

BARTLETT MURDERED
BY PERSONS UNKNOWN

(Continued From Page One.)

seeing Bartlett on the evening of his disappearance between 8:30 and 11 o'clock, and had a drink with him in the Hotel Cecil. Bartlett was with another man, and he thought that Bartlett's companion was Newman Pidd. He could not be positive, but he resembled Pidd very much.

Mr. Oliver Ellwood thought Newman Pidd looked very much like the man Alfred Brown, who cashed Bartlett's order, but came to the conclusion it was not Pidd when he saw the signature. Newman Pidd, however, swore definitely that he was not out of the house on the evening in question, and in this he was corroborated by his father, Layton Pidd and his mother.

The inquest was conducted by Dr. Woods, coroner of Mt. Brydges. The crown was represented by Crown Attorney McKillop.

Finding of the Body.

John D. Chambers, of Caradoc Township, was the first witness. He told of being on the flats near the Mount Elgin Institute on Monday last, and found the body of a man lying on the flats some distance from the river's course. It had apparently been washed up from the river. He secured the assistance of Rev. T. T. George, superintendent of the Institute, Mr. C. W. Vollick and others. Dr. Woods and Constable Fisher took charge of the body, and removed it to the former's barn. The body was taken away by Undertaker Graham, of Mount Brydges. This all happened a week ago yesterday. The body had a pair of trousers, a vest and shirt, but no overcoat nor top-coat. He did not recognize the clothing.

Rev. T. T. George, superintendent of Mount Elgin Institute, followed. He saw the body referred to by the previous witness, Mr. Chambers, at the place where it was discovered. Mr. George afterwards saw the body at the undertaker's rooms of Mr. Graham at Mount Brydges. He was present when the post-mortem examination was being made by Drs. Williams and Cairns. The body could not have been there earlier than Sunday, March 15, as he broke the jam the Saturday previous. The jam formed further down, and the body must have been washed up during this time.

Webster Vollick, Muncey, saw the body found by Mr. Chambers. He corroborated the statement as to the finding of the body. The body was overlooked about a week previous to the finding of the body.

Mr. Daniel F. Graham, undertaker, of Mount Brydges, swore that he took the body referred to from Mr. Chambers' place and brought it to his place in Mount Brydges. The body was the same as viewed by the coroner's jury, and also the same on which a post-mortem was performed by Drs. Williams and Cairns. The body was handed over to Mr. W. J. Smith, jun., undertaker, of London, on Wednesday last. Witness identified the clothing as that worn by the deceased when discovered. Witness was present when Detective Nickle cut out a piece of the trousers and took it away. He was present when the body was viewed by Newman Pidd, of London.

W. J. Smith, jun., undertaker, of London, followed. He received the body in question from Undertaker Graham on Wednesday last. He saw Mr. Layton Pidd at the funeral on Thursday, and was certain the body was viewed by Mr. Fuller and Mr. Parker, at Watford.

Mr. Ellwood's Evidence. Mr. Oliver Ellwood, secretary of the board of water commissioners of London, was the next witness. He swore that a man named Harry Bartlett was in the employ of the board in December last. Mr. Ellwood did not know Bartlett at all. Bartlett was a day laborer and was employed in doing water services under the direction of a foreman. The pay-sheet is issued on Friday of each week from the office. The money is placed in envelopes, and handed to the foreman, with vouchers. The pay-sheet is signed by the laborer. In case a man is not working on pay-day, and does not get his money from the foreman, the envelope is returned, and the man must call at the office of the commission. A pay-sheet for the week ending Thursday, Nov. 28, was produced in court. On Friday, Dec. 5, the signature, "H. Bartlett," showed that he apparently received \$3.75 for that week. The pay-sheet for the week ending Thursday, Dec. 5, was also produced. On it was the name of Harry Bartlett. The pay-sheet went out as usual, on Friday, Dec. 5. On Monday, Dec. 9, his attention was called to Bartlett, when a man called at his office between 1 and 2 o'clock.

Cure That Cough!
YOU CAN DO IT BY USING
Dr. Wood's
Norway Pine Syrup.

The Most Perfect Throat and Lung Healer in the World. : : : : :

Dr. Wood's Norway Pine Syrup gives prompt relief from that choked up, stuffed up feeling which is so distressing, it loosens the phlegm, checks the rasping and useless cough, and soothes the irritated breathing organs. It is a pleasant preparation to take and is therefore specially adapted to the coughs and colds of children and those who dislike nauseous mixtures.

