



Jissen Women's University Rare Books
Honma Hisao Collection

Digital Archives of Mason Library

Oscar Wilde
Scrapbook

Vol. 5

(Continued from page 7.)

Mr. Gill in his opening speech recited the charges to be levelled at the head of his friend, Mr. Oscar Wilde. This was the constitution of the court on the memorable day, Saturday, April 6.

Now, this brings me up to a point I wish to speak definitely upon, and in no minced language. From the time Mr. Wilde brought his action for libel against Lord Queensberry, I advocated the hearing of the case at the Old Bailey in camera. The judge, however, thought differently, and allowed all the details to be reported. Newspapers, which after all are only commercial speculations, reported the case at length, but I am glad to say all the reports were judiciously sub-edited. The St. James' Gazette, a high class evening journal, however, refused to print one word of the evidence, and I admire them for the way they stuck to their guns. The St. James', however, stood alone amongst all the London newspapers. But what a change on Saturday! The Daily Telegraph, in high fulminating language, published a leading article commenting on the nature of the evidence given, and referring in no mean language to its disgusting revelations. Up to this point I agree with the D.T., but when I find this very respectable paper published from day to day no less than four or five columns of the evidence at the Old Bailey, I am reminded of that old adage, "People who live in glass houses should not throw stones." Now I hope that as all the old ground is to be gone over again in the prosecution of Oscar that the Judge will order the trial in camera. If he does so, the Police Budget will be the first paper to rejoice over the Judge's decision.

I now come to the actual police-court proceedings at Bow Street on Saturday. Directly Sir John Bridge, the magistrate, entered the court and had taken his seat Mr. Gill rose, and speaking in a very mild and subdued tone, stated the nature of the charge against Mr. Wilde. During his recital the court was hushed, and one could almost have heard a pin drop, so deep was the silence. When Mr. Gill had spoken for some five minutes Mr. Wilde relinquished his posing position of leaning over the front of the dock, and sat down on the seat at the back of the dock. Passing his hand lightly over his forehead and brushing his hair back, he again clasped his hands together, and leaning slightly forward, listened intently to the recital of the case against him by the Treasury counsel.

Mr. Gill said he was there to prosecute Mr. Wilde on a series of charges of inciting to commit or of committing certain gross acts under the 11th section of the Criminal Law Amendment Act, and he would indicate generally the character of the evidence he proposed to produce, and the nature of the charges, while the question of what he would be ultimately committed upon would depend upon the nature of the evidence produced. The first charge related to the conduct of the prisoner with the young man Charles Parker in 1893. Wilde was then staying at the Savoy Hotel, where he lived from April 2 to March 29, and at the same time there was living at a place in Little College Street, Westminster, in the upper part of a house, a man named Alfred Taylor. He was a man closely connected with the prisoner Wilde, and the evidence would disclose that he was a person acting for Wilde and procuring for him young men. Prisoner was charged with conspiring with that man to procure young men for the prisoner. Prisoner was in the habit of visiting Taylor at Little College Street, and in the course of these visits would have evidence as to what took place at that address, where the prisoner Wilde was in the habit of going. Parker was a servant out of place, having been a valet, and was in the company of his brother William when they met Taylor at the St. James' Restaurant. Taylor was a stranger to them; he stood them drink, and invited them to visit him at Little College Street. Having got them to that place he made certain suggestions, and mentioned Oscar Wilde as a man to whom he would introduce them. They met Wilde at dinner at Kettner's, when Wilde made a selection of Parker, and went with him to the Savoy Hotel. The learned counsel described what took place there, and on subsequent occasions at two other addresses with Wilde. He gave Parker money and visited him where he lived in Camera Square, till a woman noticing the appearance of the man Wilde, which once seen was not likely to be again forgotten, caused such trouble that Parker had to leave. Parker was now living a respectable life, and come as a most unwilling witness, but he had to do so. The learned counsel added that there were a number of other cases which

About the end of March, 1893, witness was out of employment, but not absolutely without means. He had been out of employ only a week. They were together one evening in the St. James' Restaurant when a man, whom witness now knew as Alfred Taylor, spoke to them. He offered them drink and entered into conversation with them. At this point the examination was interrupted by Mr. Gill stating that he had just been informed that



THE HALL PORTER AT THE ALBERMARLE CLUB.

the man Alfred Taylor, to whom he had referred, had been arrested. He proposed, he said, that that man should be charged and at once put into the dock beside Wilde, so that the evidence of the witnesses instead of being repeated could be heard by both at the same time.

The Chief Clerk directed that the charge should be formally entered, and a slight delay took place in the proceedings.

Mr. Humphreys asked how long it was proposed to sit to-day.

Sir John said, "As long as there were witnesses ready to be examined during the ordinary time of the court." It was a case, he said, that in the public interest was to be disposed of without delay.

After some delay Parker, who was in charge of two policemen, entered the court. He is a dark-complexioned, clean-shaven young man, of about twenty-five years of age. His hair is black and well brushed back from the forehead. He carried in his hand a very glossy silk hat, and wore a long, light dust racing overcoat.

Immediately Wilde observed Taylor he rose from his seat, smiled, and bowed to him. Taylor returned the salute, and then passed Wilde in the dock, and took up his position at the other end of it. Immediately Taylor had passed him Wilde resumed his seat, and gazed at the roofing of the court. He looked extremely bored, and appeared at this point to take little or no interest in the proceedings.

After the formal charge had been entered against Taylor the lad Parker was recalled, and his examination commenced. He said Taylor was the man who spoke to himself and brother in the restaurant. The name of Wilde was mentioned by Taylor, and he would like to introduce him to them.

Mr. Gill: For what purpose? He said he was a good man.

But for what purpose? He meant he was a good man for money.

Sir John Bridge: But did he say why he wanted to introduce Wilde?

Witness: Because he liked boys.

Mr. Gill: After a time did you go to Little College Street near the Houses of Parliament. Not that evening.

No; but afterwards? Yes. Taylor gave my brother the address. I went there with my brother. Taylor had three rooms, a drawing-room, bedroom, and kitchen. The drawing-room was well furnished. The bedroom had a very low bed in it—not more than a foot or a foot and a half from the ground. It was about eleven o'clock in the morning when we went there. I do not think the rooms were lit.

Mr. Gill: Well, what passed? The witness (who had dropped his respectful manner of reply) I forget.

Mr. Gill: Think, now; you had got this address and gone there by appointment, and you saw Taylor. What passed? Witness: I forget.

Sir John: What was said? Witness: He said he had arranged to introduce us to Mr. Wilde.

Where? At a restaurant.

That same evening at half-past seven was the time, and we went there with Taylor. Taylor appointed to meet us at the St. James' bar. He accompanied us to the restaurant, and we were shown into a private room, where there was a table laid for four. The table was lighted with candles. Mr. Wilde came in, and we were introduced, and dinner was served. Champagne was drunk, and after dinner coffee and brandy served and cigarettes smoked.

Mr. Gill: Now, after dinner did Wilde say anything to you? Yes. He said, "Will you come to the Savoy Hotel with me?" I said, "Yes," and we drove to the Savoy in a hansom. It was about ten o'clock. He took me to the second or third floor. I don't know whether we entered a sitting room. No one else was there. Whisky and soda for two was brought.

Mr. Gill: After the waiter who brought them had gone what did Wilde say to you?

Witness: "Come into my bedroom." There was a door leading to a bedroom from the sitting-room. I was there for about two hours. He gave me £2, and told me to come again in about a week. I went. It was about eleven o'clock at night. I was shown to the same room—his sitting-room. I was alone with him after supper. I remained about an hour and a half. I then went away. He gave me £3 that time.

Sir John Bridge: Did he say why £3 instead of £2?

Oh, he told me to buy some clothes. I saw Wilde again from time to time. Wilde took me to the Crystal Palace and on another occasion to the Pavilion, where we had a box, after which we went back to St. James' Street. I had a room at Park Walk, Chelsea, and Wilde has visited me there. He kept his cab waiting. After that there was some unpleasantness with my landlady, and I left. I did live in Camera Square, which is about half an hour

from Tite Street. I cannot say if he visited me there. I visited Wilde once at the Albermarle Hotel. I was taken there.

Mr. Gill: Never mind. I don't want to introduce any other name into this case.

Witness: I last saw Wilde about nine months ago. He drove past me in Trafalgar Square, and stopped the cab. He shook hands and said, "You are looking as pretty as ever." I attended tea parties at Taylor's, in Chapel Street. I was with Taylor when we were arrested in Fitzroy Square. After that incident I gave up all connection with people of this kind. I do not know Wood. I know Atkins, not Mavor. I know Scarfe. I have only dined with Wilde at Kettner's and the Solferino. After I ceased companionship with these people I went into the country, where Mr. Charles Russell came to me for the other case.

At this point the Court adjourned for luncheon, and Wilde in his private cell partook of refreshments supplied to his order from a neighbouring hotel.

On the resumption of the Court, after about thirty minutes' absence, Mr. Gill put William Parker, the previous witness' brother, in the box. He said: I was formerly in employment as a groom. I and my brother, in March, 1893, were out of employment, and on one occasion in the bar of the St. James' Restaurant we were together, and a man accosted us. I recognise Taylor as that man.

Counsel tried to get the witness to say why Oscar Wilde's name was mentioned, and for what purpose, but the witness could not remember any particular words used, though he said he understood the sense of what was said, and the intention of the introduction. Continuing he said, Taylor got my name and address on this paper, which was in my handwriting, and said he should like to introduce us, as Oscar Wilde was a good man for money. The witness was then taken to the incident of the call at Taylor's rooms, the appointment for dinner the same night, and the introduction to Wilde, who made the request to Charles in his (witness's) presence, and the departure of the two. Witness said that he and Taylor afterwards left together, parting in Piccadilly.

