be represented by speakers from all the organizations interested in the plan.

A special committee consisting of Bishop Fowler, Dr. H. A. Cleveland, Dr. J. F. Chaffee, and Revs. P. Clare, E. L. Watson, J. W. Fielder and J. B. Hingeley, will make arrangements for the missionary jubilee to be held in this city by Methodists next June.

The report of the secretary of the Minneapolis Humane society for February shows: Number of children looked after, 56; same placed in the state public school, 5; number of horses looked after, 48; persons lectured for the abuse of horses, 18; cattle looked after, 22; dogs, 4.

It was learned at the court house yesterday morning that Carol P. Andrus would file a cross bill for divorce from W. P. Andrus, alleging cruel and inhuman treatment. The latter lost his suit, but was granted a new trial, and there will be a repetition of the salacious case.

The county commissioners met yesterday morning with the expectation of receiving a definite proposition from the Lake Minnetonka citizens' committee, but this body was not ready to report, but sent one of its members to ask the board to adjourn the meeting until next Wednesday at 10 a. m. This was granted.

The matter of the restoration of patrolmen's salaries was discussed yesterday by Mayor Pratt and a number of the aldermen, most of whom voted against the resolution in the council. The mayor was asked to veto the resolution, but took it under advisement, and will doubtless refer the resolution back to the council.

The Presbytery of Minneapolis will hold its monthly meeting tomorrow afternoon at 2 o'clock at Westminster church. Reports from ministers without charge, finance committee and the committee having in hand the indebtedness of Olivar church will be submitted. A number of papers will also be read.

Edward Hanson, a meek-faced youth, was arrested yesterday morning on complaint of Supt. Fay, of the associated charities. Mr. Fay charges Hanson with swindling him by disposing of a railroad ticket given him as a charitable object to a scalping firm in St. Paul. Hanson says there is a misunderstanding.

The patrolmen complain of Judge Pond's recent decision in the case of James Hefferin vs. The Realty Company and Walters & Wagner, which the officers say makes it almost a trespass for them to enter a building found open at night. The policemen are disposed to regard open doors as a good thing to pass by in the light of the judge's decision.

The pool tournament at Hartsock & Zugelmauer's, 1417 Washington avenue north, will close this week. Four men are tied for first place, and six more games will be played to decide the championship. The teams are paired as follows: Monday evening, Carney and Dougherty; Tuesday, Wendell and Baker; Wednesday, Carney and Johnson; Thursday, Baker and Johnson; Friday, Carney and Wendell.

The grand jury reported another batch of indictments to Judge Russell yesterday. The august body will be in session all of next week, special quarters being secured for it in Labor Temple in order not to interfere with the proceedings of the district court.

Deputy Coroner Dr. W. F. Nye has been lying seriously ill for the past two weeks at his residence, 2119 Lyndale avenue north, and his condition is such that fears are even entertained for his ultimate recovery. Dr. Nye has been a sufferer from Bright's disease for some time.

Catholic Orphans' Fair.

Arrangements are now completed for the Catholic orphan asylum fair, which opens at Harmonia hall tomorrow evening and continues during the week. There is every prospect of success in the respect of the fair being an interesting exhibition of art work, in a social way with entertainments of a musical and literary character on five evenings, and, finally, in the more important respect of being a source of enough revenue to relieve the asylum of its financial handicap.

The more interesting contest will be over two gold watches for ladies, a gentleman's bicycle, a boy's bicycle, an elaborate banner which the sisters of the Academy of the Holy Angels made, and which will be voted to the most popular local newspaper. Then the contest over the elegant leather chair presented by the New England Furniture company, and which will go to the most popular divine in the city, promises to be interesting.

Compulsory Education Bill.

