

EXTRAORDINARY OVERCOAT OFFERING.

OUR \$15.00 OVERCOAT SALE.



Coats that solve the problem of how to be comfortably and appropriately dressed for winter at a slight expense. We have never had coats of a like value on sale at such a price. We have never offered so varied a stock from which to select, there being thirty patterns. This stock has the length you want, the goods you want, the fit and finish you want, at the price you want. Good material and clever workmen have combined to make these garments perfect.

Other lines, \$8.00 to \$30.00.

The Boston St. Paul BOWLBY & CO. SIXTH AND ROBERT.

SHE WAS MIXED UP

SELINE CLEWETT WAS LED INTO MAZY PATHS BY QUIZZING LAWYERS.

BUT SHE TOLD OF HER LIFE BEFORE AND AFTER SHE WENT TO THE HOUSE OF THE GOOD SHEPHERD.

WAS THERE RESTRAINT OR NOT? Jury is Getting a Mass of Conflicting Testimony as to That Point.

Miss Seline Clewett, whose action against the House of the Good Shepherd to recover \$20,000 for alleged false imprisonment is exciting such widespread interest and packing Judge Brill's court, was yesterday in her own behalf yesterday. The feature of the day's proceedings was the cross-examination of the plaintiff by Gen. Clapp. It occupied the greater portion of the afternoon session. At its conclusion Mr. Butts concluded his redirect examination until court adjourned.

The testimony of Miss Clewett fairly bristled with contradiction. On her direct examination she testified that she was restrained of her liberty; that after her escape from the institution in May, 1896, she was forcibly brought back, and that she was constantly demanding her release therefrom. On cross-examination she said that she returned to the House of the Good Shepherd voluntarily, and that she told the sisters and certain of the inmates in August, 1896, that she wanted to remain in the institution until the following spring, as she didn't want to "swear out" in the cold winter weather.

During the cross-examination she first told Gen. Clapp that she was not to be released the day after she was first taken to the institution. That was a Sunday. Then she said that she did not make the request for release until Monday. Later, in answer to Gen. Clapp, Miss Clewett declared that she had been in the House of the Good Shepherd for one month and six days at \$70 per month. Warren claimed twenty days, but is allowed for only six days at the same salary.

The claim of Nels J. Ness for \$753 for work done on the substructure of the Raymond avenue bridge was referred to the corporation attorney for an opinion. Ness was awarded the contract by the board of public works and at once commenced work. The council, however, at the advice of the corporation attorney, did not confirm the contract.

Bills of the Lehigh Coal company and Schacht Fuel company for fuel furnished to the police department in March and April, 1896, were recommended to pass. Corporation Attorney Markham explained to the committee that the suits were brought in justice courts, and as there was no doubt as to the liability of the city, the claims had better be paid than to go to the expense of a suit. Hanft's claim is for one month and six days at \$70 per month. Warren claimed twenty days, but is allowed for only six days at the same salary.

The corporation attorney's office and particularly Assistant Harvey E. Hall, is worked up over the "grand stand" play attempted by Mayor Doran in the case of the three minors arrested for drunkenness last Sunday. One of the administration organs takes a shot at the legal department, and says that there is a lack of sympathy in that department with the attitude of the mayor on the question of selling liquor to minors. Mr. Hall, who has charge of the prosecuting of cases in the police court, gives this version of the matter:

"Last Monday morning Leut Boernor came to me and said the boys arrested requested that the three boys arrested Sunday for drunkenness be discharged and that warrants be issued forthwith against the saloonkeepers who had sold them liquor. The boys were not fully recovered from the effects of their debauch, and I had their cases continued until Friday. I did this in order that when they had fully recovered they might be able to tell the saloons they had procured liquor at. At the time they were in no condition and I made an appointment with them at my office for Thursday afternoon. The same day the mayor called for me and asked why I had not issued warrants for the arrest of the saloonkeepers who had sold the boys liquor. I informed him also that I had not had the boys discharged for the reason that it might result in the cases against the saloonkeepers being thrown out of court from lack of testimony. This was all there was to the conference, and I was surprised to notice in one of the papers a statement, purporting to come from the mayor, to the effect that the legal department and myself in particular, was not disposed to prosecute the men who sold the liquor to the boys. The mayor denied yesterday that he was responsible for it, and there you are.