Greatly to the surprise of everyone the next witness was a woman, and no less a person than Mrs. Ellen Grant, landlady of the house in Little College Street, Westminster. She said that Taylor was tenant of rooms in her house from January, 1892, till August, 1893. The rooms were furnished very nicely. Taylor did not let in daylight, but had art muslin strained across the windows, and then dark curtains and lace curtains of the ordinary kind. He kept no servant, but used to do his own cooking. There was no woman staying with him, but she had seen women's things for fancy dress, such as shoes and stockings and a wig.

Here, at the request of Sir John Bridge, Wilde stood up, but the witness still said she failed to identify him.

Taylor had a number of young men visitors, and some of them stayed with him at night.

After Mrs. Grant had left the box, a tall, fair youth of about nineteen years of age, and named Alfred Wood, entered it. In reply to Mr. Gill he said: I am a clerk. In January, 1893, I was staying with Taylor in his rooms. I was out of employment. I know the other prisoner, Oscar Wilde. I think I made his acquaintance in January, 1893. I think at the Café Royal. We went to the Florence Restaurant, Rupert Street, and had supper in a private room.

"A good supper?" asked Mr. Gill. Yes, a very nice supper, champagne, and liqueur. After that I went with him to Tite Street, Wilde's house.

Where was his family? He told me they were at Torquay. There seemed to be no one of the family in the house. He let us in with a key. We went to his bedroom and had drink there.

The witness was asked by Mr. Gill in general terms if acts of impropriety took place, to which the witness said "Yes," and then Mr. Humphreys objected to a leading question.

Sir John Bridge said it would not help the prisoner Wilde to have details, but as the objection was raised the witness would have to state the facts.

He admitted on further examination that he made further visits to Tite Street, drink being always plentiful.

Asked by Sir John where the supper came from, the witness said that the prisoner Oscar and himself went down to the pantry and found it. There was no servant seen by him at any time.

Witness said he had seen Oscar Wilde at Taylor's rooms in Little College Street. Witness had lodged in Langham Street, having a bed and sitting-room combined. Wilde called on him there one afternoon, and stayed about twenty minutes, but witness did not remember anything taking place there. Wilde gave me money, said the witness, on several occasions, £3 and £4 at a time, and also gave me a watch and chain. The acquaintance ceased when witness left for America in March, 1893.

Mr. Gill: How did your leaving come about? I told Taylor, said the witness, that I would like to get away from these people.

Sir John: Who do you mean by these people? Witness: Wilde and others.

Mr. Gill: Let us leave others out at present. You had become acquainted with others who attended these tea parties at Taylor's, and some of them are out of the country at present?

Witness: Yes.

You wanted to go abroad and told Taylor so? Yes. I heard Taylor telling him that I wanted to go to America, and Wilde asked me if I had any letters, and I said yes. Taylor sent me a telegram to meet Wilde, and I went to his rooms. Wilde then gave me two £10 and two £5 notes.

Mr. Gill: Did you have any letters then? He asked me for them; he seemed very anxious to get them.

Sir John: Did you give him letters of his that day?

Mr. Gill: Not his, Sir John, but other people's. The next day (continued the witness) I lunched with Wilde at the Florence. That was the last time I saw him. He sent me £5 by messenger after the lunch. I have been to the Savoy to Wilde. I know Mavor.

Replying to Sir John Bridge, the witness added that he first met Wilde at the Café Royal, having gone there in obedience to a telegram he received from a gentleman whom had met at Taylor's.

Sidney Arthur Mavor, a tall youth, well dressed was the next witness, and he said he made Taylor's

acquaintance some time in 1892. He had visited Taylor at his rooms in Little College Street. He first met Oscar Wilde at Kettner's restaurant. That was by appointment, and there was a dinner at which four were present, Lord Douglas and Taylor being the others. Witness did not know who paid for the dinner. That was in September, 1892. Wilde sent him a silver cigarette case about a week later. Witness received a message from Wilde to meet him.

Mr. Gill: At an hotel? I don't remember.

Mr. Gill: Come; we have the hotel-books, you know.

Witness: I don't know the date. It might have been October. It was at the Albermarle Hotel. Wilde was waiting when witness arrived. He found that Wilde had taken rooms and a bedroom as well for witness. The bedroom led from his (Wilde's) bedroom.

Mr. Gill asked what took place, and the witness surprised counsel by saying, "Nothing." Then, on being asked if he had not made a statement to Mr. Charles Russell, he said "No." Mr. Russell had asked him a lot of questions, but witness did not think he had taken down his answers.

Antonio Meggi, who was the next witness, and described himself as a professor of massage, said he attended to the Savoy Hotel massage "patients." Had attended, he said, to massage Oscar Wilde at the hotel, a bedroom on the third floor being occupied by him. It was in March, 1893, from the 16th to 20th. One morning on going to the room he entered after knocking, and there saw a young man in the bed. At first he thought it was a young lady, as he only saw the head. It was some one about sixteen or eighteen years of age. Wilde was in the same room dressing himself. He told witness he felt so much better that morning, and that as he was very busy he could not stay to have the treatment. Witness never attended him again.

Jane Cotter, chambermaid at the Savoy Hotel, spoke to Wilde occupying a bedroom and sitting-room at the hotel, and to her discovery of a boy as occupying the same bed.

Mr. Gill then said that that was as far as he proposed to go that day, and after a conversation the prisoners were ordered to be remanded to Thursday next at eleven o'clock.

At this point Oscar rose from his seat and said a few words to his counsel, who, addressing the magistrate, asked for bail, saying that sureties could be offered to any amount, and he remarked that though all day Friday it was known to Wilde that a warrant might be issued for his arrest, he had made no attempt or effort to get away.

Mr. Gill said the charges were relied on by the defence in the other case. He opposed bail.

Sir J. Bridge said he could not grant bail. Wilde could be seen at Holloway by his solicitor during the remand.

Mr. Humphreys: Sureties to any amount can be provided.

Sir John: There will be no bail under any conditions, but I may be able to further consider the answer next Thursday.

Wilde sighed heavily as he heard the decision, and after a short consultation with his counsel, slowly raised his heavy frame and followed his fellow prisoner out of the dock through the prisoners' door. It was expected that the prisoners would be afforded the luxury of a cab to Holloway Gaol, but no one appearing to supply the money for Oscar Wilde and Taylor together went away in the ordinary police van.

In Holloway the accused has been provided with a comfortably furnished cell. Arrangements have been made by the friends of Oscar that he is to be supplied with his meals by a local caterer. By the rules of the prison the accused is able to enjoy half a bottle of wine per diem, but smoking is prohibited. Prisoner is also provided with the daily newspapers, and is allowed to see his solicitor daily, and a friend on visiting days. His number as entered in the prison books is B 24 Wilde, 640, and by this number he is recognised throughout the whole of Holloway Castle.



PARKER.

According to the prison authorities Wilde neither eats, drinks, nor sleeps. He is extremely talkative, and gives vent to loud denunciations of the manner in which he has been treated, of the discomfort of his special room, and of the manner in which he is watched night and day. He has been deprived of knife and fork, and the extra precaution has been taken of removing all glass vessels, and even the looking-glass from his room. In this limp and unsatisfactory mood must he remain until Thursday next.

WILDE'S DEFENCE.

The Press Association has authority for stating with reference to Oscar Wilde's defence that Sir Edward Clarke wrote early on Saturday to Mr. Humphreys saying that, having regard to the events of Friday, he thought it right to say that if Oscar Wilde desired that he should defend him on his trial he would do so, and that for services offered he of course would not accept any fee. Mr. Humphreys has replied, stating that Oscar Wilde gratefully accepts the offer.

No more warrants have been issued in connection with this case, but it is not improbable that other arrests may take place ere long.



LORD DOUGLAS.

would be gone into. The prisoner had already had an opportunity of giving his version of the affair, and he could do so again if he chose. It was a most unpleasant case to go into, but one of enormous public importance. It was enormously important that it should be known to these young men the prisoner had come in contact with that there was only one end to such a life as that of the prisoner Wilde, and that was at the hand of justice.

When Mr. Gill finished his speech the prisoner, taking a piece of paper in his hands, hurriedly wrote a note and passed it to his solicitor. He then again returned to his seat and leaned languidly back against the rail. The first witness called was Charles Parker, a slight-built, dark lad, of respectable appearance. The witness being sworn, gave his age as nineteen years. He said he had been previously valet to a gentleman. He had a brother who had been butler.

Look out for the New Paper! It will startle you!

THE ART OF LONDON SOCIETY, ONE OF OUR MOST SUCCESSFUL PLAYWRIGHTS AND POETS, ARRESTED ON A HORRIBLE CHARGE.



B I T T E R

A SOCIETY LIBEL CASE.

GRAVE CHARGE AGAINST MR. OSCAR WILDE.

THE MARQUESS OF QUEENSBERRY IN THE DOCK.

SENSATIONAL ALLEGATIONS

DEFENDANT MAKES A PLEA OF JUSTIFICATION.

EXHAUSTIVE EXAMINATION OF MR. WILDE.

The suit of Oscar Wilde and the Marquess of Queensberry was down on Wednesday's list for trial at the Central Criminal Court, before Mr. Justice Collins and a common jury. The words of the indictment charged John Stollo Douglas with maliciously publishing a defamatory libel of and concerning Oscar Fingal O'Flahertie Wills Wilde. The general public and the members of the junior bar were very early in attendance, and, not only was all sitting room taken up, but the passages of the court were so blocked by the crush that ingress and egress was a matter of great difficulty.

COUNSEL ENGAGED.

Sir Edward Clarke, Q.C., Mr. Mathews, and Mr. Travers Humphreys had been retained for the prosecution; Mr. Carson, Q.C., Mr. C. F. Gill, and Mr. A. Gill were counsel for the defence, a watching brief for Lord Alfred Douglas, the son of the defendant, being held by Mr. Besley, Q.C., and Mr. Monckton.

"NOT GUILTY."