The school board met yesterday afternoon and considered the report of the legislative committee, presenting a compulsory education bill for the approval of the board. The bill provided that in each school district all children between the ages of eight and sixteen should be compelled to attend school at least twenty weeks during each school year, and of these twenty weeks at least ten must be consecutive. After much discussion it was decided that fourteen years should be substituted for sixteen, which was done, with the understanding that in case a child of fourteen could neither read nor write the English language the compulsory clause should apply to him until the age of sixteen.

Juror Dyer Sick Again.

Juror Dyer, who has been half sick ever since he was cast as a juryman in the Hayward trial, was compelled to seek his bed immediately after court adjourned yesterday. Mr. Dyer, who is well advanced in years, is suffering from an acute form of blood disease, and he has all but lost the use of his limbs. His physician, Dr. Spring, said that with careful nursing he hoped to have his patient well enough to sit through the remainder of the trial, but he expressed grave fears if the venerable juror was compelled to remain long in consultation in the jury room.

GROCER HELD UP.

Five Men Rush Into the Store of Erick Erickson.

COVERED WITH REVOLVERS.

One of the Men Takes His Watch and $40 in Cash.

THE GUARANTY LOAN SOLD.

Bought by a New York Bank --General News of Minneapolis.

The hold-up epidemic got in its work last night on another grocery store. Last night while Erick Erickson, a grocer at 1800 Central avenue, was preparing to close the store for the night, five men rushed into the store, and four covered him with their revolvers, while the fifth went through Erickson's person and rifled him of his gold watch and $40 in cash, just taken from the cash drawer. As soon as the men had left, Erickson notified the East side police station, but no trace could be found of the men.

The way the men went at their work seemed to indicate that they were novices in the business, as they had made no attempt to disguise their faces, all being smooth shaven. Erickson was so frightened that he was unable to give any description of the men.

GUARANTY LOAN SOLD.

American Exchange National Bank Gets It.

The pride and boast of Minneapolis, the famous Guaranty Loan building, has been sold. Yesterday representatives of the American Exchange Bank of New York and the Minnesota Trust company appeared before Judge Russell and submitted a proposition for the purchase of the building for $75,000 cash, subject to a first mortgage of $600,000, the purchasers to relinquish a claim of $400,000 which they now hold, thus making the purchase price $1,075,000.

The proposition was submitted by W. E. Hale, attorney for the Minneapolis Trust company, and Judge M. B. Koon representing the bank.

By the terms of the sale creditors are given forty-five days in which to subscribe such portions of the $75,000 as they may desire to assume, and sixty days in which to settle for the same. A settlement is to be made at the expiration of two years, when if the creditors desire, they may become owners of the building by paying the $400,000 claim and whatever portion of the $75,000 is not subscribed by them at that time.

The Minneapolis Trust company, as receiver, made the following statement to the court:

That at the time of the appointment of the petitioner as receiver there were among the assets of the said company 13,445 shares of stock issued by the Guaranty company. The whole amount of stock issued by the said company was 14,000 shares of the par value of $100 each. About May 3, 1893, W. S. Streeter, vice president of the company, borrowed of the Industrial Trust Company of Providence, for the benefit of the Guaranty company, $100,000 for sixty days with interest at 6 per cent, and pretending to represent the company of which he was vice president, delivered to the Industrial company for the payment of the sum borrowed 13,450 shares of stock. About May 13 the Industrial Trust company paid $10,766 to Louis F. Menage, president of the Loan company, for the purpose of paying taxes upon the building.

Then followed a detailed statement of the sale of promissory notes by the Guaranty company to the Industrial company, amounting to $49,905.17. No part of any of the sums mentioned above has yet been paid. And further, there was no agreement that the stock of the Guaranty company was pledged for more than the money borrowed.

The manner in which the American Exchange National bank became involved—in effect that on May 10, 1893, and thereafter the Guaranty Loan company had a large amount of commercial paper coming due at that institution—is then recited.

At that time Louis F. Menage, in an attempt to tide the concern over its difficulties, wired the bank that if it would pay and protect the paper he would pledge the company's stock as collateral security for the money thus expended. The bank complied with the arrangement to the tune of $150,007.37.

