

Q. Did she work continually? A. That I don't know.

Q. That is, regularly, every day? A. That I don't know.

Q. That you can't tell? A. No.

Q. And still, if an inmate didn't do any work at all, or refused to do it, you would have been informed, wouldn't you? A. I don't think so.

Q. And still, if an inmate didn't do any work at all, or refused, or was incorrigible, it would come to your knowledge? A. Well, sometimes they consider it rather a disgraceful thing to have to be reported for bad conduct—it is one of the modes of punishment.

Q. She was not reported to you? A. Not that I know of.

Q. Was she reported to you about this escape? A. The circumstances were related to me; not as a report.

Q. Now during this time that she was in there—two years and three months—with the exception of this one time that you say she escaped and ran down the hill, did she ever go outside of the institution or the enclosed yards, that is, the enclosure? A. Oh, yes, she—not with my knowledge—she never went outside of the grounds of the House of the Good Shepherd, that is, the ten acres that were around these grounds where there were no walls.

Q. Yes, but when she went outside of the enclosure did she go alone or in company? A. That I couldn't testify.

Q. Did you trust her with the keys? A. I did not.

Q. Do you know whether she was attended or unattended? A. Unattended sometimes, I think.

Q. Do you remember one in the institution by the name of Leona? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Wasn't she one of those girls? A. She was no more trusted than the rest of them, that I know of.

Q. She wasn't? A. She was a good girl like Seline Clewett, as we thought.

Q. Now these girls that you say you trusted more, it was their duty was it not? A. Now, don't mistake me, I trust none of them more than another; I am not in that department.

Q. Well, I mean that were trusted by the sister? A. I know nothing about their conduct. The sister in each department is the judge of the girl's conduct; she alone can tell these things; I know nothing of their conduct.

Q. Whenever any of those girls saw any of these inmates together privately or quietly, their conversation, if it was a wrong one was reported to the sister; was it their duty to report the fact if they couldn't hear the conversation? A. There is no duty attached, they do it of their own will; they are not compelled to do it.

Q. You would say they were doing a praiseworthy thing when they did that—reported it? A. Yes.

Q. You don't allow young girls to see the newspaper, then? Certainly not.

Q. At all? A. It depends on the newspaper.

Q. Did you? A. I didn't personally, I furnished the class.

Q. Did you furnish the plaintiff anything of that kind? A. I certainly know she was furnished.

Q. She was there two years and three months. Did you ever furnish her, except this dress, this black dress? A. I furnished none of them individually.

Q. No, but I mean your institution furnish her with a solitary piece of wearing apparel? A. I certainly think we did. I furnished the dress with all these articles. I mean the different departments, I mean the reformatories.

Q. Now you have had some inmates in there a good many years, haven't you? A. Why yes.

Q. What length of time is the longest that any inmate has been in there that you know of? A. Oh, some of them are in there since the house was founded.

Q. Twenty-eight or thirty years? Twenty-eight or thirty years are they not, in that ward? A. Not in that ward, no, in the house.

Q. In what ward? A. In the Magdalenes.

Q. Are there any in this ward? A. Not since that, but I think there is one there twenty-one years. I think she is a witness.

Mr. Butts:

Q. When we adjourned last night, you were speaking of the clothing furnished this ward. Do you know of your own knowledge what clothing was furnished any particular individual in this ward? A. No, sir.

Q. As I understand you, you don't know of your knowledge of but very little that took place in this ward, only as it was reported to you? A. As it was reported to me by the sister in charge.

Q. Did the inmates of this ward communicate with you directly as a rule, or did they communicate through Sister Zephine? A. Through the Sister, or to myself when they wished.

Q. Were they required, before they communicated with you, to obtain the permission of anyone? A. They would have no other opportunity of doing so unless I passed through, they would have to ask the Sister to tell me in order to see me.

Q. Then as a rule, it was necessary for them to obtain the permission of a Sister in charge of that ward before they could see you? A. I wouldn't say the permission; they would have to tell her they wanted to see me.