"Yesterday afternoon I had the boys at my office in accordance with the agreement made on Monday and today warrants will be issued for two saloonkeepers where they were sold liquor. There has been no shirking on my part in the matter and the only trouble appears to have been that I did not have the boys discharged as requested by the mayor when they were arraigned. This was not done because I desired to use them in prosecuting the men whom they claim sold them liquor. The boys will have a hearing in the police court this morning on the charge of drunkenness."

Aldermanic Committee on Claims Was Very Careful. The claim presented against the city by John A. Durnal, of 1555 Hewitt avenue, was considered by the committee on claims, and myself in particular, yesterday. In July last Vina Durnal, the twelve-year-old daughter of the claimant, was severely injured while playing on a street scraper which was being operated along Hewitt avenue by two men from the street force. Her father put in a claim for \$250 damages. The corporation attorney gave an opinion that the claim was not liable, as the child and others who rode on the scraper did so without the consent of the men who were operating it. The committee allowed Mr. Durnal \$25 to cover doctors' bills and medicine. Claims of Charles J. Hanft and Jo-

block and a half away. I told them they could not take me back. Martin Boan came in with the laundry wagon, and said the sisters had told him to take me back. He took me by the arm. I could not get away. He put me in the laundry wagon and locked the door of the wagon, and carried me to the building. Sister Zephyrine and Sister St. John were there. I said I could not get out of the wagon. He started to pull me out.

"When did you have a whip?" "Before Martin came up I took a whip from a box on the table and was going to strike the girls."

"My arm was bleeding. They did not treat it until the afternoon. I asked Zephyrine about getting out, and she said I would have to stay for six months for running away. I thought she would let me out when the six months were up, but she did not. I saw Mother Matilda whip Annie Dupres. She took her by the hair and threw her on the floor.

"I have heard the sisters tell some of the older girls the lines they trusted, to punish the other girls. I have seen Sister Matilda strike Edith Atwell with a washboard or with anything she could get her hands on. I have seen Mabel, a weak girl, punished."

"We could not speak to the mother superior without getting permission. When she came in we were obliged to get down on our knees and get her blessing. The sisters did the same thing. When we asked the mother superior we got on our knees. The laundry was quite cold in winter. Some of the girls went about in their stocking feet. Girls got sick. I got sick from getting wet and catching cold. I was not allowed medicine and was not allowed to lie in bed."

Miss Clewett was then asked by counsel concerning the bill of fare at the institution, and she testified that she recalled the request for release until Monday. Later, in answer to Gen. Clapp, Miss Clewett declared that she had been in the House of the Good Shepherd for one month and six days at \$70 per month. Warren claimed twenty days, but is allowed for only six days at the same salary.

The corporation attorney's office and particularly Assistant Harvey E. Hall, is worked up over the "grand stand" play attempted by Mayor Doran in the case of the three minors arrested for drunkenness last Sunday. One of the administration organs takes a shot at the legal department, and says that there is a lack of sympathy in that department with the attitude of the mayor on the question of selling liquor to minors. Mr. Hall, who has charge of the prosecuting of cases in the police court, gives this version of the matter:

"Last Monday morning Leut Boernor came to me and said the boys arrested requested that the three boys arrested Sunday for drunkenness be discharged and that warrants be issued forthwith against the saloonkeepers who had sold them liquor. The boys were not fully recovered from the effects of their debauch, and I had their cases continued until Friday. I did this in order that when they had fully recovered they might be able to tell the saloons they had procured liquor at. At the time they were in no condition and I made an appointment with them at my office for Thursday afternoon. The same day the mayor called for me and asked why I had not issued warrants for the arrest of the saloonkeepers who had sold the boys liquor. I informed him also that I had not had the boys discharged for the reason that it might result in the cases against the saloonkeepers being thrown out of court from lack of testimony. This was all there was to the conference, and I was surprised to notice in one of the papers a statement, purporting to come from the mayor, to the effect that the legal department and myself in particular, was not disposed to prosecute the men who sold the liquor to the boys. The mayor denied yesterday that he was responsible for it, and there you are.

"Yesterday afternoon I had the boys at my office in accordance with the agreement made on Monday and today warrants will be issued for two saloonkeepers where they were sold liquor. There has been no shirking on my part in the matter and the only trouble appears to have been that I did not have the boys discharged as requested by the mayor when they were arraigned. This was not done because I desired to use them in prosecuting the men whom they claim sold them liquor. The boys will have a hearing in the police court this morning on the charge of drunkenness."