The proposition met with no opposition from the creditors yesterday, and Judge Russell allowed its acceptance on the part of the receiver for the creditors.

NOT SURE OF IT.

Expo Reorganization Scheme May Yet Fail.

George W. Jenks, who has been working with might and main to save the exposition property, is apprehensive lest his cherished scheme should fall through after all. He says the talk of converting the building into a state capitol has affected the subscription list unfavorably, and that he has all along been hampered in his work by men who should have been his staunchest supporters.

In speaking of the conversion of the building into a capitol, Mr. Jenks said it would unquestionably be a great thing for Minneapolis to secure the seat of state government, and if Minneapolis offered $500,000 to secure the capitol it would compel a like offer from St. Paul. This, he says, would mean a clear gain of $100,000 to Minneapolis, which pays about 20 per cent of the entire taxes of the state.

Cut in the Pillsbury Mills.

The anticipated cut in salaries of the employes of the Pillsbury mills was officially announced yesterday. The reduction was not unexpected and has been in contemplation for several weeks. The reason assigned for it is the general depression in all lines of business. The cut is not a very heavy one, and will doubtless be accepted by the men without a murmur, as Mr. Pillsbury's employes have been too often the recipients of his generosity to greatly question any act of his in the matter of wages. The news of the cut was conveyed to the men by means of a circular letter announcing that it would be effective next Monday.

Seeks a Receiver.

DULUTH, March 2.—An action has been begun in the district court against the Northern City insurance company by J. J. Le Tourneau to have a receiver appointed and to compel the company to account for $200,000, which he alleges has disappeared in a mysterious manner. Incidentally, Mr. Le Tourneau wants an unsatisfied judgment of some $200 satisfied.

EXTRAORDINARY!

Continued From First Page.

eye-witness of the awful tragedy, I desire very much to testify; if you could advance enough money to pay my expenses to Minneapolis I would come at once. IKE WHEELER, Mapleton.

Mr. Erwin showed the letter to the court, and was informed that if he could find the man he would be allowed to put him on the stand.

IT GROWS SENSATIONAL.

Morning Testimony All Against Harry Hayward.

Everybody connected with the case came into court with an apparent desire to work fast and secure an adjournment until Monday by the noon hour. The prisoner looked pale as usual, and gazed searchingly at Attorney Hall as if trying to divine what his arch enemy had new to offer. Mr. Hall's face, however, indicated little of the sensational evidence which was shortly to stir the nature of the accused man to its depths.

Thomas O'Donnell, an employe of the Northern Pacific Express company, was the first witness to take the stand. He stated that on the night of Dec. 3, about 7 o'clock, he saw a lady conversing with a gentleman on the West hotel corner. The lady, whom witness did not know, asked the gentleman if he had been waiting long. He replied that he had been there something like an hour. Witness saw the lady get in a buggy and drive down First avenue north, towards Sixth street.

F. A. Huebner, an employe of W. S. Nott & Co., was the next witness. He testified that on the night of the murder, about 6 o'clock, he had occasion to go to Frisk Turner's, on First avenue north. After he left Turner's he went up Fifth street and turned towards Hennepin.

"What did you see there?" asked Hall.

"As I went by the livery stable across from the West hotel, I saw a man start across the street. Before he got across a buggy which was in front of the hotel started up. There was a lady in the buggy."

"Did you see which way it went?"

"Something attracted my attention and I saw the buggy go up First avenue north toward Sixth street at a pretty good gait."

"Now, did you go up the south side of First avenue north?"

"I did."

"Did you see any one on First avenue north, between Fourth and Fifth streets?"

"I did not."

"Mr. Grindall, please stand up. Did you meet that man?"

"No, I did not," said the witness, as he eyed the standing Grindall closely.