Q. Was that reported to you? A. She came and told me.

Q. Then did you decide upon the report whether you would see them or not? A. When I had the time, I said when I had the time I would see them.

Q. You refused or permitted it as you saw fit? A. Oh, certainly.

Q. Did I understand you correctly last night that when letters were written there, addressed to persons outside of the institution, the rules required that you should first read them and pass upon them as to whether they should be sent or not? A. The rules require that all the letters and communications should be brought to me for inspection. It is optional with myself to inspect them or not, just as I feel like it.

Q. And when the letters came into the institution through the mail, addressed those persons, did you do the same thing? A. Certainly.

Q. And did you exercise the right of opening these letters? A. Certainly.

Q. When Miss Clewett came to your place that evening, who if any one accompanied her? A. I did not receive Miss Clewett; it was the Sister in charge of the sewing department, where she entered, one of the reformatories. I understood that she was accompanied by Mrs. Root and some other lady.

Q. Do you know Mrs. Root? A. I have met her.

Q. How long have you known her? A. I don't know exactly the date, she came there on business to our institution a couple of times, and met her I think on two or three occasions.

Q. Where did she live? A. I believe she lived at White Bear Lake, as well as I know.

Q. Did she ever come to that institution in company with any other inmate that went there or was brought there? A. I don't know that she was accompanied, she sent another inmate once.

Q. Who was that? A. We call her Lizzie in our institution.

Q. Was her true name Agnes Taylor? A. I refuse to give it.

Mr. Clapp: If the Court please, it already appears from this witness's testimony, that these girls are placed there for the purpose of reformation; that they are given a name, so that when they go out again, whatever shame or disgrace might have attached to their prior life, their identity will not be revealed and the shame will not pursue them through the name they were known by before they were put in there. Now, I submit, that on grounds of public policy it is improper to compel this witness, or any of these defendants, to disclose the name of a person who has gone into a reformatory because of misdeeds, be they in the mild or extreme degree, and has taken another name to conceal their identity and disconnect them as far as possible with the shame that attaches to their prior misdeeds.

Mr. Butts: We claim that this girl was inveigled into this institution, and I think we have a right to know who brought her there and all the circumstances surrounding the fact, and who this woman was—she had been there before with other girls—and how many and who were there. And if it is possible to find these witnesses, we want to find them. This is a case, your Honor, where these names—it has been the hardest thing in the world to get at anything. These inmates all have names that are given to them, and when they get outside, you hear of "Gilletta" or "Leona," or some such name as that; you don't know to whom it applies and you can't hunt up the evidence. Now we want to know about this woman Mrs. Root and the circumstances surrounding the bringing of this girl to that place at 9 o'clock at night, mid-winter. Yes, and we claim that this Mrs. Root brought other girls there, and that is a thing that characterizes her act in this case. If she was hunting up girls to run them into that institution, I think we have a right to know it. They talk that this girl went there voluntarily and that she was not inveigled there, and they publish it in the paper. I see this morning, that they are going to claim this girl went there and staid two years and three months in this place, VOLUNTARILY. Now upon this issue, it seems to me we have a right to prove it all right here, to show every fact and circumstance which characterizes these acts. It is for the jury to say whether she went there voluntarily or not.

Objected to by Mr. Clapp.