This is no vain boast, but a fact that can be backed by unimpeachable testimony. One 25 cent bottle, indeed, a trial dose, will prove its merits.

Mr. Frank K. Purdie, Brandon, Man., writes: "I have used your Dr. Wood's Norway Pine Syrup for some years and have always found it a sure remedy for all colds, coughs, sore throat, hoarseness, etc. I cannot too highly recommend it to anyone suffering from any of these colds."

Mr. Pidd did not know any of Bartlett's companions. Almost two weeks after Bartlett came to his place to board, a man had called for him, but he could not say that he ever called again.

Witness informed a juror that he did not know how much money Bartlett had on him, but knew he carried all he had. He did not think Bartlett had a watch when he went away.

Mrs. Layton Pidd was the next witness. She corroborated the testimony of her husband concerning the disappearance. There was a man who called to see Bartlett on a Sunday shortly after Bartlett came to board with her, and witness did not see him. Bartlett roomed alone two or three weeks prior to his disappearance. He had a watch which Mrs. Pidd found in the top drawer of the bureau in his room after his disappearance, probably on the Monday following. It was an open-faced silver watch, with no chain or guard. The detectives called at the house after witness had found the watch. Mrs. Pidd did not remember them asking about it, but she did not tell the detectives that she did so, she said. Witness did not know whether Bartlett wore the watch daily or not. Mrs. Pidd did not know of any trouble Bartlett had, nor

for Bartlett's money. He asked witness if there was any money there for Harry Bartlett. Mr. Ellwood asked him if he was Bartlett, and he said he was not. Witness then told him he could not get the money without an order. The stranger said that he had the order, and struck his hand in his pocket as if to get it, but he did not produce it. Mr. Ellwood told him that he would have to go to the workshop, as the foreman had the pay-sheet and the money. The man did not go, but apparently knew where to go. The man appeared to be sober, and did not look to be dissipated. He did not speak with any decided accent. Witness thought he would have noticed it, either English or Scotch. The man went away, and Mr. Ellwood received the pay-sheet from James Alstone, with Bartlett's envelope, some time in the afternoon. The pay-sheet was not signed. At 5 o'clock witness came out of the office, and saw the same man standing in the arcade. He knew the stranger was after the money and he turned back into the office. The safe was unlocked, and the pay-sheet and envelope brought out. Mr. Ellwood asked the man to produce the order. It was handed witness by the stranger; it was a piece of paper, and on the past was, as I am sure, and can't get down. It was signed "Harry Bartlett." The stranger signed the pay-sheet, signing Harry Bartlett-Alf. Brown, as instructed by Mr. Ellwood.

"Looking at the signature, 'H. Bartlett,' on the pay-sheet, I saw, and that of Harry Bartlett on the order, and Dec. 7, are they in the same handwriting?" asked Mr. McKillop.

"I do not think they are," answered Mr. Ellwood.

"The money was given the man, and he went away. He had not seen him since."

Didn't Compare Handwriting.

In answer to a question from one of the jurors, Mr. Ellwood said that he did not compare the handwriting on the pay-sheet and on the order that day, but on reading in the paper the next day that Bartlett had disappeared, he compared the signatures, and found that it was a forgery. The man was about 25 or 30 years of age.

"Could you know the man again?" asked Mr. McKillop.

"I don't know that I would," answered Mr. Ellwood.

Newman Pidd.

Newman Pidd, of London, followed. He swore that a young Englishman named Harry Bartlett had boarded with his father. He came to the house on Dec. 5, and never returned. Witness saw the body at the undertaker's rooms of Mr. Graham in Mount Brydges. Witness could not identify the body. Bartlett wore a pair of gray English tweed trousers, a black double-breasted vest and a dark coat, with a dark shirt and a white tie. On the night of his disappearance, he wore a pair of black shirt with white stripes. Mr. Pidd identified the clothing shown as that worn by Bartlett on the evening of Dec. 5. The shoes were very similar to those worn by Bartlett, having been recently half-soled. The last time witness saw him was the evening of his disappearance. Bartlett went out before Pidd had his supper. He did not tell witness where he was going. Pidd merely spoke to him as he was going out the evening of Dec. 5. He was shortly after 5:30 o'clock in the house at the time were: Layton Pidd, Mr. Pidd, Newman Pidd, his two sisters, Bartlett and three other boarders, named Peter McGillivray, Ernest Ford and Bernard Newman. They were all out the evening of Dec. 5. Newman Pidd remained in the house all evening with the family. Bartlett was not a drinking man, witness only seeing him take a glass of ale on one occasion. He had never known Bartlett to have been under the influence of liquor. Witness did not remember the occasion when Bartlett had taken the liquor. The gray coat, corresponding to the trousers, was produced, and proved to be of the same material. It had been left by Bartlett at Pidd's home.