John Day Smith cross-examined the witness and asked him how he happened to recall the fact that there were no persons traveling on First avenue north between Fourth and Fifth streets and could not tell as to the people on other blocks. Witness said he could not tell except that First avenue north was not a much frequented thoroughfare. He thought it was about 7 o'clock when he got to the West hotel.

Harry S. Bushong, an expressman, was called. He said that on the evening of Dec. 3 while on Sixth street turning toward First avenue north he was nearly run over by a clay-bank horse which was being driven by a lady. He was not cross-examined.

E. H. Mathes, of the Great Western Elevator company, and the gentleman whom Hayward testified left the dining room with his wife before he (Hayward) had finished his dinner, was the next witness.

"Do you know what time Harry Hayward came into the dining room?"

"Only as compared to the time I got there. I came in about 6:45 and he came in a little after that."

"How long was Harry there?"

"I know he left before we did that night. I think he was there only five or ten minutes. I noticed it, for he ate very little and left precipitately. I think he must have left the room from six to eight minutes after 7."

"Now," said Erwin, "is this memory or calculation?"

"It is calculation, principally, although I have a little more memory regarding that night."

Mr. Erwin tried to fix witness' entrance to the dining room at about 7:15 and Harry's leaving at 7:22, but was unsuccessful.

D. A. McArthur, an advertising solicitor, living at Sunnyside, stopped at Yerxa's grocery about 5:35 on the evening of Dec. 3. He missed his car, and while waiting on the corner of Fifth street and Hennepin saw Harry Hayward pass in company with a gentleman whom he did not know.

"Do you know Harry?"

"I do."

Hayward's friend, Waterman, was asked to stand up. Witness said he did not know him.

"What was Harry doing?"

"He was talking very earnestly to his friend."

The witness was sure of his testimony and remembered the incident after reading of the murder.

At this point Adry was called and asked: "Were the $500 and $1,000 notes described by Harry in your safe? He says in his testimony they were and thinks you saw them."

"Harry don't say so," said Erwin.

"The only time I saw them was when they were being made out," replied the witness as he stepped down.

NOT IN ST. PAUL.

Miss Ging Didn't Visit the Capital Thanksgiving Week.

Miss Ireland was called and asked: "Was your aunt in St. Paul Thanksgiving week?"

"No, sir, I don't think so. She was at Mrs. Hawkins' on Tuesday."

Tuesday, it will be remembered, was the day Mrs. Julia Walker located Miss Ging in St. Paul with a strange gentleman.

"Was she absent from the shop long enough to have gone to St. Paul that day?"

"No, sir; I think not. She was in and out all day."

"Now, when was she in St. Paul last preceding that?"

"I could not swear that it was not the preceding week; but I think it was the week before that."

"Now," said John Day Smith, "what did your aunt do the Saturday before Thanksgiving week?"

"I can't tell further than that she was in the shop."

"Did your aunt always tell you where she went out?"

"Well, not every single time; but she did if she went away for any length of time."

"Did she tell you when she received notes from gentlemen?"

"Well, I don't know; not any special one. If I happened there at any time when she received it she sometimes did."

Miss Ireland was cross-examined by Mr. Smith, a proceeding which strengthened her direct testimony.

Q. Where was she on Saturday preceding Thanksgiving week?"

Mr. Hall—Is that for the purpose of testing her recollection, or for the purpose of laying further foundation?

Mr. Smith—No, sir, for the purpose of testing her recollection.

Mr. Hall—Well, I object to that as irrelevant and immaterial. She has not attempted to fix where she was on Saturday.

The Court—The objection is overruled.

Q. Answer? A. Well, she was in and out of the shop. She was at home in the evening.

Q. Did she leave the city in the evening?

The Court—Which Saturday was that?

Mr. Smith—The Saturday immediately preceding Thanksgiving week.

The Witness—No, sir, I don't think she was.

Q. Do you remember particularly what she was doing on that day? A. No, sir.

Q. Do you remember what she was doing on Friday immediately preceding Thanksgiving week? A. No, sir, I cannot go back into that week. I remember all of Thanksgiving week distinctly.

