

THE RUSSELL DIVORCE.

The Strange Story Told by the Wife of the Earl.

THE HORRORS OF HIGH LIFE.

A London cable gives the following additional particulars of the suit for divorce brought by Countess Russell, a beautiful woman, against her husband, Earl Russell, a grandson of the celebrated English statesman, Lord John Russell: The Countess said that she intended to impute some portion of her husband's cruel conduct to the influence Professor Roberts had over the Earl.

Sir Edward Clark explained that Roberts was the mathematical master of a school at Bath. A serious suggestion against Earl Russell was involved in his alleged relations with Roberts. His wife could not feel otherwise than outraged and distressed by those relations. When the Countess objected to Roberts' presence in the house the Earl told her to go to his Satanic majesty. Sir Edward said the Earl was much upset by the prospect of the Countess not having a child. He abused her in vulgar terms for this. Early in May the Earl and Countess proposed to attend a levee. The Countess came to London and stayed at the Albemarle Hotel. She laid out the clothes which the Earl was to wear. When the Earl arrived he refused to allow a servant to dress him, and insisted that the Countess should leave the dinner table and come to their room to act as his valet. When they returned from the levee, he also compelled the Countess to attend to him. The Countess was annoyed that her husband should force her to perform such services, and told him she was sorry she had ever married him. The Earl at once rang the bell and told the servant to summon Lady Scott, the Countess' mother. When Lady Scott entered the room the Earl said: "Here is your sacred daughter; take her away as soon as you like, and you can go to the devil."

In reply to a question by Sir Edward, the Countess said that when she left the Earl she asked him to kiss her. He refused with an oath.

During the recital of the incidents of her married life, Earl Russell, who was sitting in court, frequently buried his face in his hands to hide his laughter. His actions showed that he felt no compunction for his treatment of his wife; in fact, he seemed to think the whole affair was a fine subject for mirth. Many of the spectators looked upon the Earl with disgust.

Continuing her evidence against her husband, the Countess testified that when she was ill the Earl summoned her to his study and called her vile names and threw her to the floor. There was a general tittering in the court room when the Countess, in describing a quarrel that had occurred between herself and the Earl, stated that the latter had rushed about the room yelling and striking the walls with his fists.

SIR CHARLES CROSS-EXAMINES.

The witness was cross-examined by Sir Charles Russell. He opened by asking the Countess if she meant to make any imputation against her husband or Roberts. The witness replied with decision, "Yes." This answer created a sensation. The witness then added that she had never made a direct charge against either the Earl or Roberts. The Countess admitted that she had written a letter to Harry Marriellier, who was the best man at her wedding, assuring him that she brought no charge against Roberts, adding that she was in the hands of clever men and would bring no charges against the Earl unless she was fully able to prove them.

Sir Charles asked the Countess if the state of her health had not been given as the reason for breaking off an engagement to marry she had entered into before her betrothal to Earl Russell.

Witness admitted that she had had a former engagement, and that it was broken off owing to the condition of her health.

Sir Charles asked witness whether she was not attended by two doctors in 1888 for a certain complaint. The Countess replied that the doctors mentioned had given her medicine from time to time.

The court adjourned before the cross-examination was finished.

HOW THE COUNTESS LOOKED.

The Countess was attired in an elegant blue velvet dress. She wore an expensive brooch, about her neck and a large hat, which set off her beauty to great advantage. She displayed much modesty, and was greatly embarrassed by some of the questions put to her. To most of the inquiries she responded in a meek and almost inaudible voice. Lady Scott, the petitioner's mother, who sought by her presence to add to her daughter's courage in the trying position in which she was placed, was also elegantly dressed, and over all she wore a magnificent fur cloak. She occupied her time while her daughter was giving her testimony by continually sniffing at a vinaigrette. The Countess' sister was also present. She sat beside her mother and was wrapped from head to foot in furs, which even the warmth of the court-room could not compel her to remove.

THE EARL'S APPEARANCE.

In appearance Earl Russell is a great contrast to his handsome and stylish young wife. He is a weak-eyed, youngish looking man. He has hair of a reddish tinge, and what is known in slang parlance as "washed out." He wears spectacles.