The plaintiff arrived at half-past ten, accompanied by his solicitor, and took a seat in the well of the court, immediately in front of Sir Edward Clarke. Immediately afterwards the jury answered to their names, but it was not until twenty minutes to eleven that silence was called for the entrance of the learned judge. Lord Queensberry at once surrendered to his bail, and was conducted to the dock. His lordship seated himself, but, obediently to the attendant's request, advanced to the front, and stood with his arms resting upon the ledge.

The Clerk of the Court having read the indictment, charging the defendant with having published a defamatory libel of the plaintiff upon a card addressed to him, Lord Queensberry replied, "Not guilty," and added the further plea, "The libel is true, and was published for the public benefit."

COUNSEL EXPLAINS.

Sir Edward Clarke then opened for the prosecution. The libel, he said, was upon a visiting card, containing the name of Lord Queensberry, and it was a matter of very serious moment because it imputed to Mr. Oscar Wilde the gravest offence with which a man could be charged. But a far graver issue was raised by the plea that the libel was justified, and that Mr. Oscar Wilde had for a considerable period solicited certain persons (whose names were mentioned in the pleadings) to commit indecent practices. The learned counsel traced the plaintiff's career at Trinity College, Dublin, and subsequently at Magdalen College, Oxford, his marriage with a daughter of the late Mr. Lloyd, Q.C., and his later literary and artistic career. He detailed plaintiff's social connections with the sons of the defendant and with Lady Queensberry, who some years ago obtained relief from the marriage tie, owing to misconduct on the part of the marquis. Touching next on the introduction of Mr. Wilde to Lord Queensberry by Lord Alfred Douglas at the Cafe Royal, Sir Edward called the attention of the jury to a personage not hitherto mentioned. This was a man who had been given some clothes by Lord Alfred Douglas and who alleged that in the pockets he discovered four letters addressed to Lord Alfred

BITER



THE ARREST OF OSCAR WILDE.

THE PET OF LONDON SOCIETY, ONE OF OUR MOST SUCCESSFUL PLAYWRIGHTS AND POETS, ARRESTED ON A HORRIBLE CHARGE.

THE ILLUSTRATED POLICE BUDGET

JOURNAL IN ENGLAND.

SATURDAY, APRIL 13, 1895.

OSCAR WILDE'S ARREST.

FULL DETAILS OF HIS CAPTURE.

[BY OUR SPECIAL REPORTER.]

POLICE COURT PROCEEDINGS.

"Pick Oscar Wilde up to-morrow morning, and never leave him until he either goes abroad or is arrested." These few words comprised the brief instructions given me late on Thursday night by the far-seeing Editor of the *Police Budget*.

Now it was extremely difficult to find out where Oscar was living during the time his charge of slander against Lord Queensberry was being heard at the Old Bailey. The police themselves were unaware of his then whereabouts. I chanced, however, to alight on a private detective of my acquaintance. Luckily he had to keep a watch on Oscar, and in confidence confided to me the fact that he (Mr. Wilde) was sleeping at his own house in Tite Street, Queen's Road, Chelsea.

Punctually at seven o'clock on Friday morning I was in Tite Street. The houses are all of the Queen Elizabeth style of architecture, and No. 16—Mr. Wilde's house—is painted, so far as wood work goes, from top to bottom with cream coloured paint. Tite Street runs from the Queen's Road to the Embankment. At the corner is a cab rank, and I had little difficulty by keeping on the blind side of the cabs in watching Mr. Wilde's house. There were, however, two other watchers—the private detectives, employed by Lord Queensberry. Shortly before nine o'clock a smart brougham, drawn by a pair of brown cobs, pulled up outside Mr. Wilde's house. At five minutes past the hour the great Oscar himself emerged from his house and entered the carriage. He was dressed in the long cloth overcoat so familiar to the habitués of the Old Bailey, a very highly glazed top hat, wore suede gloves, and carried in his hand a small walking-stick. Between his lips was the ever favourite cigarette. The brougham no sooner started on its journey than two cabs were employed to follow it. One cab contained the private detectives, the other the *Budget* reporter.



SIR JOHN BRIDGE.

Mr. Wilde drove by way of Sloane Square to the Cadogan Hotel, a place of the highest respectability in Sloane Street. At the door of the hotel he was met by Lord Alfred Douglas, who had rooms in the building. Mr. Wilde entered the hotel, and proceeded upstairs. He opened and read some letters which had arrived for him. He stayed in the place about twenty minutes, and then re-entered his carriage and drove direct to the Old Bailey. The brougham pulled up opposite to the private entrance to the criminal court, a gateway leading to Old Newgate Prison Yard, and an entrance through which the prisoners are taken. Mr. Wilde at that time could not have realised the adage that his last entrance to the Old Bailey as a free man, considering the doorway by which he went in—of coming

events casting their shadows before them. Mr. Wilde did not enter the court in which the trial was taking place. He was, however, about to do so when he was met by his solicitor who conducted him to a private room in the building. A conference was held in that room—a conference that will become almost an historical one—between Sir Edward Clarke, Q.C., Mr. Charles Matthews, Mr. Humphries (the legal advisers of Oscar), and Mr. Wilde. The result of the discussion was seen some twenty minutes later by Sir Edward Clarke publicly withdrawing from the case. Mr. Wilde, immediately the conference was ended, left the precincts of the Old Bailey and drove in his carriage to the Holborn Viaduct Hotel, where Lord Alfred Douglas had reserved a special room for him, and who was in waiting to receive his friend. Mr. Wilde on entering the hotel proceeded directly to his room, and soon after his arrival (about half-past eleven) was joined by Lord Douglas of Hawick. At half-past twelve the party had lunch served, and at half-past one o'clock paid the bill and made arrangements for departure. On emerging from the hotel Mr. Wilde re-entered his carriage, and was followed by the two Douglas's. The party drove to Ely Place, and Mr. Wilde personally delivered a letter at the offices of Sir George Lewis. Outside Ely Place, Lord Alfred and Lord Douglas of Hawick left the brougham and entered a cab. Mr. Wilde, however, drove on in his carriage and the cab followed close behind. The procession at this time was an interesting one. Mr. Wilde leading in his brougham, then the Lord Douglas in a cab, next two private detectives in another cab, then the *Budget* man in another cab, and then about four other cabs containing more newspaper men. In this order the procession proceeded to Duquesne Circus, up Fleet Street and the Strand to St. James's Square. The cab containing the Lord Douglas's stopped at a bank and they entered and cashed a large cheque. Mr. Wilde, however, drove on, and eventually alighted at the Cadogan Hotel. Soon after he was joined by Lord Alfred Douglas. The time was now shortly after three o'clock, and as I ascertained from the porter of the hotel that Mr. Wilde had dismissed his carriage and had expressed a desire to stay at the hotel until the evening, I determined to drive back to the City and find out how matters were proceeding there.

The first news I obtained was to the effect that immediately on the termination of the trial at the Old Bailey, Mr. Charles Russell (Lord Queensberry's solicitor) had sent the following letter to the public prosecutor:—"In order that there may be no miscarriage of justice, I think it my duty at once to send you a copy of all our witnesses' statements, together with a copy of the shorthand notes of the trial."

The Hon. Hamilton Cuffe, the present Director of Public Prosecutions, is a very different man to his predecessor. He does not take a month to decide any question of grave importance. Immediately he saw the purport of the documents Mr. Russell had forwarded to him, he sent for that gentleman and requested him to attend at the Treasury immediately. Mr. Russell did so, and the result of the interview was shown in the fact that he left the Treasury with Mr. Angus Lewis, one of the solicitors to the Public Prosecutor, and Detective Inspector Brockwell. The party proceeded to Bow Street Police Court, and asked for a private interview with Sir John Bridge. This was granted, and Sir John returned with the party to Whitehall. The magistrate then read the documents supplied by Mr. Russell, and returned to Bow Street. At five minutes to five o'clock he signed a warrant for the arrest of Mr. Oscar Wilde, and handed it to Detective Inspector Brockwell for immediate execution. The inspector proceeded by cab to Scotland Yard, and instructed Detective Inspector Richards and Detective Sergeant Allen to go at once to the Cadogan Hotel and effect the arrest. The two officers took a cab, and I followed them. Arrived at the hotel, they had a moment's conversation with one of the private detectives, and then entered the hotel. What took place inside is best described in the words of an eye-witness, who was present from the time the police officers entered the hotel until Wilde came out in their custody. My informant said, "The detectives entered here (the Cadogan Hotel) about 6.20 p.m. Addressing the hall-porter, one of them asked, 'Is Oscar Wilde staying here?' They were answered in the affirmative. 'Will you show us to his room?' they asked, notifying that they were police officers. The porter, somewhat flurried, summoned the waiter, who conducted the two detectives to Wilde's sitting-room, No. 53, where they found their man. In the room were two young men. Wilde was seated by the fireplace in a saddle bag chair, calmly smoking a cigarette and drinking a brandy and soda. He raised his inquiring eyes to the intruders. Inspector Richards said, 'Mr. Wilde, I believe?' Wilde languidly responded, 'Yes, yes.' The floor of the room was strewn with some eight or

nine copies of evening papers, which had evidently been hastily scanned and then thrown aside. Inspector Richards said, 'We are police officers, and hold a warrant for your arrest.' Wilde replied, 'Oh, really.' Inspector Richards added, 'I must ask you to accompany me to the police-station.' 'Whither shall I be taken?' inquired Wilde. 'To Scotland Yard,' replied the inspector, 'and thence to Bow Street.' 'Shall I be able to obtain bail?' plaintively said Wilde. The officer sternly replied, 'That is a matter for the magistrate.' With a deep sigh, he dropped an evening paper, and raising himself by the aid of the arms of the chair into standing position, he remarked with characteristic nonchalance to the officers, 'Well, if I must go I will give you the least possible trouble.' Wilde then passed over to a couch, picked up his overcoat, and was assisted in putting it on by one of the young men present. Carefully he lifted and adjusted his hat. He grasped his suede gloves in one hand and seized his stick with the other. Then he picked up from the table a copy of 'The Yellow Book,' which he placed in security under his left arm. He then threw away the end of a cigarette, and taking a fresh one from his silver case, lit it by a match given him by one of his young friends. Before departing with the police officers he asked one of the young men present to go to his house and obtain some clean linen and forward it to the police-station whither he was to be conveyed. Then said he to the detectives, 'I am now, gentlemen, ready to accompany you.'