Never Knew Him To Drink.

Layton Pidd, father of the previous witness, followed. He swore that Bartlett came to his place on Oct. 2. On the evening of Thursday, Dec. 5, Bartlett went out, saying that he was going to get his hair cut. Mr. Pidd remained in the house all evening with his family. Pidd never knew Bartlett to drink while at his place. He saw the body at Thursday afternoon last, and was positive that it was the body of Harry Bartlett. Mr. Pidd identified the body. He was not present when Mr. Fuller, of Watford, gave Mr. Pidd a piece from an old pair of trousers left with Mr. Fuller, and it was of the same material as the vest found on the body. Bartlett's shoes were newly half-soled, and were sharp-toed. Witness thought the shoes shown were very similar. He thought the coat that Bartlett wore the night of his disappearance was of the same material as the vest.

Bartlett Had a Caller.

Mr. Pidd did not know any of Bartlett's companions. Almost two weeks after Bartlett came to his place to board, a man had called for him, but he could not say that he ever called again.

Witness informed a juror that he did not know how much money Bartlett had on him, but knew he carried all he had. He did not think Bartlett had a watch when he went away.

Mrs. Layton Pidd was the next witness. She corroborated the testimony of her husband concerning the disappearance. There was a man who called to see Bartlett on a Sunday shortly after Bartlett came to board with her, and witness did not see him. Bartlett roomed alone two or three weeks prior to his disappearance. He had a watch which Mrs. Pidd found in the top drawer of the bureau in his room after his disappearance, probably on the Monday following. It was an open-faced silver watch, with no chain or guard. The detectives called at the house after witness had found the watch. Mrs. Pidd did not remember them asking about it, but she did not tell the detectives that she did so, she said. Witness did not know whether Bartlett wore the watch daily or not. Mrs. Pidd did not know of any trouble Bartlett had, nor

for Bartlett's money. He asked witness if there was any money there for Harry Bartlett. Mr. Ellwood asked him if he was Bartlett, and he said he was not. Witness then told him he could not get the money without an order. The stranger said that he had the order, and struck his hand in his pocket as if to get it, but he did not produce it. Mr. Ellwood told him that he would have to go to the workshop, as the foreman had the pay-sheet and the money. The man did not go, but apparently knew where to go. The man appeared to be sober, and did not look to be dissipated. He did not speak with any decided accent. Witness thought he would have noticed it, either English or Scotch. The man went away, and Mr. Ellwood received the pay-sheet from James Alstone, with Bartlett's envelope, some time in the afternoon. The pay-sheet was not signed. At 5 o'clock witness came out of the office, and saw the same man standing in the arcade. He knew the stranger was after the money and he turned back into the office. The safe was unlocked, and the pay-sheet and envelope brought out. Mr. Ellwood asked the man to produce the order. It was handed witness by the stranger; it was a piece of paper, and on the past was, as I am sure, and can't get down. It was signed "Harry Bartlett." The stranger signed the pay-sheet, signing Harry Bartlett-Alf. Brown, as instructed by Mr. Ellwood.

"Looking at the signature, 'H. Bartlett,' on the pay-sheet, I saw, and that of Harry Bartlett on the order, and Dec. 7, are they in the same handwriting?" asked Mr. McKillop.

"I do not think they are," answered Mr. Ellwood.

"The money was given the man, and he went away. He had not seen him since."

Didn't Compare Handwriting.

In answer to a question from one of the jurors, Mr. Ellwood said that he did not compare the handwriting on the pay-sheet and on the order that day, but on reading in the paper the next day that Bartlett had disappeared, he compared the signatures, and found that it was a forgery. The man was about 25 or 30 years of age.