Aldermanic Committee on Claims Was Very Careful. The claim presented against the city by John A. Durnal, of 1555 Hewitt avenue, was considered by the committee on claims, and myself in particular, yesterday. In July last Vina Durnal, the twelve-year-old daughter of the claimant, was severely injured while playing on a street scraper which was being operated along Hewitt avenue by two men from the street force. Her father put in a claim for \$250 damages. The corporation attorney gave an opinion that the claim was not liable, as the child and others who rode on the scraper did so without the consent of the men who were operating it. The committee allowed Mr. Durnal \$25 to cover doctors' bills and medicine. Claims of Charles J. Hanft and Jo-

STYLISH DRESSERS

have their own ideas about Clothing—wouldn't be stylish dressers otherwise. Here's a pen picture of a stylish dresser: Cheviot 4-Button Sack Suit—cut slightly shorter than last season; Vest: Single or Double-Breasted—cut high; Trousers 16½ to 17 bottom—welt seam; Gloves: Tan; Hat: "Dunlap" shape; Tie: Ascot; Shirt: Fancy bosom. No Overcoat? To be sure, \$10 to \$25. But let's figure the rig without the Coat:—

Better Get a Rig. Suit.....\$10.00 Hat.....\$2.50 Gloves.....\$1.00 Tie.....75c Shirt.....\$1.00 \$15.25

SHOP BY MAIL. BROWNING, KING & CO. Write for Catalogue. Seventh and Robert Streets.

BIT OF DIPLOMACY

WILL SECURE FOR HAMLINE UNIVERSITY RECOGNITION AT THE HOSPITAL.

PROF. BRIDGMAN'S REQUEST DISCUSSED BY THE BOARD OF CONTROL AND HOSPITAL STAFF.

CONVENIENT VACANCY TO FILL. This at the Request of the Board Will Be Tendered to Dr. Charles E. Smith.

A committee from the staff of the city hospital held a conference with the board of control yesterday afternoon regarding the request made by President Bridgman, of Hamline university, that a representative from the city hospital, and the students from the medical department of Hamline be given an opportunity to attend clinics at the hospital. The committee from the staff consisted of Dr. Park Ritchie, Dr. Albert Snekler and Dr. John F. Fulton. Aside from representing the staff of the city hospital, the gentlemen also are connected with the medical college of the state university. Dr. Ritchie being dean of that department of the university.

The members of the committee, in the course of a general talk, gave the board to understand that, while there was no objection to Dr. Charles E. Smith being added to the staff at the city hospital, the allowing of clinics to be held for the benefit of students from Hamline university would interfere somewhat with the work of the clinics held by the medical department of the state university. Without protesting against the request of Hamline being granted, the inference given the board was that the benefits to Hamline university would be more than offset by the detriment it would be to the pupils of the state university. All the members of the board of control held to the position that as Hamline university was an institution in the city of St. Paul and Ramsey county, it was entitled to the benefits of there were any, that would be gained by having a representative on the staff at the city hospital, and its students allowed to hold clinics at the hospital.

Commissioner Menck said the hospital was a public institution, and he was in favor of granting the request of President Bridgman, as, in his opinion, it would be doing justice to all concerned. Commissioner Judson was of the same opinion as Mr. Menck, and he paid a high tribute to the ability of Dr. Smith, whose name had been presented by President Bridgman to represent Hamline university on the staff.

Dr. Ritchie agreed with the commissioners that Dr. Smith was an able physician, and that it was his duty to appoint any one on the staff, there was no one he would rather see named than Dr. Smith. If the staff was to elect a physician, he would be glad to have it would be preferable, but he suggested that the board direct Dr. Ancker to name Dr. Smith for the position, and this would take it out of the hands of the staff. The members of the board of control, after some discussion, decided this would be the proper way and will request Dr. Ancker to name Dr. Smith as a member of the staff, with the understanding that the committee recommend that he be put on the staff.

The vacancy in the hospital staff is caused by the resigning of Dr. G. J. Hanley, and while it has always been customary for the members of the staff to fill vacancies, the board of control, under the circumstances, has a desire to grant the request of President Bridgman, will have Dr. Ancker submit the name of Dr. Smith, and then approve his appointment.

WILL IT BE AMES?

Mayor Doran Says He Has Not Heard Him Mentioned.