"Detective Allen, acting upon this condensation, ran down the stairs and hailed a four-wheel cab (No. 15,034) from the rank in Cadogan Square. When the party came down to the hall the porter, by force of habit, politely opened the door, while the waiter as politely showed them into the cab."

When Mr. Wilde emerged from the hotel he looked considerably flushed, but he did not appear in any way to have lost his self-possession, and he never for one moment relaxed his grasp of the "Yellow Book." One of the young men referred to as having been in the room of the hotel—a sallow complexioned young fellow, wearing a fur lined coat and a silk hat—exhibited the intention of entering the cab, but, on a strong hint from one of the detectives, he desisted. The detectives and Wilde were now fairly seated in the growler. Detective Allen directed the cabman to drive by the shortest route to Scotland Yard. The driver accordingly proceeded by way of Cadogan Square, and as he passed the cab-rank he cried out to some of his brethren, "I've got him inside." The man was evidently animated by the full glory that he had captured a distinguished fare. The four wheeler then proceeded by way of Hobart Place, Buckingham Palace Road, and St. James' Park to Scotland Yard.

Detective Allen alighted first, and Wilde came next. In alighting he missed the carriage step and nearly fell to the stone pavement. Quickly recovering his position and still retaining between his teeth the cigarette which he was smoking, he dived his hand into his pocket and pulled out some money for the purpose of paying the cabman. Detective Allen interposed, "I'll pay." "No! No!" said Wilde. "Allow me if you please," but on being informed that it was a way they had at Scotland Yard of paying for the conveyance of prisoners Wilde returned the coins to his pocket. Wilde was then hurried by the two detectives into "the Yard," where he was detained for some time, and subsequently removed to Bow Street, arriving shortly after eight o'clock. Up to this time Wilde had not been charged, and consequently as he drove along in the cab, accompanied by Detective Inspectors Brockwell and Richards, he was allowed to smoke. Arrived at the chief police station in London, Wilde was taken into the charge room and placed in the dock. Inspector Brockwell read the warrant to him and Mr. Digby took the charge. Whilst all this formality took place, Wilde leant over the side of the dock, smiled occasionally, looked extremely bored, and said nothing except asking for the dates mentioned in the warrant to be repeated. He was then searched, and twenty £5 notes found in his pocket-book, his cigarette case and matches taken from him. Lord Alfred Douglas offered bail for Mr. Wilde, but it was refused. He was then conveyed to one of the police cells, and a constable told off to watch him. He was provided with rugs on which to make his bed—a kindness not extended to all prisoners. Wilde, however, slept little, and for more than half the night he paraded his cell. About six o'clock he called the constable on duty and asked if he could smoke. When told it was against the rules, he seemed much surprised. Wilde next gave orders for some breakfast to be sent for from the Tavistock Hotel in Covent Garden. A waiter brought it across on a tray, but Wilde eat hardly any of the toast and eggs, but he drank all the tea, and, in fact, when a second breakfast ordered by mistake arrived, he partook of some more tea, but not one atom of food did he allow to pass his lips. Thus did the man who has

cultivated affectation, a shameless disavowal of all morality, and the Great Mogul of the æsthetic craze passed his first night and early morning in a prison cell.



MR. OSCAR WILDE.

After the police constable, who had been in attendance on Oscar during the night, had removed his breakfast things he asked the author of "all that's beautiful" if he would like to wash himself. Mr. Wilde replied in the affirmative, and taking off his top coat, and placing it on his bed he followed the police officer from the cell, along a passage, and across the yard at the back of Bow Street Police Station, where a lavatory is fitted up. Here Mr. Wilde doffed his silk-lined frock-coat, turned up the cuffs of his shirt, took off his collar and tie and had a good sluice in the basin of water the constable prepared for him. Having washed and dried himself, he brushed his massive head of hair with a nearly worn-out brush. He next replaced his collar and then arranged his tie, carefully putting his gold pin in the cravat. His toilet finished, he retraced his steps back to the police cell, arriving shortly before nine o'clock. He was then locked in and left to his own meditations. At half-past ten o'clock, Gaoler Bush came hurriedly to Mr. Wilde's cell door, unlocked it, and asked the prisoner to follow him. Accompanied by Bush and three constables, Oscar was conducted across the police-station yard to the prisoners' entrance to the Police Court. The party ascended by a private staircase to the cells behind the Extradition Court. About twenty minutes to eleven o'clock the door by which prisoners enter the Court was opened, and Oscar, hat in hand, and his suede gloves between his fingers, entered the Court. He was conducted by Mr. Bush to the iron dock, at each end of which stood a policeman. Immediately he was in the dock Mr. Wilde placed his silk hat on the seat provided for the convenience of prisoners and his gloves inside it. He then leant over the front of the dock, and with clasped hands had a short but animated conversation with his solicitor, Mr. Travers Humphreys. The Court, small and oppressive, presented at this moment a scene that will one day become historic.

In the dock, looking haggard, tired, and troubled, stood Oscar Wilde, the man who had materially assisted to make the dramatic history of the nineteenth century, and who practically was better known for his "peculiar" literary audacity than any man of the present day. Yes! there he stood to answer a criminal charge—a charge, one of the most fearful known to our law. In front of Mr. Wilde sat Mr. Gill, the Treasury council, and Mr. Angus Lewis, the solicitor to the Public Prosecutor, who were told off to conduct the prosecution on behalf of the Crown. By the number of papers and documents Mr. Gill had before him the trial seemed likely to be a lengthy one. Next to these gentlemen sat Mr. Humphreys, who had few or any documents in his possession. This was probably accounted for by the fact that, as he himself said, "The arrest of Mr. Wilde had so completely taken him by surprise." In other parts of the court were Detective-Inspectors Brockwell and Richards and Detective-Sergeant Allen, who represented the police. Newspaper men, police officers, and a few of the public went to swell the motley throng. One important personage—Lord Alfred Douglas—sat at the solicitors' table, looking the very semblance of the image of misery. He spoke to no one and no one spoke to him. He was wrapped up in his own thoughts, and seemed to be deeply moved as

(Continued on Page 10.)

Look out for the New Paper! It will startle you!

A SOCIETY LIBEL CASE.

GRAVE CHARGE AGAINST MR. OSCAR WILDE.

THE MARQUESS OF QUEENSBERRY IN THE DOCK.

SENSATIONAL ALLEGATIONS

DEFENDANT MAKES A PLEA OF JUSTIFICATION.

EXHAUSTIVE EXAMINATION OF MR. WILDE.

The suit of Oscar Wilde and the Marquess of Queensberry was down on Wednesday's list for trial at the Central Criminal Court, (before Mr. Justice Collins and a common jury). The words of the indictment charged John Stolto Douglas with maliciously publishing a defamatory libel of and concerning Oscar Fingal O'Flahertie Wills Wilde. The general public and the members of the junior bar were very early in attendance, and, not only was all sitting room taken up, but the passages of the court were so blocked by the crush that ingress and egress was a matter of great difficulty.

COUNSEL ENGAGED.

Sir Edward Clarke, Q.C., Mr. Mathews, and Mr. Travers Humphreys had been retained for the prosecution; Mr. Carson, Q.C., Mr. C. F. Gill, and Mr. A. Gill were counsel for the defence, a watching brief for Lord Alfred Douglas, the son of the defendant, being held by Mr. Besley, Q.C., and Mr. Monckton.

"NOT GUILTY."

The plaintiff arrived at half-past ten, accompanied by his solicitor, and took a seat in the well of the court, immediately in front of Sir Edward Clarke. Immediately afterwards the jury answered to their names, but it was not until twenty minutes to eleven that silence was called for the entrance of the learned judge. Lord Queensberry at once surrendered to his bail, and was conducted to the dock. His lordship seated himself, but, obediently to the attendant's request, advanced to the front, and stood with his arms resting upon the ledge.

The Clerk of the Court having read the indictment, charging the defendant with having published a defamatory libel of the plaintiff upon a card addressed to him, Lord Queensberry replied, "Not guilty," and added the further plea, "The libel is true, and was published for the public benefit."

COUNSEL EXPLAINS.