"Could you know the man again?" asked Mr. McKillop.

"I don't know that I would," answered Mr. Ellwood.

Newman Pidd.

Newman Pidd, of London, followed. He swore that a young Englishman named Harry Bartlett had boarded with his father. He came to the house on Dec. 5, and never returned. Witness saw the body at the undertaker's rooms of Mr. Graham in Mount Brydges. Witness could not identify the body. Bartlett wore a pair of gray English tweed trousers, a black double-breasted vest and a dark coat, with a dark shirt and a white tie. On the night of his disappearance, he wore a pair of black shirt with white stripes. Mr. Pidd identified the clothing shown as that worn by Bartlett on the evening of Dec. 5. The shoes were very similar to those worn by Bartlett, having been recently half-soled. The last time witness saw him was the evening of his disappearance. Bartlett went out before Pidd had his supper. He did not tell witness where he was going. Pidd merely spoke to him as he was going out the evening of Dec. 5. He was shortly after 5:30 o'clock in the house at the time were: Layton Pidd, Mr. Pidd, Newman Pidd, his two sisters, Bartlett and three other boarders, named Peter McGillivray, Ernest Ford and Bernard Newman. They were all out the evening of Dec. 5. Newman Pidd remained in the house all evening with the family. Bartlett was not a drinking man, witness only seeing him take a glass of ale on one occasion. He had never known Bartlett to have been under the influence of liquor. Witness did not remember the occasion when Bartlett had taken the liquor. The gray coat, corresponding to the trousers, was produced, and proved to be of the same material. It had been left by Bartlett at Pidd's home.

Never Knew Him To Drink.

Layton Pidd, father of the previous witness, followed. He swore that Bartlett came to his place on Oct. 2. On the evening of Thursday, Dec. 5, Bartlett went out, saying that he was going to get his hair cut. Mr. Pidd remained in the house all evening with his family. Pidd never knew Bartlett to drink while at his place. He saw the body at Thursday afternoon last, and was positive that it was the body of Harry Bartlett. Mr. Pidd identified the body. He was not present when Mr. Fuller, of Watford, gave Mr. Pidd a piece from an old pair of trousers left with Mr. Fuller, and it was of the same material as the vest found on the body. Bartlett's shoes were newly half-soled, and were sharp-toed. Witness thought the shoes shown were very similar. He thought the coat that Bartlett wore the night of his disappearance was of the same material as the vest.

Bartlett Had a Caller.

Mr. Pidd did not know any of Bartlett's companions. Almost two weeks after Bartlett came to his place to board, a man had called for him, but he could not say that he ever called again.

Witness informed a juror that he did not know how much money Bartlett had on him, but knew he carried all he had. He did not think Bartlett had a watch when he went away.

Mrs. Layton Pidd was the next witness. She corroborated the testimony of her husband concerning the disappearance. There was a man who called to see Bartlett on a Sunday shortly after Bartlett came to board with her, and witness did not see him. Bartlett roomed alone two or three weeks prior to his disappearance. He had a watch which Mrs. Pidd found in the top drawer of the bureau in his room after his disappearance, probably on the Monday following. It was an open-faced silver watch, with no chain or guard. The detectives called at the house after witness had found the watch. Mrs. Pidd did not remember them asking about it, but she did not tell the detectives that she did so, she said. Witness did not know whether Bartlett wore the watch daily or not. Mrs. Pidd did not know of any trouble Bartlett had, nor

Found Watch in Drawer.

Newman Pidd was recalled. Witness swore that Bartlett had a silver watch when he came. It was held in place by a silver chain doubled. He did not know whether Bartlett wore it every day. The family ever discovered whether the watch had disappeared with Bartlett or not. His mother told him that she had found the watch in a bureau drawer. Witness was in bed before any of the boarders came home on the night of Dec. 5. He did not know whether Bartlett had any money on him the night he went away or not. He never showed his money. He heard Bartlett say that he wanted to save some money, to send to England, but witness did not know whether he had saved any or not. A photo of Bartlett was produced by Mr. Pidd and submitted to the coroner. He did not know whether Harry belonged to any fraternal order or not.