Mr. Butts: I think this is the time to prick this right to the quick. Now, so far as branding these girls is concerned, I don't think the girls have had much to do with it. We will find as we go along in this case, they have been put into that place, as the evidence will disclose as we go along, here, without their consent, very frequently; and if they are going to be put in there and then branded because they are in there and we can't show anything about them—well where are we? These sisters can come on here and tell any story they are a mind too and our mouths are closed and this plaintiff would have to come on the stand and tell her own story uncorroborated. Now she is here, and I will tell for the counsel's benefit, that she is going to swear that she was put in there and kept for two years and three months and that she tried to get out a hundred times and couldn't, and was accused and notified over and over again, that if she asked to get out she was a life prisoner; and I will show your Honor, further, that it was told in that ward to every one of those inmates, these girls here that were there, that if they ever asked to get out it made them life prisoners. That is what the plaintiff tells me she will swear to. Now, I am going to show by this witness that this woman Mrs. Root—at least I claim to this jury—was a procurer; that she brought others to that place; that she was of the same; that she was on good terms with this woman and knew her; and if that is so, it bears upon the question whether or not this girl went there of her own free will or whether she was taken there. I am going to show by this other witness—for I have one of them—that Mrs. Root got her there in the same way; and I want this woman to give me the names of those girls that were brought there by Mrs. Root, and I think I am entitled to have it. I am going to characterize the action of Mrs. Root in this regard. It is corroborating evidence in our case, and I am going into the whole of this as far as I can at this time. Of course the order of this evidence I think the Court will agree with me, should be left to me, and to put it in the order that I see best. But if my client does not go on the stand and claim that she was in there against her will, I will consent to dismiss this case very quickly. I want to characterize the actions of Mrs. Root in taking this girl there.

The Court: Objection sustained.

Exception by plaintiff.

Q. Did you ever prefer any charge against this plaintiff, in any court whatever? A. I don't understand the question.

Q. I say did you ever make any A. P. A. 10.

Q. I say, prefer any charge, in any court, against the plaintiff? A. Do you mean in the municipal court or what court?

Q. In any court? A. I don't know of any court that I made a charge.

Q. You never then went before any magistrate or public officer and charged this girl with any offense? A. Do you mean Mrs. Clewett?

Q. Yes. A. Not that I know of; not that I remember.

Q. And you never had her examined before any officers? A. Not that I know of.

Q. You stated yesterday, I believe, that whenever girls wanted to get out, that it was necessary for a girl who was in the institution, who was under age, before they could get out, for some of their relatives to apply for them, did you not? A. That is, when they are—of course that are placed there, if they are under age, their parents or guardians, those who have a right to do so; it depends upon them to come and take them out.

Q. What step do you take to ascertain whether the person is the guardian of any one when they come there with them? A. Simply if they are the relatives.

Q. Suppose that a girl is brought there by somebody who is not a relative, then what do you do? Q. I don't understand the meaning there, what do I do—if they are brought there by whom?

Q. Why, if any girl is brought there who is not in the company of her parents or relatives, what do you do then? A. Any girl that is under age—under 18—who was placed there, brought there by parties, we receive them.

Q. No matter who brings them? A. Well, that is an open question. No one brings them that I know of, but those that have the authority to do so.

Q. You receive them? anyone that is brought there under age? A. Under age for reformation.

Q. And do you not make any inquiry as to who the person is bringing them, do you? A. They have to state their names, and why they do so, though we never want the history of the case. We don't care to hear the history of why they are brought there, except they are under some legal reason, some cause for doing so.

Q. So you take no further steps then, to ascertain when a child is brought there under age, than just the inquiry made of the person bringing them? A. That is all.

Q. Now, whenever that person wishes to get out of that institution what must be done? A. If they are good, and we have authority from those who brought them, and if we can responsible them a situation, and if we can recommend—which is not very often the case—sometimes we procure them a situation if they are under age.

Q. And if their conduct is not as it ought to be, and it sums itself up into this, that they can't go? A. If I can't conscientiously recommend them; not that I see fit.

Q. These letters that came to your place, you stated the other day, from any person except relatives of the family, were not delivered? A. Did they state that they were always not delivered? Q. Well, sometimes—is that it? A. Sometimes, yes.

Q. How would you receive these letters? How did you receive those letters? A. Through the mail.

Q. PRIOR TO DELIVERING TO THE INMATES YOU ALWAYS OPENED THEM? A. ALWAYS.

Q. And when the letters were mailed by them they were delivered to you for mailing? A. Yes, sir.

Q. And opened by you before mailing? A. Yes, sir. They were not sealed when they came to me.

Q. NOW DID YOU NOT KNOW THAT THIS WAS A SERIOUS VIOLATION OF THE POSTAL LAWS FOR YOU TO OPEN MAIL? A. THAT IS THE RULE OF OUR INSTITUTION.