Sir Edward Clarke then opened for the prosecution. The libel, he said, was upon a visiting card, containing the name of Lord Queensberry, and it was a matter of very serious moment because it imputed to Mr. Oscar Wilde the gravest offence with which a man could be charged. But a far graver issue was raised by the plea that the libel was justified, and that Mr. Oscar Wilde had for a considerable period solicited certain persons (whose names were mentioned in the pleadings) to commit indecent practices. The learned counsel traced the plaintiff's career at Trinity College, Dublin, and subsequently at Magdalen College, Oxford, his marriage with a daughter of the late Mr. Lloyd, Q.C., and his later literary and artistic career. He detailed plaintiff's social connections with the sons of the defendant and with Lady Queensberry, who some years ago obtained relief from the marriage tie, owing to misconduct on the part of the marquess. Touching next on the introduction of Mr. Wilde to Lord Queensberry by Lord Alfred Douglas at the Cafe Royal, Sir Edward called the attention of the jury to a personage not hitherto mentioned, who was a man who had been given some clothes by Lord Alfred Douglas and who alleged that in the pockets he discovered four letters addressed to Lord Alfred

by Mr. Oscar Wilde. Whether the man had found or stolen them was a matter of speculation. This person came to Mr. Oscar Wilde, represented himself as in distress, and as wanting to go to America, and plaintiff gave him £15 or £20 in order to pay his passage. He then handed to plaintiff the letters. To those letters he (Sir E. Clarke) did not attach the slightest importance. As was generally the case, the important letter was retained. While Mr. Oscar Wilde's play, "A Woman of No Importance," was in preparation, what appeared to be to some extent the copy of a letter was handed to Mr. Tree, the actor, with a request to give it to Mr. Wilde. After this, another individual called on the plaintiff and offered him the original, but he said, "No," he had a copy, which he looked upon as a work of art, and did not want the original. Plaintiff looked upon the letter as a sort of prose sonnet, and told the man that it would probably appear as a sonnet poem. It did so appear in a critical magazine, edited by Lord A. Douglas, and called "The Spirit Lamp." The learned counsel read a letter, opening with the words, "My own Boy,—Your sonnet was lovely, and it is a marvel that those red rose-leaved lips of yours should be made for the music of song rather than for the madness of kissing." The writer suggested that Lord Alfred, being alone in London, should go to Salisbury, "and cool your hands in the grey twilight of Gothic things." The signature was "Always with undying love, yours—Oscar." The words of the letter did appear extravagant to those in the habit of reading commercial correspondence. (Laughter.) But it was merely an expression of poetic feeling, and had no relation whatever to the painful suggestion now made. On the production of the plaintiff's play "The Importance of Being Earnest," Lord Queensberry was refused admission and his money returned because he brought to the theatre a bouquet of vegetables—(laughter)—and the jury might have their doubts whether his lordship was responsible for his actions. The learned advocate dealt at some length with the suggestion made against plaintiff because of his connection with certain literary productions, and, as showing his real feeling as to improper publications, he instanced the fact that plaintiff, the instant he saw a production called "The Priest and the Acolyte" wrote to the editor of the magazine protesting against its continued appearance. As to Mr. Wilde's "Picture of Dorian Gray," it was simply idealising reality in the sense of harmony and beauty.

Sidney Wright, the porter of the Albermarle, having deposed to handing Lord Queensberry's post-card to Mr. Oscar Wilde, PLAINTIFF IN THE BOX.

The plaintiff himself entered the witness-box, and, assuming an easy pose, with his arms resting on the rail, he answered the questions of his leader in a firm, deliberate voice. He met the man Wood, who had the letters referred to, at the rooms of a tailor, and Wood said a man named Allen had stolen the letters from him, but they had been recovered by a detective. Plaintiff told him he did not consider the letters of any importance. Wood said he had been offered £60 for what witness described as his "beautiful letter to Lord Alfred Douglas." His reply was, "I never received so large a sum for a prose work so short in length." That letter formed the basis of a French poem afterwards published and signed by a young French poet, a friend of his own. Passing from various interviews with Wood and another person named Tyler, plaintiff described a scene with Lord Queensberry in his library. He told defendant he supposed he had come there to apologise for the letter he had written about plaintiff and his son. Defendant replied that the letter was privileged, adding that plaintiff and Lord Alfred had been kicked out of the Savoy Hotel at a moment's notice, and that they had been blackmailed, and that plaintiff had taken rooms for defendant's son in Piccadilly. These statements were perfectly untrue. He asked defendant, "Do you seriously accuse your son and me?" Lord Queensberry answered, "I do not say that you are it, but you look it." (Slight applause in court.)

The learned Judge: I will have the court cleared if there is the smallest repetition of disturbance.

Witness completed Lord Queensberry's answer: "I do not say that you are it, but you look it, and you pose at it, which is just as bad. If I catch you in a public cafe again with my son I will thrash you." Plaintiff replied, "I don't know what the Queensberry rules are, but the Oscar Wilde rule is to shoot at sight." He then ordered defendant out of his house, saying to the servant, "This is the Marquess of Queensberry, the most infamous brute in London. Never allow him to enter my house again. If he attempts it send for the police." He was not responsible for the publication of "The Priest and the Acolyte" in the "Cameleon" magazine. He disapproved of it, and expressed his disapproval to the editor. The envelope containing the original of defendant contained the pleadings.

UNDER CROSS-EXAMINATION.

Mr. Carson began his cross-examination by asking plaintiff whether he was not something over 39, the age which he had given in his examination-in-chief. He now said he was born on the 16th of October, 1854. In addition to his house in Chelsea, he had rooms in St. James's-place, and Lord A. Douglas had visited them. He regarded "The Priest and the Acolyte"

as violating all the artistic canons, and as being disgusting twaddle, but he had never publicly dissociated himself from the "Cameleon," in which it appeared.

Was "The Priest and the Acolyte" immoral?—It was worse, it was badly written. (Laughter.)

The learned counsel took witness through a series of questions on his "Phrases and Philosophies," contributed to the "Cameleon" on "Wickedness is a myth invented by good people to account for the attractiveness of others." Do you hold that to be a safe axiom?—Witness: Most stimulating. (Laughter.)

Do you hold that to be a safe axiom?—Witness: Most stimulating. (Laughter.)

You think anything that stimulates thought is good whether moral or immoral?—I thought is neither one nor the other. Thought is intellectual.

Counsel called attention to a criticism of "Dorian Gray," in the "Scottish Observer," in which it was described as set in "an atmosphere of moral corruption," and asked plaintiff whether he regarded that as a suggestion that his work pointed to a certain grave offence.

Witness: Some might think it so, whether reasonable or not.

Mr. Carson: In your introduction to "Dorian Gray" you say there is no such thing as a moral or an immoral book. Books are either well or badly written.

Plaintiff: That expresses my view.

Has "Dorian Gray" a certain tendency?—Only brutes and illiterates would so regard it.

Do the majority of people take up the "pose" you are giving us?—I am afraid not. I am afraid they are not cultivated enough.

Mr. Carson: Not cultivated enough to draw a distinction between a good book and a bad book?

Witness (loftily): Oh, certainly not! (Laughter.)

Mr. Carson, quoting from a copy of "Lippincot" (a second copy having been handed to the learned judges), read the author's description of his first meeting with "Dorian Gray," and asked, "Do you consider that description of the feelings of a man towards a youth just growing up as proper or improper?"

Plaintiff: I think it is the most perfect description possible of what an artist would feel on meeting a beautiful personality.

Mr. Carson: Have you ever felt the feeling of "adoring madly" a man some years younger than yourself?

Plaintiff: I never gave adoration to anybody except myself. (Laughter.)

May I take it that you have never felt the sensations which you there describe?—No, I borrowed from Shakspeare's sonnets.

Mr. Carson: You have written an article pointing out that Shakspeare's sonnets have a certain tendency?

Plaintiff: On the contrary, I wrote objecting to the shameful perversion by Hallam, the historian, and a great many French critics.

Certain questions as to a French novel referred to in plaintiff's "Dorian Gray" were ruled out as irrelevant.

Mr. Carson returned to "Dorian Gray," and in a long passage hit upon the phrase, "Why is your friendship so fatal to young men?"

Plaintiff: I do not think any grown person influences another grown person. Further questioned, he said his letter to Lord A. Douglas was written from Torquay, where he was staying, and Lord Alfred was at the Savoy.

Mr. Carson: You say, "Your slim gilt soul walks between passion and poetry."

Plaintiff: It is a beautiful phrase. (Laughter.) The letter is unique. (Renewed laughter.)

Mr. Carson: Listen to this second letter of your own to Lord A. Douglas:—"Dearest of all boys,—Your letter was delightful, and it was red and yellow wine to me, for I am sadly out of sorts. You must not make scenes with me. They kill me; they wreck the loveliness of life. I cannot see you, so Greek and gracious, distorted by passion. I cannot listen to your curved lips saving hideous things to me. Don't do it. You break my heart. I must see you soon. You are the divine thing. I want a thing of grace and genius, but I do not know how to do it. Shall I come to Salisbury? There are many difficulties. My bill here is £43 for the week. I have also a new sitting-room over the Thames for you. Why are you not here, my wonderful boy? I fear I must leave. No money, no credit, and a heart of lead—Ever your own, OSCAR."

Plaintiff (with a lofty air): An extraordinary letter—everything I write is extraordinary. (Laughter.)

Mr. Carson: You do not lose as being ordinary?

Plaintiff (with a gesture of contempt): No.

Is that a love letter?—It is a letter expressive of love.

Cross-examination continued: Wood was a young man who had held a clerkship, and was in a different social position. He had been asked by Lord A. Douglas to help Wood, and supped with Wood at a cafe on the night of his introduction. On one occasion he gave Wood £2, but not for an object suggested by the learned counsel. He never miscondemned himself with Wood at his house in Chelsea, while his (plaintiff's) wife and children were away. When Wood brought those letters to him, he thought he came to levy blackmail.

My suggestion to you is that, instead of giving him £16, you gave him £30. Did you not give him £5 the following day?—Witness: Yes. (Sensation.)

Did you have a champagne farwell lunch with the man who levied blackmail?—Yes. He convinced me he had no intention, and that the letters had been stolen by other persons.

Why?—Because he said £15 would land him penniless at New York.

Did you not think it strange that a man with whom you had lunched in a private room should seek to levy blackmail?—Perfectly infamous.

Cross-examination resumed: He knew Wood as "Alfred," and two other men named Allen and Taylor were also known to him. Allen was known to him by reputation as a blackmailer and nothing else. He gave Allen 10s. "to show his contempt." (Laughter.) After Allen came Clyburne, who also consulted him about the letters. He was also kind to Clyburne, and gave him 10s. (Laughter.) He told Clyburne he was afraid he was leading a dreadfully wicked life. Clyburne said, "There's good and bad in all of us," to which he replied, "You are a philosopher." (Laughter.)

Is the discovered letter the only one that a sonnet was written about?—I should have thought a great deal of modern poetry before I could answer that. (Laughter.)

THE PLAINTIFF AND THE OFFICE BOY.

Did you become fond of the office boy to a firm of publishers in February, 1892?—No.

Was it a young man of eighteen employed in the shop?—Yes.