Peter McGillivray followed. He was a boarder at the home of Layton Pidd at the same time Bartlett boarded there. He was there from March 16 to Dec. 21. Witness knew that Bartlett had an English silver watch. On the evening of Dec. 5 McGillivray went out early, while Bartlett was dressing. The latter told witness he was usually had his hair cut at Miller's barber shop on Clarence street. He heard Harry say that he was saving money to pay the company for his passage to this country. Witness had no idea how much money he had. Bartlett and McGillivray were on Thanksgiving Day. Bartlett had several drinks, but they did not seem to affect him.

Detective Nickle.

Detective Nickle, London, was the next witness. He swore to cutting a piece from the trousers found on the body, washed it, and found it to be of the same material as the coat left by Bartlett at Pidd's. The tie found on the body was somewhat similar to that worn by Bartlett when the picture was taken, but witness could not be certain as to it.

Mr. Boyd's Evidence.

Fred. Boyd, London, took the stand. He met Bartlett in November while canvassing for insurance. Bartlett then employed in the waterworks department. Witness did not know Bartlett, and the latter told him who he was, and that he lived at 265 Clarence street. The next time he saw Bartlett was the Thursday night before the 9th of December. Mr. Boyd had an inspection on Dec. 9 and was at 231 Grey street the Thursday previous. He saw a man named Richardson. Boyd came up Clarence street and met Bartlett at the railway crossing some time between 8:30 and 10 o'clock. There was another man with him. Bartlett stooped witness and said, "Here is the man who tried to insure me." They walked to the hotel at the corner of Clarence and York. They had two glasses of ale there, Bartlett buying one and witness the other. Another young Englishman came into the bar from the side entrance. Boyd did not know him. He thought one of the men was a boarder at Pidd's. Bartlett had some to drink, and it was noticeable that he was under the influence of drink. He was jovial and the intoxication was quite noticeable. He said he could not take out the insurance, as he had a payment to make on his passage money.

Cross-Questioned.

Crown Attorney McKillop questioned Boyd closely as to the reason he was for stating that Thursday night. All witness could state was that he knew that he was down to Grey street to see Mr. Richardson on Thursday before Monday previous to Dec. 9. He was positive of the day, but had no work or entry showing that such was the day.

"I feel certain that it was Thursday night," declared Boyd.

"But you have no entry in any of your books to show that," said Mr. McKillop.

"No, I have not, but I am sure it was Thursday," declared Boyd.

"Did Bartlett show any money to you, he bought the drink?" asked a juror.

"I don't remember whether he had much money or not," Boyd answered.

Thought It Pidd.

A juror wanted to know the name of the man with Bartlett in the barroom of the Cecil Hotel. Mr. Boyd thought he would know the man if he saw him again. He was of the opinion that he has seen him since the disappearance. He thought it was Newman Pidd, as the man resembled Pidd very much. He was not positive, but he thought it was.

Not Out, Says Pidd.

Newman Pidd was again recalled. He swore that he was not out of the house on the night of Dec. 5, and was never in the Cecil Hotel with Bartlett in his life. Pidd did not know Boyd, nor had he ever spoken to Boyd in his life to date. Pidd was not out with Bartlett any night during the week, and was not in the habit of keeping company with Bartlett.

"Do you know the witness, Boyd?" Mr. McKillop asked.

"I do not," answered Pidd.

"Were you in the Cecil Hotel with Bartlett?" continued Mr. McKillop.

"I was only in one hotel with Bartlett in my life, and that was not the Cecil Hotel," answered Pidd. "This was Thanksgiving Day. I was not out with him after that at night."

Witness had not changed his clothing on the evening in question, but had remained in all night.

Crown Attorney McKillop read a statement made by Mr. Geo. T. Fuller, in which Mr. Fuller swore that the body was received before the man was thrown into the water, possibly from five to fifteen minutes.

"The injury was not received at the same time he fell into the water," declared Mr. Williams.

Q—Then it would not be caused by falling off a bridge into the water?

A—No, it was not.

Q—There was no abrasion?

A—No.

Q—Could it be caused by a club?

A—Yes, a sound club through the hat, or a fall down a plank.

Q—Could it be caused by a sand-bag?

A—Yes, I think so, very nicely.

Dr. Cairns' View.

Dr. Cairns, Mount Brydges, followed. He assisted Dr. Williams in the post-mortem on the body on Tuesday last. Witness agreed with the post-

with Mr. Fuller from June until October.