Mayor Doran takes occasion to deny in a half-hearted way the report that he intends to name William L. Ames as a member of the board of water commissioners, whose term expires Dec. 1. In his denial the mayor very cleverly ducks the point by saying "I do not remember the resigning of Dr. G. J. Ames' name mentioned in connection with the position." The announcement that Mr. Ames was to get the appointment, while not given out by the mayor himself, came straight from one of his nearest benches, and was not a guess. Mayor Doran is quoted as denying that he has picked out the water board for partisan action, but as being of the opinion that any man in the service of the city can be replaced without detriment to public business. The matter of deposing Mr. Bement as president of the board of water commissioners, the mayor says, will be left entirely in the hands of the members of the board.

It was stated yesterday, anent the talk about Mr. Ames being given a place on the board, that some time ago the mayor promised a committee of plumbers, that the next appointment he made on the water board would be a representative of that trade. This promise, it was claimed,

was given previous to the appointment of Messrs. Bement and Wolterstorff last year, and after the last mentioned gentleman had been named, the mayor endeavored to convince the plumbers that in naming Mr. Wolterstorff he had carried out the promise.

HENRY IS ACQUITTED. Jury Finds He Is Not Guilty of Forgery.

B. F. Henry, who has been on trial in the criminal court for the past two days on an indictment charging that he had forged in the second degree, was found not guilty. The jury went out shortly after 4 p. m., and returned the verdict of acquittal at 8 p. m. On the first ballot, the vote was 11 to 1 for acquittal. Henry was charged with attempting to negotiate an alleged forged check for \$28.99 signed Charles E. Becker, and payable to B. F. Henry. He was defended by Attorneys Cornican and F. H. Clarke.

Damage Suits Tried. Anastasia Hort, who sued Sheriff Wagener to recover \$1,000 alleged damages, for seizure of property under a chattel mortgage, secured by Charles E. Becker, yesterday secured a verdict of \$100 damages. The seizure was made under a chattel mortgage of the property executed by the plaintiff's former husband, who the sheriff believed to be the sole owner of the goods. The plaintiff protested at the time of the seizure, claiming that she had a bill of sale of the goods, though the sheriff says she did not produce such a document at the time. The goods were not removed, while in the employ of the store in which they were located.

The personal injury suit of Elmire Gendron against Wm. Lynch, on trial before Judge Kelly and a jury, the plaintiff brings the medical department of Hamline before the jury in behalf of her son Joseph, a minor, who, was injured while operating a cutting machine in the defendants' printing and publishing establishment. Plaintiff asks \$2,000 damages.

Leut. Gheen Wins. Judge Willis ordered findings for the plaintiff yesterday in the suit instituted by Edward H. Gheen against the Warrendale Improvement company to set aside a foreclosure sale. Plaintiff took a mortgage from the defendant company, an "discovered after a sale in foreclosure, while in the possession of one of the lots. The court set aside the sale and ordered that the property be resold.

Far Mark Infringed. Gordon & Ferguson have brought an action against B. A. Schuit asking the court to restrain the defendant from using a certain trademark, alleged to be an infringement on that employed by the plaintiff.

Court Calls Today. District Court—Jury—J. Kelly, Brill and Otis, 148, 154, 155, 158, 161. Court—Judge Willis, 113, 142, 146, 152. Criminal Court—Judge Lewis, State of Minnesota vs. James Lynch. Probate Court—Judge Willich, Estate of Edward Langvin. Supreme Court—Nos. 67, 70, 71, 20.

In Supreme Court. Three cases were submitted in the supreme court yesterday and taken under advisement, as follows: No. 77—Ellen Rush, for the use of Philip Rush, appellant, vs. the St. Paul City Railway company, respondent. No. 88—Robert W. Laing, respondent, vs. the St. Paul Forestry Queen, defendant, and Estelle F. Close, intervening defendant, appellant. No. 92—Silas B. Foot et al., respondents, vs. the Mississippi & Red River Boom company, defendants, and Charles Keith, appellant. Submitted on briefs.

THE NAME

on the Most Perfect Piano made is

CHICKERING

SOLE AGENTS, HOWARD, FARWELL & CO., 20-22-24 West 5th St. Reliable Music Dealers.