Was he a handsome boy?—He had an intellectual face.

Did you ask this lad to dine with you at the Albemarle Hotel?—Yes.

Was that for the purpose of an intellectual treat?—Well, for him, yes. (Laughter.)

Did you dine alone?—No; a gentleman was present. (Plaintiff wrote the name.)

Counsel closely questioned plaintiff as to what took place while the youth was in his company, and he appealed to the learned judge to protect him from the ignominy of being obliged to answer detail after detail, seeing that he denied all.

Did you ever give him any money?—Yes, on three occasions. First, 24; secondly, a railway fare to Cromer, where my wife and I were staying, and on the third occasion 25.

Did you present him with copies of your works?—Yes.

With the inscription "To Dear Edward"?—Yes.

Did you become friendly with a lad who sold newspapers, but who was a loafer at Worthing? (Laughter.)—Yes.

Was he a literary character?—No, he and another youth assisted two fishermen to pull down the boat he and Lord A. Douglas were using. They took the youths for a sail.

Was Alphonso literary?—No, he was a pleasant kind of creature. (Laughter.) No familiarity ever took place.

Did you give Alphonso sums amounting in all to £15?—Plaintiff (emphatically): Never.

You gave him a cigarette case, a book, and your photo?—Yes.

Counsel held up a walking stick amidst laughter, and plaintiff said he gave it to Alphonso. He took the same boy to Brighton and gave him a blue serge suit. It might have been that their bedrooms at the hotel communicated.

Mr. Carson had not concluded his examination when, at a quarter to five, the court adjourned. Lord Queensberry was again admitted to bail.

MR. OSCAR WILDE AGAIN IN THE WITNESS-BOX.

PLAINTIFF AND HIS INCONGRUOUS COMPANIONSHIPS.

SEVERE CROSS-EXAMINATION.

FURTHER EXTRAORDINARY CORRESPONDENCE.

The Marquess of Queensberry again surrendered to his bail on Thursday at the Central Criminal Court charged with publishing a defamatory libel concerning Mr. Oscar Wilde. The doors were opened at half-past nine, and even at that comparatively early hour the junior bar not only monopolised the greater part of the sitting accommodation, but overflowed into the adjacent passages in such numbers as to seriously obstruct the view from many points. For some time the chief usher was occupied in finding seats for holders of cards of admission, and the aidenmanic bench soon became as crowded as on Wednesday.

PRINCIPALS IN COURT.

Lord Alfred Douglas, a pale, slim, fair-haired youth, sat in a remote corner, close to the door, through which the judge usually enters from the robing-room. The marquess was again attired in the semi-sporting costume, which seems to go far towards making him a distinctive personality. Mr. Wilde, with his flowing hair brushed back and falling negligently upon the heavy black velvet collar of his overcoat, sat chatting to his solicitor for some time before the re-appearance of the jury. Lord Queensberry took his place in the dock at half-past ten, and a few moments later Mr. Justice Collins came in. As Mr. Wilde stepped into the witness-box, holding a glass of water, the defendant wrote a note and passed it down to his counsel.

PLAINTIFF UNDER CROSS-EXAMINATION.

Mr. Carson, Q.C., at once resumed his cross-examination by putting to Mr. Wilde questions about his relationship with the man Taylor. He used to go to the upper part of a house occupied by Taylor, where there were two parties. Taylor's rooms did not strike him as peculiar, except that they were more tasteful than usual.

Were they not luxurious for the upper part of a house, 15, Little College-street?—They were pretty rooms.

Did you ever see the curtains otherwise than drawn?—Yes.

Were you ever there at any time when light was let into those rooms and when a double set of curtains were not drawn across?—Yes, once, in March.

Were not these rooms always strongly perfumed?—I would not say always. Taylor burnt perfumes.

Did you meet Wood there?—Yes.

And another person (named)?—Yes, but I have not seen him for a year, and have not the remotest idea where he is at present.

Have you been told he has disappeared within the last week?—No. His mother was asked by Taylor where he was, and was told he would be back home on Monday.

Did you see Taylor with a lady's costume on?—No.

Further cross-examined, he had not constantly sent telegrams to Taylor, but he wired him respecting Wood's possession of the letters referred to on Wednesday.

Do you know that Taylor and a man named Parker were arrested in a raid on a house in Fitzroy-square last year?—Yes.

How many men did Taylor introduce you to?—About five.

Did you give money to all?—Yes.

Was Parker a gentleman's servant out of employment?—I don't know.

If you had known it would you have been friendly with him?—I would be friendly with any human being I liked. (Laughter.)

Was he a literary man? Witness (airily): Culture was not his strong point. (Laughter.)

What pleasure could you have in the company of groome and coachmen?—The pleasure of being with those who were young, bright, and happy. (Laughter.)

You invited Taylor to dinner, and he brought a valet and a groom?—That is your account of it, not mine.

It was at Kettner's Restaurant, and was the wine Kettner's best?—Yes. (Laughter.)

Did you give them an intellectual treat?—They seemed deeply impressed. (Much laughter.)

Did they have plenty of champagne?—What gentleman would stint his guests? Mr. Carson: Yes, what gentleman would stint the valet? (Great laughter.)—Plaintiff: I strongly object to that description.

A BASE CHARGE DENIED.

The learned counsel asked if witness did not after that dinner drive one of the men to the Savoy, where he had a private room, gave him a cigarette case and had given him about £4. Parker had never been in his bedroom at Tite-street, Chelsea, nor had he ever visited this man at 12, Park-walk, Chelsea, at half-past twelve o'clock at night.

Asked why he associated with young men of a different class, witness replied, "I recognise no social distinctions, and would sooner talk to a young man half an hour than be cross-examined in court."

MEN IN WOMEN'S CLOTHES.

You knew Parker and Taylor were arrested in a raid?—Yes, I read it in a newspaper. Did you know that at the time they were arrested they were in company with several men in women's clothes?—My recollection is that two men in women's clothes drove up to the house and were arrested outside, but whether men were at the concert inside in women's clothes I do not know.

Did you not think it a serious thing that your friend Taylor and your friend Charles Parker should be arrested in a police raid?—When I read it I was greatly distressed, but the magistrates took a different view because he dismissed the case.

They were charged with a felonious practice, were they not?—I don't know.

But the magistrates fined some who were there, did he not?—I do not know at all.

Did you not hear of one of these men in connection with the Cleveland-square scandals?—Never.

Was not one of them a notorious personage?—I never heard of him.

Did the arrest in Fitzroy-square make any difference to your friendship with Taylor?—I was distressed to hear it, and I wrote to him.

Was not this the same Taylor who lunched with you on Tuesday last?—I did not invite him to lunch. He came to my house.

FREDDY AND OSCAR.

Further cross-examined: He was introduced to a young man named Freddy Atkins, who was connected with bookmakers, and met him at dinner with a gentleman, whose name was written down and passed to counsel on Wednesday. He called Atkins "Freddy," and Freddy addressed him as "Oscar."

Freddy had an ambition for the music-hall stage. He could not discuss literature. The art of the music-hall was as far as he had got. (Laughter.) He took Freddy to Paris, engaging three bedrooms at the hotel. He took Freddy out to lunch.

After lunch did you suggest he should have his hair curled? (Laughter.)—No.

Did he get his hair curled?—I should have been very angry with him if he had. (Laughter.)

Was there plenty of champagne?—If you suggest that I ply a man with wine it is detestable and monstrous, and I won't have it. (Laughter.)

OFF TO THE MOULIN ROUGE.

Did you give Freddy a sovereign to go to the Moulin Rouge?—Yes.

Counsel here put a specific question to witness as to what happened at the hotel after Freddy returned from the Moulin Rouge. Witness met it with a flat negative.

If anyone came here and said they witnessed your conduct, would it be a mistake?—It would be an infamous lie. The gentleman whose name had been written came to Paris while Freddy was there. The gentleman and Freddy afterwards visited him in London, plaintiff being ill in bed at the time.

A PRESENT FOR MABOR.

The gentleman whose name had been written down also introduced him to two young men, named Searp and Mabor. To the latter he gave a cigarette case. They afterwards stayed at the same hotel in town, Mabor having met him at the railway station on his return from Scotland. No indecencies took place. He had also dined with Mabor at Kettner's and at the Solferino, Taylor being present. He knew a youth named Granger at Lord Alfred Douglas's rooms in High-street, Oxford.

Did you ever kiss or embrace Granger?—No, he was ugly.

Mr. Carson (sharply): Why do you mention his ugliness?

Witness: It is difficult to imagine such a thing under any circumstances.

I ask you why did you mention his ugliness?—Because you stung me with an insolent question.

Further cross-examined: He brought Granger to Goring in June, 1893, he having taken a house there. He knew a masseur at the Savoy Hotel, but he denied that the masseur ever said anything incriminating or entertaining.

Is that a love letter?—It is a letter expressive of love.

Cross-examination continued: Wood was a young man who had held a clerkship, and was in a different social position. He had been asked by Lord A. Douglas to help Wood, and supped with Wood at a cafe on the night of his introduction. On one occasion he gave Wood £2, but not for an object suggested by the learned counsel. He never misconducted himself with Wood at his house in Chelsea while his (plaintiff's) wife and children were away. When Wood brought those letters to him, he thought he came to levy blackmail.

My suggestion to you is that, instead of giving him £15, you gave him £30. Did you not give him £5 the following day?—Witness: Yes. (Sensation.)

Did you have a champagne farewell lunch with the man who levied blackmail?—Yes. He convinced me he had no intention, and that the letters had been stolen by other persons.

Was it then you gave him the £5?—Yes. Why?—Because he said £15 would land him penniless at New York.

Did you not think it strange that a man with whom you had lunched in a private room should seek to levy blackmail?—Perfectly infamous.