Q. How is it—how does it happen you can remember all the days of Thanksgiving week, and you can't get back any further? A. Well, I can go back to Sunday before, but back of that I can't go.

Q. You can't tell where she was on Thursday, Friday and Saturday of the preceding week? A. Well, she was at the shop.

Q. What were your duties at the shop? A. I was there to oversee.

Q. You don't remember of her being in St. Paul Thanksgiving week? A. No, sir, I know she was not in St. Paul.

Q. Did she always tell you every time she went out? A. Well, no, not every single time.

Q. Well, when she was going out for a couple of hours? A. No, sir.

Q. Did she always tell you where she was going evenings? A. She did as a rule; if she didn't tell me before she went she did afterwards.

Q. Did she ever tell you about this man with the gray mustache and chin whiskers? A. No, sir.

Q. Never heard about him? A. No, sir.

Q. You never saw him—he never called at the shop? A. Oh, he might have called—might have been out in the other room, or something, but I never saw him.

Q. Did she ever tell you about her receiving notes from gentlemen? A. Why, no, sir; no particular gentleman. If a letter or note came, and I made any particular inquiry, why, she always told me.

THIS IS A CLINCHER.

Mr. Jenks Saw Harry Run Alongside a Car.

George W. Jenks, the well-known banker and broker with offices in the Minnesota Loan and Trust company's building, was the next and last witness put on in rebuttal. His testimony quickly discovered the expected sensation.

Q. You are engaged in what business? A. Banker and broker, in the Minnesota Loan and Trust company's building, in this city.

Q. And where is your home? A. 2120 Fremont avenue south; in the region known as the Lake of the Isles. It is two blocks west of Hennepin avenue, near Twenty-second street.

Q. What line of cars do you take in going to your home and in coming to the city? A. Usually the Lake Harriet.

Q. Where were you on the evening of Dec. 3, in the vicinity of 7 o'clock? A. At home.

Q. At what time did you leave your home? A. Five minutes past 7—five or six minutes past 7.

Q. Had you any engagement, anything that called your attention to the time, the passing time? A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was that? A. I was to attend the Retail Merchants' banquet at the Commercial club at 7:30. Yes, sir; I wanted five minutes before the meeting to meet some personal friends.

Q. Leaving your house, then, about five minutes past 7 o'clock, you took what car line—what street car? A. As I came out on my porch I missed the car, the five minutes past 7 car was just passing; so I walked down to the junction, where I might have a chance of catching one of three lines, at Lowry hill—the Lyndale, Kenwood and Harriet. My next car, regular car, was the twenty-minute car—twenty minutes between.

Q. As you came down on the car, were you sitting on the inside of the car, or were you on the outside of the car? A. I was standing in the vestibule, on the rear platform.

Q. Do you recollect anything unusual happening on that trip down on the car, from where you got on down to your point of destination, which would be the intersection of Fourth street and Hennepin avenue? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Anything happen near or about the vicinity of Central park? A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was it? A. When we reached a point one block this side of Kenwood boulevard—

Q. Will you indicate on the map—this is a continuation of Harmon place— A. (Indicating on map.) It is a little street—it is a continuation of Harmon place—I don't know the name of it.

Q. It is this? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know whether there is a vacant lot or block there? A. Yes, sir; it is a little vacant lot in there—a vacant lot.

Q. That is the block lying north of the Kenwood boulevard? A. Yes, sir, right next to Hennepin.

Q. Using that pointer you may describe what you saw there and what there occurred.

Mr. Erwin—Objected to as immaterial, not knowing what it is.

The Court—The objection is overruled.

Mr. Erwin—Exception.