A London cable continues as follows the report of the divorce trial of Earl Russell: Eliza Vale, the maid who found the Countess in a faint on the floor in her room, was then called. She testified that on this occasion she heard the Countess pleading with the Earl. Afterwards witness found her mistress lying naked on the floor.

The Countess admitted she had received a letter from the Earl's solicitor advising her to borrow £1,500 from an insurance company for the purpose of settling her debts. When asked whether the state of her health had anything to do with her separation from her husband, the Countess replied that her doctor told her she was suffering much from worry, and she would be better if she separated from the Earl for some little time. It was then agreed that she and "Daddy" should part for at least three months, and then she would see how her husband would treat her. During this

period she went to stay with relatives of the Earl at Pembroke Lodge.

Sir Charles Russell here read letters exchanged by the Earl and Countess during the time the latter was at Pembroke Lodge. A number of letters from the Countess to the Earl commenced "Dear Frank," and those of the Earl to the Countess began "Dear Mabel." Countess Russell testified that her husband had repaid all the money he had advanced to pay her debts. During her married life she had been constantly reminded of her debts by the Earl.

The next witness called on behalf of the petitioner was Dr. Godson, the family physician of Lady Scott. Dr. Godson testified that he had constantly attended the Scott family in their sicknesses since 1880. He had never seen any indication of hysteria on the part of the Countess. Before her marriage she periodically suffered severe pains. At the time of her marriage she was attacked by the influenza. This developed into pleurisy, and witness attended her twice daily until she went to Torquay. When she returned he again attended her. She then complained of the manner in which her husband had treated her. She was very weak, and her nervous system was completely upset.

The evidence for the Countess here closed. Sir Charles Russell presented the case for Earl Russell. He said he would limit himself to the broad issue of the case. So far as the separation of the Countess and Earl Russell was concerned, all he would say was that the lady was at liberty to leave her husband when she liked. The sole object of the present suit was to force the payment of alimony by the Earl. Sir Charles, in referring to the Roberts incident, declared that the Countess, through veiled and obscure innuendo, simply desired to wound her husband. She was afraid to strike openly. Why had the other side not made that serious allegation honestly, straightforwardly, and directly? Unless the suggestion in connection with Roberts was meant to be treated as a grave charge, to be gravely considered and dealt with, a greater act of cruelty could not have been performed than in bringing it forward. Sir Charles then rebutted the charges of cruelty. He asked the jury not to be carried away by a clever and engaging woman telling them a story that was untrue in all its essential details—a woman so perverted as to put forward the Roberts incident in order to support a hopeless case by odious imputations. These imputations were made not only against the Earl but against another man, whose name and reputation might have been blasted by them if he had not stood high in the opinion of his colleagues.

The court then adjourned.

A mob surrounded the Law Courts at the close of the day's proceedings, and as the Earl left he was hooted at, and attempts were made to strike him. The police endeavored to protect him, but the crowd overpowered them, and the Earl was obliged to seek refuge in the Temple. Being still followed, however, he jumped into a cab, and succeeded in getting away amid the jeers and hisses of the mob.

Sir Charles Russell resumed his argument for the defendant. He attempted to refute the statements of violence at the hands of the Earl. Sir Charles then turned to the charges against Prof. Roberts. Sir Charles charged them as false and decidedly malicious. He declared that they were trumped up in order to give strength to an otherwise weak case, and that though the darkest insinuations had been made, no one was willing to come forward and make a direct charge of the nature hinted at against either the Earl or the professor.

A London cable says: The first witness for the defence was Prof. Roberts. The professor testified that he was friendly with the Earl at college. He afterwards became acquainted with the Scott family. After the marriage of the Earl and Lady Mabel he visited at their home. He had sung with the Countess and had thought her a charming hostess. The witness made a very emphatic denial of the actions imputed to him by the Countess in relation to Earl Russell.

Mr. Inderwick, of counsel for the Countess, asked to be allowed to put in evidence letters that had passed between the Earl and Prof. Roberts to show the relations which existed between them. Sir Edward Clarke said he could not see any issue requiring the letters to be produced, but he nevertheless consented to their being admitted.

THE EARL'S TESTIMONY.