METROPOLITAN

TONIGHT! Matinee Tomorrow. Prices 50c and 60c. Edwin Milton Royle, Selma, Fetter Royle and a Great Company in CAPT. IMPUDENCE. EXTRA! NEXT EXTRA! Engagement of OTIS SKINNER, Presenting his new and successful romantic comedy, PRINCE RUDOLPH. Seats now on sale. Prices 60c, 75c, 90c, 25c.

SAINT PAUL. DORAN TOOK IT BACK

LEGAL DEPARTMENT CALLS THE MAYOR DOWN FOR A REPORTED INTERVIEW ABOUT BOYS AND SALOONS.

THE OTHER SIDE OF THE STORY ABOUT SELLING MINORS LIQUOR. HALL CALLS A GRAND STAND PLAY. He Is and Has Been Willing to Prosecute Saloonkeepers for Violating the Law.

The corporation attorney's office and particularly Assistant Harvey E. Hall, is worked up over the "grand stand" play attempted by Mayor Doran in the case of the three minors arrested for drunkenness last Sunday. One of the administration organs takes a shot at the legal department, and says that there is a lack of sympathy in that department with the attitude of the mayor on the question of selling liquor to minors. Mr. Hall, who has charge of the prosecuting of cases in the police court, gives this version of the matter:

"Last Monday morning Leut Boernor came to me and said the boys arrested requested that the three boys arrested Sunday for drunkenness be discharged and that warrants be issued forthwith against the saloonkeepers who had sold them liquor. The boys were not fully recovered from the effects of their debauch, and I had their cases continued until Friday. I did this in order that when they had fully recovered they might be able to tell the saloons they had procured liquor at. At the time they were in no condition and I made an appointment with them at my office for Thursday afternoon. The same day the mayor called for me and asked why I had not issued warrants for the arrest of the saloonkeepers who had sold the boys liquor. I informed him also that I had not had the boys discharged for the reason that it might result in the cases against the saloonkeepers being thrown out of court from lack of testimony. This was all there was to the conference, and I was surprised to notice in one of the papers a statement, purporting to come from the mayor, to the effect that the legal department and myself in particular, was not disposed to prosecute the men who sold the liquor to the boys. The mayor denied yesterday that he was responsible for it, and there you are.

"Yesterday afternoon I had the boys at my office in accordance with the agreement made on Monday and today warrants will be issued for two saloonkeepers where they were sold liquor. There has been no shirking on my part in the matter and the only trouble appears to have been that I did not have the boys discharged as requested by the mayor when they were arraigned. This was not done because I desired to use them in prosecuting the men whom they claim sold them liquor. The boys will have a hearing in the police court this morning on the charge of drunkenness."

Aldermanic Committee on Claims Was Very Careful. The claim presented against the city by John A. Durnal, of 1555 Hewitt avenue, was considered by the committee on claims, and myself in particular, yesterday. In July last Vina Durnal, the twelve-year-old daughter of the claimant, was severely injured while playing on a street scraper which was being operated along Hewitt avenue by two men from the street force. Her father put in a claim for \$250 damages. The corporation attorney gave an opinion that the claim was not liable, as the child and others who rode on the scraper did so without the consent of the men who were operating it. The committee allowed Mr. Durnal \$25 to cover doctors' bills and medicine. Claims of Charles J. Hanft and Jo-

seph Warren for pay as policemen between the time they were discharged by the mayor and the council occurred in such action were recommended to pass. Corporation Attorney Markham explained to the committee that the suits were brought in justice courts, and as there was no doubt as to the liability of the city, the claims had better be paid than to go to the expense of a suit. Hanft's claim is for one month and six days at \$70 per month. Warren claimed twenty days, but is allowed for only six days at the same salary.

The corporation attorney's office and particularly Assistant Harvey E. Hall, is worked up over the "grand stand" play attempted by Mayor Doran in the case of the three minors arrested for drunkenness last Sunday. One of the administration organs takes a shot at the legal department, and says that there is a lack of sympathy in that department with the attitude of the mayor on the question of selling liquor to minors. Mr. Hall, who has charge of the prosecuting of cases in the police court, gives this version of the matter:

"Last Monday morning Leut Boernor came to me and said the boys arrested requested that the three boys arrested Sunday for drunkenness be discharged and that warrants be issued forthwith against the saloonkeepers who had sold them liquor. The boys were not fully recovered from the effects of their debauch, and I had their cases continued until Friday. I did this in order that when they had fully recovered they might be able to tell the saloons they had procured liquor at. At the time they were in no condition and I made an appointment with them at my office for Thursday afternoon. The same day the mayor called for me and asked why I had not issued warrants for the arrest of the saloonkeepers who had sold the boys liquor. I informed him also that I had not had the boys discharged for the reason that it might result in the cases against the saloonkeepers being thrown out of court from lack of testimony. This was all there was to the conference, and I was surprised to notice in one of the papers a statement, purporting to come from the mayor, to the effect that the legal department and myself in particular, was not disposed to prosecute the men who sold the liquor to the boys. The mayor denied yesterday that he was responsible for it, and there you are.