Q. I KNOW, BUT IS THIS RULE OF YOUR INSTITUTION ABOVE THE LAWS OF THIS LAND? A. I AM NOT PREPARED TO ANSWER. IT IS THE RULE OF OUR INSTITUTION.

Q. I SAY ARE RULES OF YOUR INSTITUTION ABOVE THE LAWS OF THIS LAND? A. THOSE RULES ARE MADE AND PEOPLE UNDERSTAND IT.

Q. THE PEOPLE UNDERSTAND THAT, I KNOW. A. YES.

Q. BUT DO YOU MEAN TO TELL THIS JURY THAT THE RULES OF YOUR INSTITUTION ARE ABOVE THE LAWS?

Mr. Clapp: Well, now, if the Court please, it is not shown here that it is a violation of the federal law for a person to open letters when they have been expressly or impliedly authorized to do so.

The Court: Well, it is a fruitless discussion in any event.

Mr. Butts: I want to find out what this witness's state of standing is. I think I have a right, your Honor.

The Court: You have a right to inquire what she did.

Mr. Butts: Yes, it goes clear to this whole business.

The Court: But to discuss the question whether the rules of the institution are "above the laws of the land" it seems to me is fruitless because there is no question about that.

Q. Well, it wouldn't make any difference to you what the laws were, you would go on doing that just the same? That is what you mean to say? A. Well, I can't say that—I would carry out the rules in a sense, that is, keeping a reformatory; our letters that come in and go out have to be examined.

Q. THEY HAVE TO BE EXAMINED? A. YES.

Q. AND THAT IS REGARDLESS OF THE LAW? A. I AM NOT A VIOLATOR OF THE LAW.

Q. WELL, YOU SAY THEY HAVE TO BE EXAMINED. NOW DO YOU MEAN TO SAY BY THAT THEY WILL BE ANYWAY? A. ACCORD-

ING TO OUR RULE, THE RULE OF THE INSTITUTION.

Q. AND YOU PROPOSE TO FOLLOW THOSE RULES? A. WHY, I CERTAINLY DO.

Q. Now, in this sewing room the children are what ages? A. Vary.

Q. From what? A. Well, we have—

The Court: Haven't you been over that—the other day, Mr. Butts?

Mr. Butts: Yes, I have, your Honor, to a certain extent, but there's one or two ideas I want to bring out at this time.

A. I think we have there at present in the juvenile reformatory as young as 12.

Q. That is, in the sewing room? A. Sewing room.

Q. That is, in the reformatory, in these reformatories, there are no studies taught at all? A. I didn't say that.

Q. Didn't you testify to that the other day? A. I did not.

Q. There is now in the laundry department no studies? A. Last winter there was studies.

Q. Yes, but when Seline Clewett was in there? A. I wouldn't be positive.

Q. There weren't, were there? A. I wouldn't be positive.

Q. You know of none? A. I know we furnished a sister to teach there a part of last winter.

Q. Yes, but I mean when Seline Clewett was in there. A. I don't know, I don't remember.

Q. Didn't you testify positively the other day that you wanted the jury to distinctly understand that the sewing department and laundry department were reformatories? A. I certainly do.

Q. And that there was no time there for teaching, that that was a place where they worked? A. Did I not say they were taught two hours, from 4 until 6?

Q. Didn't you say that was in the preservative class?

A. No, sir, the preservative class go out to the public school.

Q. Now, just tell the jury what teaching was done in the laundry when Seline Clewett was there? A. That I don't remember.

Q. Well, what was done in the sewing class? A. Two hours, Oh, Seline Clewett was there only two days.

Q. I say while Seline Clewett was in your institution what teaching was done in the sewing class at that time? A. From 4 until 6.

Q. Well, you know, as a matter of fact, do you not, that the laws of this land provide that children between certain ages (5 and 16, I think it is, or 14,) shall go a certain number of hours a day to school? A. I certainly do.