Cross-examination resumed: He knew Wood as "Alfred," and two other men named Allen and Taylor were also known to him. Allen was known to him by reputation as a blackmailer and nothing else. He gave Allen 10s. "to show his contempt." (Laughter.) After Allen came Clyburne, who also consulted him about the letters. He was also kind to Clyburne, and gave him 10s. (Laughter.) He told Clyburne he was afraid he was leading a dreadfully wicked life. Clyburne said, "There's good and bad in all of us," to which he replied, "You are a philosopher." (Laughter.)

Is the discovered letter the only one that a sonnet was written about?—I should have to go through a great deal of modern poetry before I could answer that. (Laughter.)

THE PLAINTIFF AND THE OFFICE BOY.

Did you become fond of the office boy to a firm of publishers in February, 1892?—No. Was it a young man of eighteen employed in the shop?—Yes.

Was he a handsome boy?—He had an intellectual face.

Did you ask this lad to dine with you at the Albemarle Hotel?—Yes.

Was that for the purpose of an intellectual treat?—Well, for him, yes. (Laughter.)

Did you dine alone?—No; a gentleman was present. (Plaintiff wrote the name.)

Counsel closely questioned plaintiff as to what took place while the youth was in his company, and he appealed to the learned judge to protect him from the ignominy of being obliged to answer detail after detail, seeing that he denied all.

Did you ever give him any money?—Yes, on three occasions. First, £4; secondly, a railway fare to Cromer, where my wife and I were staying, and on the third occasion £5.

Did you present him with copies of your works?—Yes.

With the inscription "To Dear Edward"?—Yes.

Did you become friendly with a lad who sold newspapers, but who was a loafer at Worthing? (Laughter.)—Yes.

Was he a literary character?—No, he and another youth assisted two fishermen to pull down the boat he and Lord A. Douglas were using. They took the youths for a sail.

Was Alphonso literary?—No, he was a pleasant kind of creature. (Laughter.) No familiarity ever took place.

Did you give Alphonso sums amounting in all to £15?—Plaintiff (emphatically): Never.

You gave him a cigarette case, a book, and your photo?—Yes.

Counsel held up a walking stick amidst laughter, and plaintiff said he gave it to Alphonso. He took the same boy to Brighton and gave him a blue serge suit. It might have been that their bedrooms at the hotel communicated.

Mr. Carson had not concluded his examination when, at a quarter to five, the court adjourned. Lord Queensberry was again admitted to bail.

MR. OSCAR WILDE AGAIN IN THE WITNESS-BOX.

PLAINTIFF AND HIS INCON- GRUOUS COMPANIONSHIPS.

SEVERE CROSS-EXAMINATION.

FURTHER EXTRAORDINARY CORRESPONDENCE.

The Marquess of Queensberry again surrendered to his bail on Thursday at the Central Criminal Court charged with publishing a defamatory libel concerning Mr. Oscar Wilde. The doors were opened at half-past nine, and even at that comparatively early hour the junior bar not only monopolised the greater part of the sitting accommodation, but overflowed into the adjacent passages in such numbers as to seriously obstruct the view from many points. For some time the chief usher was occupied in finding seats for holders of cards of admission, and the aldermanic bench soon became as crowded as on Wednesday.

PRINCIPALS IN COURT.

Lord Alfred Douglas, a pale, slim, fair-haired youth, sat in a remote corner, close to the door, through which the judge usually enters from the robing-room. The marquess was again attired in the semi-sporting costume, which seems to go far towards making him a distinctive personality. Mr. Wilde, with his flowing hair brushed back and falling negligently upon the heavy black velvet collar of his overcoat, sat chatting to his solicitor for some time before the re-appearance of the jury. Lord Queensberry took his place in the dock at half-past ten, and a few moments later Mr. Justice Collins came in. As Mr. Wilde stepped into the witness-box, holding a glass of water, the defendant wrote a note and passed it down to his counsel.

PLAINTIFF UNDER CROSS-EXAMINATION.

Mr. Carson, Q.C., at once resumed his cross-examination by putting to Mr. Wilde questions about his relationship with the man Taylor. He used to go to the upper part of a house occupied by Taylor, where there were tea parties. Taylor's rooms did not strike him as peculiar, except that they were more tasteful than usual.

Were they not luxurious for the upper part of a house, 13, Little College-street?—They were pretty rooms.

Did you ever see the curtains otherwise than drawn?—Yes.

Were you ever there at any time when light was let into those rooms and when a double set of curtains were not drawn across?—Yes, once, in March.

Were not these rooms always strongly perfumed?—I would not say always. Taylor burnt perfumes.

Did you meet Wood there?—Yes. And another person (named)?—Yes, but I have not seen him for a year, and have not the remotest idea where he is at present.

Have you been told he has disappeared within the last week?—No. His mother was asked by Taylor where he was, and was told he would be back home on Monday.

Did you see Taylor with a lady's costume on?—No.

Further cross-examined, he had not constantly sent telegrams to Taylor, but he wired him respecting Wood's possession of the letters referred to on Wednesday.

Do you know that Taylor and a man named Parker were arrested in a raid on a house in Fitzroy-square last year?—Yes.

How many men did Taylor introduce you to?—About five.

Did you give money to all?—Yes. Was Parker a gentleman's servant out of employment?—I don't know.

If you had known it would you have been friendly with him?—I would be friendly with any human being I liked. (Laughter.)

Was he a literary man? Witness (airily): Culture was not his strong point. (Laughter.)

What pleasure could you have in the company of grooms and coachmen?—The pleasure of being with those who were young, bright, and happy. (Laughter.)

You invited Taylor to dinner, and he brought a valet and a groom?—That is your account of it, not mine.

It was at Kettner's Restaurant, and was the wine Kettner's best?—Yes. (Laughter.)

Did you give them an intellectual treat?—The Jissen Women's University Library (Much laughter.)

Did they have plenty of champagne?—What gentleman would stint his guests?

Mr. Carson: Yes, what gentleman would stint the valet? (Great laughter.)—Plaintiff: I strongly object to that description.

A BASE CHARGE DENIED.

The learned counsel asked if witness did not after that dinner drive one of the men to the Savoy, where he had a private room, gave him iced champagne, and commit an act of criminality. Witness absolutely denied the suggestion, also that he gave the man £2; and invited him to dinner the following night. The ambition of one of the men was to go on the stage. He never visited Parker at the house in Camera-square. He presented Parker with a cigarette case and had given him about £4. Parker had never been in his bedroom at Tite-street, Chelsea, nor had he ever visited this man at 12, Park-walk, Chelsea, at half-past twelve o'clock at night.

Asked why he associated with young men of a different class, witness replied, "I recognise no social distinctions, and would sooner talk to a young man half an hour than be cross-examined in court."

MEN IN WOMEN'S CLOTHES.

You knew Parker and Taylor were arrested in a raid?—Yes, I read it in a newspaper.

Did you know that at the time they were arrested they were in company with several men in women's clothes?—My recollection is that two men in women's clothes drove up to the house and were arrested outside, but whether men were at the concert inside in women's clothes I do not know.

Did you not think it a serious thing that your friend Taylor and your friend Charles Parker should be arrested in a police raid?—When I read it I was greatly distressed, but the magistrates took a different view because he dismissed the case.

They were charged with a felonious practice, were they not?—I don't know.

But the magistrates fined some who were there, did he not?—I do not know at all.

Did you not hear of one of these men in connection with the Cleveland-square scandals?—Never.

Was not one of them a notorious personage?—I never heard of him.

Did the arrest in Fitzroy-square make any difference to your friendship with Taylor?—I was distressed to hear it, and I wrote to him.

Was not this the same Taylor who lunched with you on Tuesday last?—I did not invite him to lunch. He came to my house.

FREDDY AND OSCAR.

Further cross-examined: He was introduced to a young man named Freddy Atkins, who was connected with bookmakers, and met him at dinner with a gentleman, whose name was written down and passed to counsel on Wednesday. He called Atkins "Freddie," and Freddy addressed him as "Oscar." Freddy had an ambition for the music-hall stage. He could not discuss literature. The art of the music-hall was as far as he had got. (Laughter.) He took Freddy to Paris, engaging three bedrooms at the hotel. He took Freddy out to lunch.

After lunch did you suggest he should have his hair curled? (Laughter.)—No.

Did he get his hair curled?—I should have been very angry with him if he had. (Laughter.)

Was there plenty of champagne?—If you suggest that I ply a man with wine it is detestable and monstrous, and I won't have it. (Laughter.)

OFF TO THE MOULIN ROUGE.

Did you give Freddy a sovereign to go to the Moulin Rouge?—Yes.

Counsel here put a specific question to witness as to what happened at the hotel after Freddy returned from the Moulin Rouge. Witness met it with a flat negative.

If anyone came here and said they witnessed your conduct, would it be a mistake?—It would be an infamous lie. The gentleman whose name had been written came to Paris while Freddy was there. The gentleman and Freddy afterwards visited him in London, plaintiff being ill in bed at the time.

A PRESENT FOR MABOR.

The gentleman whose name had been written down also introduced him to two young men, named Seap and Mabor. To the latter he gave a cigarette case. They afterwards stayed at the same hotel in town, Mabor having met him at the railway station on his return from Scotland. No indecencies took place. He had also dined with Maber at Kettner's and at the Solferino, Taylor being present. He knew a youth named Granger at Lord Alfred Douglas's rooms in High-street, Oxford.

Did you ever kiss or embrace Granger?—No, he was ugly.

Mr. Carson (sharply): Why do you mention his ugliness?

Witness: It is difficult to imagine such a thing under any circumstances.

I ask you why did you mention his ugliness?—Because you stung me with an insolent question.

Further cross-examined: He brought Granger to Goring in June, 1893, 143, having taken a house there. He knew a masseur at the Savoy Hotel, but he denied that the masseur ever said anything incriminating or enticing his name.

one morning for massage. He also repudiated certain suggestions with regard to his behaviour on visits to Paris.