A. On this corner there is a sign board, or a bill board, forty or fifty feet long. As we reached this point a man suddenly appeared at this end of the bill board and he came on the sidewalk and ran down the sidewalk, following the car. Thinking he wanted to catch the car I touched the conductor, who was standing next to me; he reached for the bell and brought the car almost to a standstill; when the car stopped or slacked up the man stopped running. I noticed the man was not after the car, and the conductor pulled the bell cord and he went on. We halted the car for the man at the corner. (Indicating.)

How near to the car had the man whom you saw at first running come before the car again started up on its way. A. When the conductor pulled the bell cord to go on the man was somewhere in this street, having run 10 or 15 yards, the length of that—perhaps 10 or 15, or perhaps 20 yards, the length of the bill board, and had gotten in the street itself.

Q. As the car proceeded down Hennepin, did you observe the direction he kept? A. He followed the car and by the time we had turned this corner he had passed in behind these large trees in front of a brick block, this tenement—there is four or five tenements in there.

Q. Following up Hennepin avenue? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are you able to identify the man whom you saw? A. I believe so; yes, sir.

Q. Who was it? A. Harry Hayward.

Mr. Hall—Take the witness.

Cross-examination by Mr. Erwin.

Q. Who was the conductor on that car? A. I don't know, sir.

Q. Give me the name of the person that was on the car with you? A. I could not do it.

Q. Have you tried to inquire who was on the car with you? A. No, sir; I reported it to the officer.

Q. The vestibule is glassed in? A. Yes, sir.

Q. So you are inside of a glass house? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Inside of a glass house and swinging along at the rate of an electric car, you noticed out behind you a man running on the sidewalk? A. Yes, sir.

Q. You saw him running the length of that bill board? A. Yes, sir.

Q. How far was he behind your car? A. Oh, about the same distance, the length of the bill board, 20 or 25 yards.

Q. Seventy-five feet out in the night and removed from you—Hennepin avenue is 100 feet wide, or is it 125 feet wide—how wide is it? A. About 100 feet; I think it is narrow there.

Q. Who else was on the vestibule besides you and the conductor? A. Not any one.

Q. Then there was room for you to stand with your back to the rear in the vestibule? A. Stand any way.

Q. You could not see without looking through the glass? A. No, sir.

Q. And what you saw you saw through a glass, and saw through a glass out into the night? A. Yes, sir.

Q. The man never got any nearer to you than you have described, this distance? A. A very few feet, if any. The car was going there about at the rate of a slow walk, slacking down for the turn just above that, and whether he gained on the car when he was running or not, I don't know; it would be a difference of a very few feet.

Q. How long have you known Harry Hayward? A. I don't know him.

Q. Then you had never seen him before that night? A. Not to know him, no, sir.

Q. How long have you known Adry Hayward? A. I don't know him, except by sight.

Q. How long have you known him by sight? A. Oh, six months or a year or so, perhaps longer; I don't know him at all to speak to him.

Q. How could you tell these two boys apart that distance and through that glass and through that night? A. The peculiar way in which the man ran; he has a very peculiar gait, different from any man I ever saw.

Q. You had never seen him run before? A. No; I have since.

Q. When you saw him run since, where was it? A. From the jail over here—between here and the jail.

Q. Who was with him? A. The jailers, I presume, a man on each side of him. It was one of the first days of the trial, when one of the jurors was being examined—when they were securing the jury. I took a position where I could see him as I did that night. I was trying to prove that I was mistaken. And I only wish you could convince me that I was; I would like to be convinced that I was mistaken.

Q. "A man convinced against his will is of the same opinion still." A. It is not against my will, however. I really hope you can convince me.

Q. Now, you knew Adry by sight, did you, before that time? A. Yes, sir.

Q. So you got around in front of Harry when he was coming with handcuffs on him—he was handcuffed? A. I didn't see the handcuffs, but I suppose he must have been; he held his hands down this way (indicating).

Q. And he had a peculiar gait as he hurried along between the officers and this motley file of citizens? A. There wasn't any file at that time; there was a few people gathered on this corner.