Q. And you know and said the other day that when parents put their children in there, or any one came there with them under age, that nobody had any authority to get them out except those that put them there? A. Parents?

Q. Or the persons that brought them? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now you know that is not a compliance with the school laws of this land, don't you?

Mr. Clapp: Well, if the Court please, I object to that. They can prove all the facts and circumstances here, but to get into a legal discussion—

The Court: The objection sustained.

Exception by plaintiff.

Q. Now, Miss Crow, the jury went out to your place yesterday afternoon, to view the premises; you had them fixed up somewhat, didn't you, for visitors? A. No, sir.

Q. Well, when did you have the house painted?

A. I think the inside of the house was painted some years ago.

Q. When was the outside painted? A. I really couldn't tell you when the inside of the house was kalsomined and painted; I think it was all of two or three years ago.

Q. When was the outside painted? A. That was done this summer, to save the bricks from falling.

Q. I am talking with reference to the laundry department; what was done to that this summer? A. We got in some new machinery there.

Q. Yes, in the laundry department. What new machinery? A. Oh, we are getting a laundry outfit, trying to; we ordered a laundry outfit.

Q. Well, about all the machinery that is in there is new and been put in very lately, hasn't it? A. This summer. Well, the shirt ironer was put in I think, about May. I don't remember the date.

Q. And those big pieces of machinery were put in within a very few weeks, were they not? A. Yes, our mother general visitor ordered them, I didn't wish to have them put in, but she wished it.

Q. There has been some change in the rooms there this summer?

A. I think the refectory was changed—the larger room. As the inmates left, were not so many, and they take a smaller room for refectory than what they had before. That is the only material change.

Q. Was there any painting done in the laundry this summer since Seline Clewett? A. I think the sister in charge there painted some, yes.

Q. And do you know whether there was any kalsomining done this summer? A. There was whitewashing done by the inmates.

Q. The walls were whitewashed? A. The kalsomining was done some years ago; I think, two or three years ago.

Q. But the whitewashing was done this summer? A. By the inmates. We whitewash every year nearly.

Q. Well, the napkins—I noticed there were some napkins lying on the tables there. Those napkins were kind of unusual.

A. Ever since the change of prisoners I think these have been there—have something of that kind there.

Q. There has been quite a material change there this summer?

A. Not this summer; not at all, sir. Since the prisoners left. We tried to get the two reformatories as much uniform as possible.

Q. Now, Miss Crow, there have been habeas corpus proceedings instituted against your place there quite a number of times, haven't there?

A. Oh yes, sir.

Q. Well, what are they? What kind of proceeding? Just tell the

jury. A. I couldn't possibly remember the different circumstances.

Q. WELL, I KNOW, BUT WHAT DO YOU MEAN BY HABEAS CORPUS?

A. OH, HABEAS CORPUS—TAKE THE BODY DEAD, OR ALIVE.

Q. TAKE IT AWAY FROM YOUR PLACE? A. YES, CERTAINLY.

Q. THE COURT ISSUED THESE WRITS TO GET GIRLS OUT OF YOUR PLACE? A. YES, SIR.

Q. Now, in the last four years, how many writs of that kind have been issued? A. I don't remember how many writs. I know that prisoners were pardoned out by the governor on two or three occasions; wrote me a personal letter and pardoned them out. But the writs I don't remember. I remember one, if you wish to recall that, I shall do so.

Q. Don't you remember but one writ of habeas corpus? A. The details of them I don't remember. But I remember the details of one case.

Q. Well, I don't care about the details, but will you swear that in the last four years there haven't been at least a dozen writs of habeas corpus issued against your building?

A. I think I could swear there haven't been a dozen. I don't remember how many.

Q. There were quite a number? A. I can't tell how many; I don't know. Certainly not a dozen, and I certainly think I could say truthfully not a half dozen; wouldn't be sure.

Q. These writs were issued out because you failed to deliver up the inmates, weren't they? A. Sometimes they came out without our knowing there was any one demanding it.