Earl Russell now took the stand. He testified he had never heard the slightest objection made to the presence of Prof. Roberts in the house. The witness had objected to his wife going to a certain lady's house, and hinted his objection on the fact that the lady was divorced. Countess Russell was very much put out by his objecting to her visiting the lady's home, and in the quarrel that followed with him he said to her, "If you say such things you will soon be sorry you married me." The Countess replied, "So I am sorry." The Earl declared he had never insisted that the Countess should dress him. If she had requested him to allow her to dress him, he would not have let her do so. He was very much attached to her and had tried to make things pleasant for her. He objected to her going to Ascot for the reason that they were several persons there whom he did not wish her to meet. He positively denied that he had gone to the cabinet in search of a pistol. At the time he held it in his hands there was a warehouse and there was not a single weapon of that description in the house.

With reference to the charge that when the Countess on one occasion asked him after a row for £5 he threw her a half sovereign, the Earl said it was not true. He was about to give her the money she had asked for when she said, "I don't want your dirty money." The Earl denied the various other charges. He admitted that on one occasion that the Countess had boxed his ears.

CALLED HER "DARLING."

Sir Chas. Russell then drew from the Earl his version of the bedroom incident, when the Countess was found nude and in a faint on the floor. The Earl said that after he and his wife had retired he declared he would not go to Lord Salisbury's owing to the refusal of the Countess to go to Amberley Cottage, the Earl's residence in Berkshire. The Countess got out of bed and fainted on the floor. When she came to he said, "How are you, darling?" She replied, "Don't you dare call me darling," and then there was a soap dish at him and made for him with the poker. She threatened to throw herself out of a window if he remained in the room with her. The Earl declared

that the statements made by the Countess that he left her and went to Roberts' bedroom were absolutely false. There was not the slightest reason to suggest an impropriety between himself and Roberts. Once when his wife was hysterical he had held her wrists to prevent her from tearing her dressing jacket to pieces. On returning to the Albemarle Hotel from the levee he had scolded the Countess because she had lunched with a divorcee who very well deserved to be divorced. The Earl admitted he had once used the word "barren" in conversation with his wife, but he had only used it in fun.

The Earl stated he did not think his wife's health or nerves suffered during her married life. Her ailments were caused by unaccustomed restraints.

Sir Edward Clarke asked witness to give an instance of unaccustomed restraint.

SHE SMOKED CIGARETTES.

The Earl replied that one instance was his limiting his wife to six cigarettes a day. Witness declared he was not unduly anxious to have a son. He denied that he ever had sworn at his wife or called her a brute or a beast. He was much annoyed shortly after his marriage by learning that many of the Countess' debts were unpaid. Once a milliner came to the house and created a bother. The Countess came to witness and asked him to "Get her out for God's sake," adding, "she's screaming in the hall and I cannot get rid of her." The Earl stated he had never kept his wife up in the night to make up his accounts. Once the Countess told him she was "d—d sorry" she had married him. When the Countess fainted in the bedroom he bathed her face with water and eau de Cologne and tried every means to restore her to consciousness; she was perfectly rigid. He was frightened. When she recovered she went into a violent hysterical fit and exclaimed, "D—d you."

THE EARL'S CHARACTER.

Sir Edward Clark cross-examined the Earl. He referred to the Earl's conduct before marriage, and the latter admitted that before he married her he seduced a servant, but he had told Lady Mabel Scott, his fiancée, all the circumstances, and she found that no reason to discard him.

The Earl admitted that he had been intimate with a girl named Williams. He had seduced her. This intimacy continued until within a short time of his engagement to Lady Mabel Scott. The girl brought an action against him for breach of promise of marriage. He paid £500 down and was to pay her £1 a week. He is still paying her this latter sum. The Countess objected to his re-engaging a man servant named Mosey, but he persisted in his determination to take him back into his employ, saying that he was a good servant and was in no way connected with the Williams girl.

A NEW TACK.

Sir Edward Clarke now went on a new tack. He started in by asking the Earl, "When did you leave Oxford?"

The Earl—In May, 1885.

Sir Edward—Had you been there a full coil-gear course?

The Earl—No.

Sir Edward—Were you sent down?

The Earl—I was.

Sir Edward—What was the complaint against you?

The Earl—That I had written an improper letter.

Sir Edward—To a man or a woman?