Mr. Benjamin Parker, of Watford, also identified the body as that of Harry Bartlett.

Dr. Ernest Williams, of London, who performed the post-mortem, then gave his report. He was assisted by Dr. Cairns, of Mount Brydges. The post-mortem data as given by Drs. Williams and Cairns, were as follows:

Post-mortem Data.

Height, 5 feet 5 inches.

Apparent age, 25 years.

Apparent weight, 150 pounds.

General description, well nourished and good muscular development.

Skin mottled, green or body and limbs.

Face black. Lips and chin dried and shriveled. Right lower central incisor missing. Tongue between the teeth.

Nose pinched, eyes bulging and protruding between eyelids. Hair absent from head, except on occipital region.

In the axillary spaces, and in perineal region, Epithelium peeling off body and limbs. Nails absent from fingers and some of the toes. Swelling over left parietal bone, and neck abnormally swollen, especially at back. Abdomen distended. Bones of limbs and skull fractured. Gravel stones found in the mouth. Marks apparently made as gravel stones over the body.

On cutting the scalp, tissues over left parietal bone gorged with blood, which extended down into left side of the neck. Bones of skull normal. No fracture present, either in the vault or base. Surface of brain apparently normal. No clot extended to meninges. Interior of brain decomposed. No dislocation or fracture of the bones of the neck. Gas in both pleural cavities, and also a small amount of dark-colored fluid. Both lungs apparently normal, contained air, but not engorged with blood. Pleuro not thickened or adhered.

Heart—Pericardium contained small amount of dark colored fluid. Heart normal in size, cavities empty, except left ventricle, which contained a small amount of coagulated blood. Valves and orifices normal. Aorta normal, all great vessels empty.

Abdomen distended with gas. Abdominal walls normal, and well nourished. Small bowel distended with gas. A small amount of blood was found in the transverse colon.

Liver, normal in size, and apparently healthy.

Spleen, normal, and apparently healthy.

Kidneys, normal, and apparently healthy.

Stomach slightly enlarged, and given to coroner.

It was evident that the body had been for some time in the water.

asked Crown Attorney McKillop.

"I should say two or three months."

Q—What would you say was the cause of death?

A—I was unable to determine.

Q—Was there any wound to the head sufficient to cause death?

A—In my opinion it was not.

Q—Was that injury caused before the body went into the water?

A—I think it was. It must have been caused before it went into the water.

Q—That injury caused what?

A—It caused a bleeding of the small blood vessels outside the skull.

Q—It was a lot of small hemorrhages, causing a lump?

A—Yes, that is right.

Q—When would the bleeding stop?

A—As soon as the heart ceased to beat. The bleeding might have ceased before that.

Q—That injury was not, in your opinion, sufficient to cause death?

A—It might have.

Q—Did the man breathe after he went into the water?

A—No, I don't think so.

Q—How long before his death did this injury take place?

A—At least five minutes, and probably fifteen minutes before his death.

Q—It might have been an hour?

A—It might have.

Q—The bleeding must have taken place while the man was in the water?

A—Did he breathe after he went into the water?

A—If he breathed at all, he must have breathed very little.

Q—How do you know that?

A—You would expect that if he had inhaled water, there would be some water in the lungs.

Q—There was no water in the lungs?

A—No. There is water in the lungs generally when persons are drowned, except in exceptional cases.

Q—The man was unconscious from the blow before going into the water, would there be any water in his lungs?

A—No, there would not be. Respiration would be very shallow, and would probably cease when he struck the water.

Q—Might there have been an injury to the brain without an injury to the skull?

A—There might have, but the probability is against it. The brain was so decomposed nothing could be found concerning it.

Q—What is your theory as to the cause of death from your judgment?

A—From the examination, I did not find injuries sufficient to cause death, but would cause unconsciousness, and the shock of falling into the cold water would cause death without taking water into the lungs.

Q—Might he have died from exposure?

A—Yes; and afterwards reached the water.

Q—That was what?

A—A juror. Dr. Williams declared that there was no doubt the injuries were received before the man was thrown into the water, possibly from five to fifteen minutes.

"The injury was not received at the same time he fell into the water," declared Mr. Williams.

Q—Then it would not be caused by falling off a bridge into the water?

A—No, it was not.

Q—There was no abrasion?

A—No.