SAINT PAUL. DORAN TOOK IT BACK

LEGAL DEPARTMENT CALLS THE MAYOR DOWN FOR A REPORTED INTERVIEW ABOUT BOYS AND SALOONS.

THE OTHER SIDE OF THE STORY ABOUT SELLING MINORS LIQUOR. HALL CALLS A GRAND STAND PLAY. He Is and Has Been Willing to Prosecute Saloonkeepers for Violating the Law.

The corporation attorney's office and particularly Assistant Harvey E. Hall, is worked up over the "grand stand" play attempted by Mayor Doran in the case of the three minors arrested for drunkenness last Sunday. One of the administration organs takes a shot at the legal department, and says that there is a lack of sympathy in that department with the attitude of the mayor on the question of selling liquor to minors. Mr. Hall, who has charge of the prosecuting of cases in the police court, gives this version of the matter:

"Last Monday morning Leut Boernor came to me and said the boys arrested requested that the three boys arrested Sunday for drunkenness be discharged and that warrants be issued forthwith against the saloonkeepers who had sold them liquor. The boys were not fully recovered from the effects of their debauch, and I had their cases continued until Friday. I did this in order that when they had fully recovered they might be able to tell the saloons they had procured liquor at. At the time they were in no condition and I made an appointment with them at my office for Thursday afternoon. The same day the mayor called for me and asked why I had not issued warrants for the arrest of the saloonkeepers who had sold the boys liquor. I informed him also that I had not had the boys discharged for the reason that it might result in the cases against the saloonkeepers being thrown out of court from lack of testimony. This was all there was to the conference, and I was surprised to notice in one of the papers a statement, purporting to come from the mayor, to the effect that the legal department and myself in particular, was not disposed to prosecute the men who sold the liquor to the boys. The mayor denied yesterday that he was responsible for it, and there you are.

"Yesterday afternoon I had the boys at my office in accordance with the agreement made on Monday and today warrants will be issued for two saloonkeepers where they were sold liquor. There has been no shirking on my part in the matter and the only trouble appears to have been that I did not have the boys discharged as requested by the mayor when they were arraigned. This was not done because I desired to use them in prosecuting the men whom they claim sold them liquor. The boys will have a hearing in the police court this morning on the charge of drunkenness."

Aldermanic Committee on Claims Was Very Careful. The claim presented against the city by John A. Durnal, of 1555 Hewitt avenue, was considered by the committee on claims, and myself in particular, yesterday. In July last Vina Durnal, the twelve-year-old daughter of the claimant, was severely injured while playing on a street scraper which was being operated along Hewitt avenue by two men from the street force. Her father put in a claim for \$250 damages. The corporation attorney gave an opinion that the claim was not liable, as the child and others who rode on the scraper did so without the consent of the men who were operating it. The committee allowed Mr. Durnal \$25 to cover doctors' bills and medicine. Claims of Charles J. Hanft and Jo-

seph Warren for pay as policemen between the time they were discharged by the mayor and the council occurred in such action were recommended to pass. Corporation Attorney Markham explained to the committee that the suits were brought in justice courts, and as there was no doubt as to the liability of the city, the claims had better be paid than to go to the expense of a suit. Hanft's claim is for one month and six days at \$70 per month. Warren claimed twenty days, but is allowed for only six days at the same salary.