The Earl—To a man, I suppose. I never saw the letter and never heard what it was or what was in it.

Sir Edward—Do you mean to say you were sent down on a complaint of which you had no details?

The Earl—I never new any of the details. My college was Balliol. I left England for a time and went to America for seven months. I suppose the circumstances connected with my leaving college were known to my relations.

HE LEFT COLLEGE.

Sir Edward announced that he was through with the witness, and Sir Charles then proceeded to re-examine him. In reply to the questions put to him by his counsel Earl Russell stated that Dr. Jowett was master of Balliol College while he was there. Having demanded but being refused an examination into the charge made against him in connection with the alleged improper letter, the witness had taken his name off the books of the college. Since leaving Balliol, Dr. Jowett had invited him to visit him there, and Dr. Jowett came to his wedding. Before his marriage he told his fiancée's mother he had been "sent down" from Oxford and the nature of the charge against him. He did not tell his future wife, because her mother had requested him not to do so.

COURT THEN ADJOURNED.

HER DIVORCE-COURT DRESS.

The plaintiff, the beautiful Mabel Edith, Countess of Russell, wore a stunning blue velvet dress, mink boa and chic hat. She is only 22 years of age, and has a reputation as a fine horse-woman, who drives a tandem and is a good sculler. She is also known among her intimates as "the bad Countess."

Her pretty dress has a curious story behind it. A few days ago a visitor is said to have called and found her in an unusually bright and cheerful frame of mind. She wore the new frock, and she seemed particularly pleased with it.

"Do you like my new dress?" she asked. The visitor very politely replied, "I think your ladyship looks charming." "Ah!" said the Countess with a little sigh of satisfaction, "I'm so glad you like it, because it's my divorce-court dress. You know—the one I shall wear when my case comes off." Lady Scott, the mother of the Countess, is a beauty of a somewhat corpulent type, who wore a long fur coat which was thrown open and a tiny Erench bonnet on the back of her curly head.

Bishop Brooks interfered to secure to the Salvation Army the right to give a street parade in Boston.

The Republicans of 1860 carried seven States out of thirty-three; in 1864 they carried twenty-two out of the twenty-five that voted; in 1868 they carried twenty-six out of thirty-eight; in 1872 twenty-nine out of thirty-eight; in 1876 twenty-one out of thirty-eight; in 1880 nineteen out of thirty-eight; in 1884 eighteen out of thirty-eight; in 1888 twenty out of thirty-eight. Next year there will be forty-four States to vote. How many of them will the Republicans carry?

A CANADIAN BIGAMIST.

The Amours of "Prof." Foster, or Faustre.

HE GETS THREE YEARS IN STATE'S PRISON.

A Covington, Ky., despatch says: The evidence in the case of the Commonwealth against Albert Faustre for bigamy was concluded at dark last night and was generally of a very dramatic nature to the defendant. Faustre's flippant manner upon the stand very materially injured his case. Witnesses had been brought from Canada, the home of the accused, to testify against him, and they wove around him a net of such convincing proof that it will be barely possible for him to escape the penitentiary. The testimony showed that Faustre was a music teacher in London, Ontario, and that in 1881, while visiting Niagara Falls with a Miss Eichenberger and others of a gay party of excursionists, they were married; that subsequently he had left her and come to this country, where he had engaged in his profession, using it as a means of alluring susceptible girls to his ruin. He had married in Indiana, and had been divorced. Some time later he came to Newport and won the affections of Miss Minnie Knight, the daughter of a well known merchant of that city. The marriage was a clandestine one, and bitterly opposed by the parents of the girl.

Mr. Knight set to work at once to find out something about his musical son-in-law, and soon discovered the Canadian marriage and had Faustre arrested.

When the latter took the stand he stated that he had made the trip to Niagara Falls alluded to, but had gotten drunk upon the occasion, and if a marriage was performed it was while he was in the stupor of his debauch and he did not know it.

"About a month after that he had heard a rumor that he and Miss Eichenberger had been married, but did not believe it. Colonel Nelson, upon cross examination, told the witness and then the denouement came. The Colonel asked, 'Then you never had contemplated marriage with the young lady prior to the trip to the Falls?'

Faustre looked straight at the witness, and, without changing a muscle, said: "No, sir; neither before nor at the time of the trip."