Q. You saw a peculiarity in his gait when he was in this condition? A. Yes, sir.

Q. And he had that same peculiarity in his gait when you saw him on the night of the homicide? A. Yes, sir.

Q. And that is the way you recognized him? A. One of the ways.

Q. Now, Mr. Jenks, when did you first report to anybody on earth that you saw Harry Hayward that night? How long after the trial began? A. It was before the trial began. It might be two or three weeks.

Q. To whom did you report it A. I mentioned it to a neighbor in my own family—in my own home.

Q. Who, connected with the prosecution or with the public press, or with the state's authority, did you first report to? A. This neighbor reported it to—

Q. I asked you when you first reported it. Now, you have a nice way fixed up to slide this in here.

Mr. Hall—I object to that—and I object to him treating the witness in such a manner.

The Witness—Well, I will answer him the same way if he wants to.

The Court—Well, you cannot answer in the same way, and he cannot ask you in that manner. You must treat the witness with respect, and he must treat you with respect.

Mr. Erwin—Well, I am going to postpone my respect until I find out—

The Witness—I have not postponed mine; I haven't any.

The Court—You want to keep cool, Mr. Jenks, and answer the questions he asks you. He must put a proper question, and you must answer them properly.

The Witness—I simply ask the protection of the court that he will not abuse and insult me.

The Court—Well, proceed.

Q. If you were anxious to be corrected in any mistakes, you would seek criticism, and not despise it. A. I am willing to be criticised, but not abused or insulted.

Q. Who did you first report to about this matter? A. Detective Hoy called on me at my office concerning it. That was the first time I ever spoke to him. I never had any conversation with him before.

Q. After talking with Detective Hoy, who did you next report to? A. The county attorney. That was during the time they were selecting the jury. If I remember correctly, two or three only had been selected at that time.

Q. And after that time you located yourself here so you could see Harry Hayward run? A. I did, yes, sir, at that time.

Q And after you had seen him run you became convinced he must be the man, in your mind? A. Yes, sir.

Q. There is a possibility of your being mistaken, too? A. Certainly, a possibility, but not a probability.

Q. And then, when you testify that that was Harry Hayward you mean to testify from a reflected memory, a calculating memory, made up and arrived at at a time subsequent to the car passing a man on the avenue that night?

Mr. Hall—Objected to as being double and argumentative. If you divide the question I will have no objection.

The Court—The objection is sustained.

Q. It is possible that that might have been Adry, is it not? A. No, sir.

Q. Why? A. Considerable difference in their height. I know there is a marked difference.

Q. You were above the man—you were on the car in the center of the street where the street is graded, nearly on the center—you were above the man, you were on the car and the car is above the track, and the track is level with the sidewalk, at least—your vision would be backwards and downwards and to to the right, and there is no comparison betwixt your vision of height—how can you testify to the difference between Harry Hayward's height and Adry's height? A. I absolutely say I can tell the difference between your height and his; but I cannot tell by what mental process I arrive at it.

Q. Were you looking when you saw him? Both?

Q. Well, if you were looking, where were you looking? A. Looking out in front of me, to the rear and side.

Q. Did you read the testimony of a half-dozen witnesses who testified to seeing Harry Hayward in the dining room of the boarding house, when you say you saw him running out there? A. I have not read any such thing.

Q. If you should hear four or five human beings swear before God that they saw him in the dining room of the Ozark at the same time you saw him running up there would that shake your belief? A. It would not.

Mr. Hall—Objected to as incompetent, irrelevant and immaterial.

The Court—The objection is sustained.

Q. Now, hadn't you known Harry before that time? A. No, sir.

Q. Had you business dealings with Adry before that time? A. No, sir, I never.

Q. Did you ever see Harry before? A. I don't know that I ever did.

Q. You recollect last spring of Harry Hayward coming into your office and asking you the price of bank stock, and wished to talk about the sale of real estate? A. No, sir, I don't remember.