The corporation attorney's office and particularly Assistant Harvey E. Hall, is worked up over the "grand stand" play attempted by Mayor Doran in the case of the three minors arrested for drunkenness last Sunday. One of the administration organs takes a shot at the legal department, and says that there is a lack of sympathy in that department with the attitude of the mayor on the question of selling liquor to minors. Mr. Hall, who has charge of the prosecuting of cases in the police court, gives this version of the matter:

"Last Monday morning Leut Boernor came to me and said the boys arrested requested that the three boys arrested Sunday for drunkenness be discharged and that warrants be issued forthwith against the saloonkeepers who had sold them liquor. The boys were not fully recovered from the effects of their debauch, and I had their cases continued until Friday. I did this in order that when they had fully recovered they might be able to tell the saloons they had procured liquor at. At the time they were in no condition and I made an appointment with them at my office for Thursday afternoon. The same day the mayor called for me and asked why I had not issued warrants for the arrest of the saloonkeepers who had sold the boys liquor. I informed him also that I had not had the boys discharged for the reason that it might result in the cases against the saloonkeepers being thrown out of court from lack of testimony. This was all there was to the conference, and I was surprised to notice in one of the papers a statement, purporting to come from the mayor, to the effect that the legal department and myself in particular, was not disposed to prosecute the men who sold the liquor to the boys. The mayor denied yesterday that he was responsible for it, and there you are.

SAINT PAUL. DORAN TOOK IT BACK

LEGAL DEPARTMENT CALLS THE MAYOR DOWN FOR A REPORTED INTERVIEW ABOUT BOYS AND SALOONS.

THE OTHER SIDE OF THE STORY ABOUT SELLING MINORS LIQUOR. HALL CALLS A GRAND STAND PLAY. He Is and Has Been Willing to Prosecute Saloonkeepers for Violating the Law.

The corporation attorney's office and particularly Assistant Harvey E. Hall, is worked up over the "grand stand" play attempted by Mayor Doran in the case of the three minors arrested for drunkenness last Sunday. One of the administration organs takes a shot at the legal department, and says that there is a lack of sympathy in that department with the attitude of the mayor on the question of selling liquor to minors. Mr. Hall, who has charge of the prosecuting of cases in the police court, gives this version of the matter:

"Last Monday morning Leut Boernor came to me and said the boys arrested requested that the three boys arrested Sunday for drunkenness be discharged and that warrants be issued forthwith against the saloonkeepers who had sold them liquor. The boys were not fully recovered from the effects of their debauch, and I had their cases continued until Friday. I did this in order that when they had fully recovered they might be able to tell the saloons they had procured liquor at. At the time they were in no condition and I made an appointment with them at my office for Thursday afternoon. The same day the mayor called for me and asked why I had not issued warrants for the arrest of the saloonkeepers who had sold the boys liquor. I informed him also that I had not had the boys discharged for the reason that it might result in the cases against the saloonkeepers being thrown out of court from lack of testimony. This was all there was to the conference, and I was surprised to notice in one of the papers a statement, purporting to come from the mayor, to the effect that the legal department and myself in particular, was not disposed to prosecute the men who sold the liquor to the boys. The mayor denied yesterday that he was responsible for it, and there you are.

"Yesterday afternoon I had the boys at my office in accordance with the agreement made on Monday and today warrants will be issued for two saloonkeepers where they were sold liquor. There has been no shirking on my part in the matter and the only trouble appears to have been that I did not have the boys discharged as requested by the mayor when they were arraigned. This was not done because I desired to use them in prosecuting the men whom they claim sold them liquor. The boys will have a hearing in the police court this morning on the charge of drunkenness."

Aldermanic Committee on Claims Was Very Careful. The claim presented against the city by John A. Durnal, of 1555 Hewitt avenue, was considered by the committee on claims, and myself in particular, yesterday. In July last Vina Durnal, the twelve-year-old daughter of the claimant, was severely injured while playing on a street scraper which was being operated along Hewitt avenue by two men from the street force. Her father put in a claim for \$250 damages. The corporation attorney gave an opinion that the claim was not liable, as the child and others who rode on the scraper did so without the consent of the men who were operating it. The committee allowed Mr. Durnal \$25 to cover doctors' bills and medicine. Claims of Charles J. Hanft and Jo-

seph Warren for pay as policemen between the time they were discharged by the mayor and the council occurred in such action were recommended to pass. Corporation Attorney Markham explained to the committee that the suits were brought in justice courts, and as there was no doubt as to the liability of the city, the claims had better be paid than to go to the expense of a suit. Hanft's claim is for one month and six days at \$70 per month. Warren claimed twenty days, but is allowed for only six days at the same salary.