Colonel Nelson then handed him an official-looking document, bearing an ominous-looking seal, and asked: "Did you ever see that before?"

It was a marriage license issued to Faustre and Miss Eichenberger four days before the trip to the Falls.

It was an unexpected blow, and the self-possession of the witness at once deserted him, and he looked confused. He spent several minutes in examining the paper, and declared he had never seen it before.

Colonel O'Neil, who represented the defence, seemed to be dumfounded, so unexpectedly had the shaft struck his client, and from that moment he seemed to have lost hope in the case.

The authenticity of the document was proved by a Canadian official, and a barrister of that country was present to testify to the laws of the Dominion.

Faustre's first wife was present, and when the former was asked if he recognized her, he turned, stared brazenly at her for a moment, and said he did not; then turning to the jury he said, half apologetically: "But you know how a person will change in ten years."

Wife No. 2 was also present, with her babe in her arms.

Later—the jury was out only twenty minutes, and returned a verdict of guilty, with a sentence of three years in State's prison.

London Free Press: Albert was the son of Mr. Foster, who kept the brick hotel in the village of Lambeth for some years. On the 19th of September, 1881, he married Miss Carrie Eichenberger, of the village of Delaware, a very estimable and highly respected young lady. In the following spring the young couple moved to Belleville. Albert being possessed of musical talent, entered Albert College for the purpose of becoming thoroughly trained in music. In about six months' time he matriculated in music, for which honor he dubbed himself professor.

BURNED AT THE DOCK.

A Steam Barge Fire in Which Two Men Lose Their Lives.

A Cleveland despatch says: The steam barge James S. Pease, which came into port from Lake Superior on Tuesday, caught fire about noon, and was nearly destroyed before the fire department extinguished the flames. There were two men and the cook in the after cabin, which was burning, and only one of the three, the cook, Anna L. Bennen, was saved. The latter was in the kitchen when the fire was discovered. She endeavored to rescue her personal belongings, but was unsuccessful. She was compelled to drop everything except the captain's overcoat and one or two garments of her own, which she hastily picked up, and, groping her way through the smoke and flames, managed to reach the side of the boat and jumped to the dock. The first engineer, Philip Stedman, whose home is in Delaware place, Buffalo, was seen by several witnesses to emerge from the burning cabin, his clothing on fire, and jump into the river, where he floated for several minutes. Several attempts were made to rescue him, but he sank before aid could reach him. He was about 70 years of age, and leaves a wife and family in Buffalo. The other, who was at work at the hold in the after part of the barge since it is thought he perished. The barge Planet, which was lying at the dock close to the Pease, caught fire, and was saved only by dint of desperate exertion. The loss on the Pease is about \$10,000.

A New Name for It.

Harper's Young People: "Oh, mamma! cried Willie, on seeing a zebra for the first time, 'do come here and see this poor little convict pony.'

Lady Somerset has been slumming in New York and speaking of the dives of the Bowery said: "What struck me most was that there were so few women in them compared with ours at home. But you will soon have many women drunkards as we have unless this terrible traffic is prohibited. It will be impossible for you to escape the fearful effects of hereditary craving for drink."

PERISHED IN THE FLAMES.

Five of a Family of Seven Burned to Death at Detroit.

TWO BOY AND SERVANT GIRL ESCAPE.

A Detroit despatch says: A frightful fatality occurred shortly after 2 o'clock this morning, when, in the partial burning of the two-story brick store and residence of George J. Reis, corner of Orleans and Catharine streets, five persons lost their lives. The list of the dead includes five members of Mr. Reis' family of seven, viz., Mr. Reis himself, his wife and three sons. Eight persons occupied the apartments above the store, but three of them—the servant girl and two sons, Moxey and Tony—escaped. It was within a few moments of 2 o'clock a. m. that Patrolman Frank Derkies noticed the blaze two blocks away. The fire was in the front part of the store and spreading rapidly. He at once sounded the alarm, and although the department arrived on the scene promptly the flames had spread through the entire store. Immediately after giving the alarm Officer Derkies ran to the burning building, and saw the servant girl and Tony Reis climbing out of the front window to the cornice. Another boy, Moxie, aged 15, was on a roof back of the building. The latter climbed down the lightning rod, and escaped uninjured, as did also Tony and the servant girl, who jumped to the sidewalk. When the door leading to the rear staircase of the house was broken open a frightful sight met the view. Lying in a heap at the foot of the staircase were the bodies of Mr. Reis and his wife, burned to a crisp. The firemen at once made their way to the upper floor, and there found, first the body of Charles Reis, aged 20, stretched on the floor near a side window, and in one of the front rooms were found the bodies of the two boys, recognized as Eddie Reis, aged 8, and Josie, aged 12. All three had been suffocated by the smoke. The bodies were taken from the burning building.