Q. But the writs were issued, well, then what did you do? A. Sent the parties away, of course. Sent the party to the party demanding them.

Q. But it really became necessary to issue these writs before you would deliver them up, didn't it? A. It depended upon who demanded the inmate. If we thought the party who demanded the inmate was not a responsible person or a character who should get the inmate—well, only to the law would we deliver them.

Q. Then you simply mean to say this, that unless you were satisfied with the person that came there to get the inmate, you wouldn't deliver her up? A. Unless I was fully satisfied of the moral character of the individual I wouldn't deliver a girl into their hands.

Q. Under any circumstances, unless the court ordered it? A. Leaving the circumstances aside.

Q. Do you know Rev. Mr. Hultkrens? A. The name is familiar.

Q. Did he ever make a demand for a girl in there by the name of Mollie Hart? A. I don't remember the demand sir.

Q. Do you remember delivering the girl over to him? A. I don't remember that—it may have happened—because I don't do all those deliveries, there are subordinates who attend to it.

Q. Before there is anybody delivered over it comes to your knowledge? A. Yes, certainly, but I take no note of it.

Q. But everything practically goes through your hands? A. Yes, certainly.

Q. Did a man by the name of James Hearn, an attorney of this city, ever demand a girl of you by the name of Lizzie Kessler?

A. There was a writ served for Lizzie Kessler if I don't mistake.

Q. And Mr. James Hearn is the attorney that caused that writ to be issued, is he not? A. Who the attorney is I don't remember.

Q. You don't remember that? A. No, I remember the case.

Q. Well, habeas corpus proceedings were finally instituted by Mr. Hearn to get this girl Lizzie Kessler? A. Yes, sir, there was. Some attorney—that was the case I would be glad to relate to the jury.

Q. Now, did the firm of McDonald & Barnard, or Mr. Barnard ever make a demand on you for any inmate there? A. I don't remember; may have. I don't remember.

Q. Did he threaten to institute habeas corpus proceedings to get out an inmate? A. I don't remember. I don't remember the occasion. In fact the only one I distinctly remember the writ is this Kessler case that he speaks of. All the other writs I don't remember.

Q. In this sewing room, about how many girls did you say there were? A. I said there were different averages—not always the same.

Q. Now, what is done with the work they make there? A. They work for a firm, sir.

Q. What firm? A. We work for Guiterman Brothers, in that department.

Q. And is that work paid for? A. Paid for, yes.

Q. Who gets the pay for it? A. The institution, sir, gets the pay.

Q. Through you? A. Yes, sir, through the corporation.

Q. And you keep it? A. The corporation keeps it, sir.

Q. None of that money goes to the girls doing the work? A. It goes to their support, sir.

Q. Well, only so far as you testified as to their getting support—what support? A. To their support.

Q. The money goes to the corporation, and is practically kept by the corporation? A. It goes to the support of the institution—the heating of the building; buying of different things.

Q. What do you do with the work that is done in the laundry department? A. What do we do with the money accrued from it?

Q. Well, yes; the work is done there. Do you sell? You practically sell the girls' labor there; it goes out as laundry work, and you get pay for it? A. Those girls, sir, come to us to be clothed, supported, taken care of when they are sick, and receive a home. They are supposed to labor, as the sisters do in maintaining the institution.

Q. And you take the money for that labor and keep it? A. The corporation spends it for the benefit of the institution.

Q. Now, didn't you know, too, that there is a law in this state declaring that to be a felony?

Mr. Clapp: Objected to as incom-

petent not shown to be an expert on the law of Minnesota.

Exception by plaintiff.

The Court: Objection sustained.

Cross-examination by Mr. Clapp.