The corporation attorney's office and particularly Assistant Harvey E. Hall, is worked up over the "grand stand" play attempted by Mayor Doran in the case of the three minors arrested for drunkenness last Sunday. One of the administration organs takes a shot at the legal department, and says that there is a lack of sympathy in that department with the attitude of the mayor on the question of selling liquor to minors. Mr. Hall, who has charge of the prosecuting of cases in the police court, gives this version of the matter:

"Last Monday morning Leut Boernor came to me and said the boys arrested requested that the three boys arrested Sunday for drunkenness be discharged and that warrants be issued forthwith against the saloonkeepers who had sold them liquor. The boys were not fully recovered from the effects of their debauch, and I had their cases continued until Friday. I did this in order that when they had fully recovered they might be able to tell the saloons they had procured liquor at. At the time they were in no condition and I made an appointment with them at my office for Thursday afternoon. The same day the mayor called for me and asked why I had not issued warrants for the arrest of the saloonkeepers who had sold the boys liquor. I informed him also that I had not had the boys discharged for the reason that it might result in the cases against the saloonkeepers being thrown out of court from lack of testimony. This was all there was to the conference, and I was surprised to notice in one of the papers a statement, purporting to come from the mayor, to the effect that the legal department and myself in particular, was not disposed to prosecute the men who sold the liquor to the boys. The mayor denied yesterday that he was responsible for it, and there you are.

SAINT PAUL. DORAN TOOK IT BACK

LEGAL DEPARTMENT CALLS THE MAYOR DOWN FOR A REPORTED INTERVIEW ABOUT BOYS AND SALOONS.

THE OTHER SIDE OF THE STORY ABOUT SELLING MINORS LIQUOR. HALL CALLS A GRAND STAND PLAY. He Is and Has Been Willing to Prosecute Saloonkeepers for Violating the Law.

The corporation attorney's office and particularly Assistant Harvey E. Hall, is worked up over the "grand stand" play attempted by Mayor Doran in the case of the three minors arrested for drunkenness last Sunday. One of the administration organs takes a shot at the legal department, and says that there is a lack of sympathy in that department with the attitude of the mayor on the question of selling liquor to minors. Mr. Hall, who has charge of the prosecuting of cases in the police court, gives this version of the matter:

"Last Monday morning Leut Boernor came to me and said the boys arrested requested that the three boys arrested Sunday for drunkenness be discharged and that warrants be issued forthwith against the saloonkeepers who had sold them liquor. The boys were not fully recovered from the effects of their debauch, and I had their cases continued until Friday. I did this in order that when they had fully recovered they might be able to tell the saloons they had procured liquor at. At the time they were in no condition and I made an appointment with them at my office for Thursday afternoon. The same day the mayor called for me and asked why I had not issued warrants for the arrest of the saloonkeepers who had sold the boys liquor. I informed him also that I had not had the boys discharged for the reason that it might result in the cases against the saloonkeepers being thrown out of court from lack of testimony. This was all there was to the conference, and I was surprised to notice in one of the papers a statement, purporting to come from the mayor, to the effect that the legal department and myself in particular, was not disposed to prosecute the men who sold the liquor to the boys. The mayor denied yesterday that he was responsible for it, and there you are.

"Yesterday afternoon I had the boys at my office in accordance with the agreement made on Monday and today warrants will be issued for two saloonkeepers where they were sold liquor. There has been no shirking on my part in the matter and the only trouble appears to have been that I did not have the boys discharged as requested by the mayor when they were arraigned. This was not done because I desired to use them in prosecuting the men whom they claim sold them liquor. The boys will have a hearing in the police court this morning on the charge of drunkenness."

Aldermanic Committee on Claims Was Very Careful. The claim presented against the city by John A. Durnal, of 1555 Hewitt avenue, was considered by the committee on claims, and myself in particular, yesterday. In July last Vina Durnal, the twelve-year-old daughter of the claimant, was severely injured while playing on a street scraper which was being operated along Hewitt avenue by two men from the street force. Her father put in a claim for \$250 damages. The corporation attorney gave an opinion that the claim was not liable, as the child and others who rode on the scraper did so without the consent of the men who were operating it. The committee allowed Mr. Durnal \$25 to cover doctors' bills and medicine. Claims of Charles J. Hanft and Jo-

seph Warren for pay as policemen between the time they were discharged by the mayor and the council occurred in such action were recommended to pass. Corporation Attorney Markham explained to the committee that the suits were brought in justice courts, and as there was no doubt as to the liability of the city, the claims had better be paid than to go