Q. Where have you known Adry? A. I have never known him. Some one pointed him out to me when he went past the window one day.

Q. When did you first see Harry Hayward after this occurrence, after the homicide? A. At the time I mentioned, when he was being brought over from the jail.

Q. Then, as I understand it, you never saw him unless you saw him when he was running until you saw him when he was brought over from the jail? A. That is right.

Q. I noticed when you was testifying and asked if you knew the man you said yes; and when you were asked who it was you did not use the words, "I think it was Harry Hayward, to the best of my belief it was Harry Hayward," but you said, "Harry Hayward," with a smile? A. No, sir.

Q. Didn't you notice the smile? A. No, sir.

Q. You had an arch smile as you lifted up your head toward Harry Hayward?

Mr. Hall—That is objected to as argumentative.

The Court—The objection is sustained and it is an insult to the witness.

Mr. Erwin—Well, it is necessary to ask these questions, your honor.

The Court—Well, you want to treat the witness fairly and ask him proper questions.

Mr. Erwin—I will, your honor.

SUR-REBUTTAL.

No Testimony of Importance Is Brought Out.

Ben Bridell testified that he was thrown into the Ramsey county jail Jan. 19, and met and talked with Adry Hayward there.

Q. In the course of that conversation, did he say to you, "I know Harry didn't have anything to do with the murder?" A. Well, that is not the right way he put it—there is one word that is wrong.

Q. What word is it? A. "Know."

Q. What did he say? A. He said, "Harry didn't have anything to do with the murder that evening; he was at the opera and not around the block." He didn't say, "I know."

Q. Adry testified that that morning when you came into the jail that you came to him and said, "Your name is Adry Hayward"—that he told you it was; that you said, "I am from the junction up north, and, no difference what comes, stand pat." Did you say anything like that? A. No, sir.

Policeman A. A. C. Arnold was asked:

Q. Do you know James E. Ford, who lives at the corner of First avenue north and Fifth street? A. I know a man living there by the name of Ford, but I don't remember his given name.

Q. Mr. Arnold, did you ever have any conversation with him in regard to his going across the street at the intersection of Fifth street and First avenue north, and picking up a stick of wood, and when returning to his house, he being nearly run over with a team, a horse driven by a lady? A. Yes, sir; it was the latter part of November.

It will be remembered that Ford stated that this incident occurred Dec. 3.

Charles Derby was asked:

Q. Do you know M. J. Griffin? A. Yes. He lives at 1115, on the second floor.

Q. It is one of the blocks W. W. Hayward has charge? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you see M. J. Griffin on the day following Thanksgiving day, that is, Nov. 30, '94? A. Yes, sir. He was piling the wood in his shed right in the rear of the house. It was pretty close to 10 o'clock in the forning. I saw him again in the neighborhood of twenty minutes after 11. He was still throwing wood in the same place where he was before, and where I saw him before.

Q. How many blocks is that from the Oneida block? It is eleven squares from First avenue south and Third street to where you live? A. Yes, sir.

Mrs Catherine Derby was questioned as follows:

Q. Will you state where you were in November, the 30th, 1894. A. 1117 Third street south.

Q. Will you state whether you are acquainted with M. J. Griffin? A. Slightly.

Q. Did you see him on Nov. 30, '94? A. Yes, sir, I saw him in the back yard throwing wood into the shed. It was between 10 and half-past 11 o'clock. I saw him three or four times between 10 o'clock and half-past 11.

Q. Was he at work all the time from half-past 10 to 11?

Mr. Hall—That is objected to as calling for a conclusion, incompetent and immaterial.

The Court—The objection is sustained.

Cross-examination by Mr. Hall.

Q. In a laundry it is not an unusual thing to wash clothes? A. No, sir. We always have to wash them to get them clean.

Q. And when you are washing clothes you always pay attention to what the neighbors are doing? A. No, sir, I never do.

Q. Well, on this occasion it appears that you