Q. You stated that you recalled this Lizzie Kessler habeas corpus proceeding? A. Yes, sir, I did.

Q. And wanted to state the facts about that? A. Yes, sir.

Q. You may say she then, a Lizzie, was sent to us by the municipal court, for ninety days, I think. She was so young—such a mere child—that I did not wish to place her in with the common inmates of the city at that time, or those others; and before placing her in the prisoners department I retained her in a room in the convent, and sent for her mother—her parents, in fact. I asked them, as she was under age, if they would be willing to leave that child for six months to a year, instead of the length the municipal court wished to detain her. The mother's words—I don't know as another sister took the testimony—however, the conclusion of it was this: Well, the parents signed the contract.

Mr. Butts: Well, now, I object to that as incompetent, irrelevant, immaterial, and not the best evidence.

Mr. Clapp: I think the fact that they signed a contract—of course the contents of the contract would be proven by the contract, perhaps. May be it is a contract, and may be it isn't.

The Court: The objection sustained.

Mr. Butts: I take the ground that the parents can't make a contract of this kind—to put children in places of this kind. It is against public policy.

Q. Well, what happened then? A. Instead of placing her in the prisoners' department, we placed her in the reformatory, with the girls who were sent by parents and guardians, so that she would reap the advantages of two hours' schooling, and earning her own money, instead of being in the laundry department. At the expiration of the municipal court sentence or a very short time after it (I can't exactly state when), the parents demanded the girl. And I told them I had kept my contract, by placing her in the reformatory, and giving her schooling, and not letting her mix with the prisoners; and that I required that they should keep theirs; at least the contract, the contract would not be legal. So that writ came to take out the girl and I delivered her over to the law.

Q. During the time that you were receiving prisoners committed by the Municipal Court, where were they placed?

A. A short time after I went there in charge—as I stated, it was five years ago the 22nd of last July—as soon as possible I made a division so that there would be more or less of a distinction between the prisoners and the younger girls in the reformatory, and that is why we had the two reformatories up to that date, except for some years back—that I have forgotten the time—the prisoners and the reformatory girls were placed together.

Q. Well, now when this separation was made, after that where did you as a rule keep the prisoners and you?

A. They were placed in the wash-house department.

Q. That is where the laundry is? A. Yes, sir.

Q. This Kessler girl you say was young? A. Young—a girl.

Q. And on that account you took her from the prisoners' ward and put her in the reformatory? A. In the reformatory.

Q. Now, as distinguished from the prisoners' ward you call the sewing department the reformatory? A. Yes, sir. Now we call them both reformatories as we have no prisoners.

Mr. Butts:

Q. Then if I understand you correctly, in this Mollie Hart matter you got a contract from the parents? I mean the Lizzie Kessler matter? and when they came after her you refused to deliver her up? A. They signed the paper that I speak of—

Q. Yes, and— A. And I demanded that they keep their promise as well as I kept mine.

Q. You proposed to keep the girl—that was the sum and substance?

A. Until the time expired that they signed with the institution.

Q. And when you didn't deliver the girl they went to the court and got a writ of habeas corpus and made you give her up?

A. They got a writ.

Q. You had to give her up. A. Gave her to the law.

Q. Then you knew when you got this contract that it wasn't good in law? A. The parents had control over the child, sir, at the time.

Q. Then why didn't you deliver her up?

A. Well, I thought they might have honor, as I had.

Q. You simply tried to fool these parents, and when it wouldn't work you had to deliver her up—that was it, wasn't it?

A. That is your construction. Q. These parents were Catholics? A. I wouldn't testify. I think they are. I wouldn't be positive.

Seline Clewett, sworn in her own behalf, testified as follows:

By Mr. Butts:

Q. What is your name? A. Seline Clewett.

Q. Where do you live? A. In White Bear.

Q. How old are you? A. Twenty-seven years old.

Q. Are you compelled to wear anything in your ears to help you hear? A. Yes, sir.

Q. You have them on now? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Whereabouts were you born? A. Little Canada.

Q. Is your mother living? A. No, sir.

Q. How old were you when she died? A. Fourteen years.

Q. Is your father living? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you ever went to school any? A. Went to school some not very much.

Q. Well, about how long, do you think. Was it one year or two years or three years, or how long? A. About a year.

Q. Where was that? A. In White Bear.