The dead are: George J. Reis, aged 50; Mrs. Reis, his wife, aged 45; Charles Reis, son, aged 20; Josie Reis, son, aged 12; Eddie Reis, son, aged 8.

George J. Reis was an old and respected citizen, having lived in the vicinity of his awful death for more than twenty years. There is no clue as to the origin of the fire. The damage to the building and contents will amount to about \$2,000.

A SHILLI I FIGHT.

Parnellites Lay for McCarthys, but Find Them Ready.

A London cable says: A disgraceful scene occurred to-day at the railway station in Limerick, growing out of the antipathy entertained by the two factions of the Irish party for each other. The McCarthys had been holding a convention at Limerick, and among the prominent speakers present were Mr. Wm. O'Brien and Mr. John Dillon. After the business had been concluded, a large number of those present escorted Messrs. Dillon and O'Brien to the station. A large crowd of Parnellites had gathered at the station with the evident intention of insulting the McCarthys. When Messrs. Dillon and O'Brien arrived at the station they were greeted with hoots and yells, and many opprobrious epithets were hurled at them. The McCarthys who had accompanied Messrs. Dillon and O'Brien were highly indignant at the treatment accorded them. Most of them carried heavy walking-sticks, and before the Parnellites realized their intentions they swooped down in a body upon the insulters of their leaders. The latter resisted as best they could, and for a time the scrimmage was a mighty lively one. Many of the Parnellites were hurt, and several were so badly injured that it was found necessary to remove them to the hospital.

The McCarthysite section of the Irish Parliamentary party have decided to take decisive steps to secure the Irish funds at present in the hands of Mr. Munro, the Paris banker. Mr. Parnell was one of the trustees of these funds, and upon his death, acting upon instructions from Mrs. Parnell, Mr. Munro refused to let anyone draw the money. Mr. Justin McCarthy and Mr. Timothy Healy have now commenced an action against Mr. Munro to decide the ownership of the funds, and to compel him to restore the money to those who are entitled to the possession of it.

DOM PEDRO DEAD.

Brazil's Old Ruler Will Never Again See the Land He Loved.

A Paris cable says: Dom Pedro, ex-Emperor of Brazil, died to-day. Pedro II (de Alcantara) was born in 1825 at Rio Janeiro. On the abdication of Dom Pedro I, his father, in 1831, he succeeded to the throne of Brazil, but, being a minor, the country was ruled by a Council of Regency until 1840. He was a man of a very high order of intelligence, and well known in Europe and the United States. He did a great deal to develop the material resources of the country, which prospered under his rule. In 1871 he issued an imperial decree for the gradual abolition of slavery. The total emancipation of the slaves in his dominion was effected in 1888. On November 16, 1889, a revolution broke out, which was supported by the army. The Ministry resigned, and a provisional government was formed under the presidency of General da Fonseca. The provisional government on the same day declared the Monarchy abolished, and, on the 17th, the ex-Emperor and his family were compelled to leave for Europe. The ex-Emperor has since resided in Portugal, and rapidly failed in health. His wife, Princess Theresa Christina Maria, sister of Francis I. King of Naples, whom he married in 1843, died shortly after the revolution. Dom Pedro was a Bourbon descendant of the houses of Braganza, Lorraine and Hapsburg.

John Howard Parnell, as head of the Parnell family, sailed for Ireland and it is said that he will by and unite the factions. The latest fad out West, says the St. Joseph News, is a shoe party. They stretch a sheet across the room and the ladies stand behind it and stick their feet under it so you can see only their shoes. Then you go along and pick out a pair of shoes and the lady who is in them you take down to supper.