Mr. Carson having concluded his cross-examination, Sir Edward Clarke began re-examination by putting in certain letters of Lord Queensberry, upon which questions were put to plaintiff. The first of the series was taken, dated from Carter's Hotel, W., April 1, and was from Lord Queensberry to Lord Alfred Douglas. The writer began:—

"Alfred.—It is exceedingly painful for me to have to address you in this style, but I decline to receive any letters from you anywhere that may come in a disguised handwriting, or in any other. They will be put in the fire unread. Am I to understand that, having left Oxford as you did with discredit to yourself, the reasons of which were fully explained to me by your tutor, you now intend to lounge about town? I was put off with the assurance that you were going into the Civil Service or the Foreign Office. Then the assurance was given me that you were going to the Bar. It appears to me you intend to do nothing. You are too late now for any profession, and I utterly decline to supply you with sufficient funds to enable you to loaf. You are preparing a wretched future for yourself, and it would be cruel and wrong for me to encourage you in this. Do you seriously intend to make no attempt to help yourself? Secondly, your infamous intimacy with this man, Wilde, must cease, or I will disown you and stop all money supplies, and, if necessary, I will go personally and tell him so. I am not going to try to analyse this intimacy, and make no accusations. But to pose as a thing is as bad as to be it. With my own eyes, from this window, I saw you in a disgusting and



MR. OSCAR WILDE.

loathsome familiarity. It was proved by your manner and the expression on your countenance. It turned my blood cold. Never have I seen such a sight in human nature as I saw in your horrible face. I hear now, on good authority, that his wife is petitioning for a divorce from him, on the grounds of—unnatural crimes. Is this true, and do you know it? If it is, what is your position going about with him as a woman? The horror has crossed my mind that you may possibly be brought into this. Whether true or not, posing seems to me to be equivalent to a criminal relationship. If I thought the actual thing true, I should be justified in shooting him on the spot. These English Christian cowards—men they call themselves—want waking up. I will stand this no longer. I will stop all money or insist on your leaving the country.—Your disgusted so-called father.

"QUEENSBERRY."

Sir E. Clarke: Is there any foundation for the statement as to a petition for divorce?

Plaintiff: Not the slightest.

"WHAT A FUNNY LITTLE MAN."

Sir E. Clarke informed the jury that Lord Alfred Douglas replied to the letter by writing:—

"Queensberry.—Carter's Hotel.—What a funny little man you are.—Alfred Douglas." (Much laughter.)

The answer of Lord Queensberry was dated Tuesday, April 3:—

"You impertinent young jackanapes, I request you not to send me such messages by telegraph, and if you go on sending me impertinent messages I will give you the thrashing you so strictly deserve. Your only excuse is that you must be crazy. I learn from an Oxford man that that was your reputation there. If I catch you with this man, Wilde, I will make a public scandal in a way you little dream of. It is already a suppressed one. I prefer an open one, unless the acquaintance ceases. I shall carry out my threat, and stop supplies. I will cut you down to a mere pittance. So you know what to expect, QUEENSBERRY."

A STINKING SCANDAL.

The next letter, said the learned counsel, was from Lord Queensberry to Mr. A. Montgomery. The father of the lady who was formerly defendant's wife, and who was the mother of Lord Alfred. The writer said, "I have changed my mind, and, as I am not at all right, having been very much upset by what has happened during the last ten days, I do not see why I should dance attendance upon you, particularly as I do not know what it is you want to know, or whether it is only curiosity on your part. Your daughter is the person who is supporting my son in defying me. I received a quibbling and prevaricating message from her, saying the boy denied being at the Savoy Hotel this year. Why send such a telegram unless the boy denies staying there with Oscar Wilde? As a matter of fact, he did so, and there has been a stinking scandal. I know that they were warned off, but the proprietor will not allow this. This hideous scandal has been going on for years. Your daughter must be mad the way she is behaving. She evidently thinks I want to make out a case against my son. Nothing of the kind. I have made out a case against Oscar Wilde. I said to him, 'I do not accuse you of being a —, but you look like one, and you pose as one.' If I were certain of the actual fact I would shoot the fellow at sight. I accuse him of posing. I will mark him if he does not stop. I don't believe Wilde will now dare to defy me. He plainly showed the white feather. He is a damned cur and coward of the Rosebery type. I am convinced that the Rosebery-Gladstone Royal insult that came to me through my other son—that she worked that. I saw Drumlanrig on the river last night, and it rather upset me. Lord Drumlanrig, the learned counsel explained, was the defendant's eldest son, who recently died. The letter continued:—"It shall be known some day that Rosebery not only insulted me by lying to the Queen (which makes her as bad as him) and Gladstone, but, also, has made a life-long quarrel between my son and me." In a letter following from Scotland on the 21st of August, 1894, Lord Queensberry addressed Lord Douglas as "an abortion and a reptile. You are no son of mine, and I never thought you were." On the 29th of August he addressed him as "You miserable creature," and went on, "If you are my son it is only confirming to me how right I was to face horror and misery rather than bring others into the world. That was my reason for breaking off with your mother. So dissatisfied was I that when you were quite a baby I shed bitterest tears that I had brought such a creature into the world; that I had unintentionally committed such a crime. You



MARQUESS OF QUEENSBERRY.

must be demented. There is madness on your mother's side. Few families in this Christian country are without it if you look into them. It all depends on yourself whether I make you any further allowances." Replying to his counsel, plaintiff said he utterly disregarded Lord Queensberry's requests that he should discontinue seeing Lord Alfred Douglas. He made some modification in one passage of "Dorian Gray" obediently to a suggestion of the late Mr. Walter Pater.

OSCAR IS LATE.

On the court re-assembling after the adjournment, Mr. Oscar Wilde apologised to his lordship for keeping the jury waiting some minutes. Replying to Sir E. Clark, he said he helped the bookseller's assistant, Shuteley, because he was in difficulties, and was a young man interested in literary subjects. Taylor was educated at Marlborough. Nothing had come to plaintiff's knowledge against the character of certain persons mentioned in cross-examination that day. He had never been at Camera-square or Park Wall. He at first refrained from taking proceedings against Lord Queensberry owing to pressure brought upon him by the Queensberry family.

On the conclusion of the re-examination a letter was put in from Lord A. Douglas to his father, accusing him of meanly depriving him of money. If necessary he should defend himself with a revolver. "If he should defend himself we shall be acting in self-defence against a violent and dangerous ruffian. If you were dead nobody would miss you." After the reading of correspondence between Lord Queensberry and Mr. Wilde's solicitors, the case for the plaintiff closed.

Mr. Carson at once began his address to the jury for the defence. He said the Marquess of Queensberry withdrew nothing, and what he had done was premeditatedly done. Taylor was the pivot of the whole case, and he, the proprietor of the extraordinary den in Little College, was absent. These various men would be called on defendant's behalf, and would prove for what purpose they were introduced by Taylor to Oscar Wilde, who had strange associates as a man of art, and who had so generous and democratic a soul that he could accommodate himself to the valet, the coachman, and the newspaper boy. (Laughter.) From plaintiff's writings and course of life, defendant was justified in assuming that Wilde was addicted to certain habits. The idea of "The Priest and the Acolyte," and of "Dorian Gray" was precisely the same idea as that disclosed in Wilde's letters to Lord A. Douglas. What would be the horror of any member of the jury finding that his own son, under the domination of a person like Mr. Oscar Wilde, had written contributions in the "Chameleon," disclosing the results of that education in certain tendencies of the mind? If they came to the conclusion that Mr. Oscar Wilde's book, "Dorian Gray," was of the description he had submitted to them, there could be no answer to the plea of justification, and Lord Queensberry was bound to have acted as he had in the interests of his own son. Wilde's anxiety to get the letters from Wood was explained by the relations which had previously existed between them. He gave Wood £16 to get him off to America and an additional £5 at a farewell luncheon. Wilde thought by this means he had got rid of Wood, but, observed the learned counsel, "he has not. Wood is here and will be examined." Mr. Beerholm Tree acted with the most perfect propriety in handing to Wilde a letter which had been addressed to the theatre. He was anxious this should be understood, because he was told Mr. Tree had already cabled from America. Sir E. Clarke agreed with him there was not the slightest reflection upon Mr. Tree.

Mr. Justice Collins: He acted with the most perfect propriety.

Mr. Carson resumed his address with a reference to plaintiff's correspondence with Lord A. Douglas—"My own dear boy.—Your red rose-leaved lips were made for the music of song no less than for the madness of kissing. Your slim, gilt soul walks between passion and poetry. Hyacinthus, whom Apollo loved so madly, was you in Greek days." "Beautiful!" exclaimed the learned counsel; "an abominable piece of disgusting immorality." His second letter, addressed from the Savoy Hotel, suggested the same thoughts. He (Mr. Carson) was not there to suggest that anything took place between this young man and Wilde, but he was there to say that Wilde had conceived a vile, abominable passion for Lord Alfred Douglas, who was in a dangerous position, for he had become so dominated by Wilde that he even threatened to shoot his own father.

Mr. Carson was continuing his address at 4.30, when the court again adjourned. Lord Queensberry was again admitted to bail.

one morning for massage. He also repudiated certain suggestions with regard to his behaviour on visits to Paris.

Mr. Carson having concluded his cross-examination, Sir Edward Clarke began re-examination by putting in certain letters of Lord Queensberry, upon which questions were put to plaintiff. The first of the series was taken, dated from Carter's Hotel, W., April 1, and was from Lord Queensberry to Lord Alfred Douglas. The writer began:—

"Alfred.—It is exceedingly painful for me to have to address you in this style, but I decline to receive any letters from you anywhere that may come in a disguised handwriting, or in any other. They will be put in the fire unread. Am I to understand that, having left Oxford as you did with discredit to yourself, the reasons of which were fully explained to me by your tutor, you now intend to lounge about town? I was put off with the assurance that you were going into the Civil Service or the Foreign Office. Then the assurance was given me that you were going to the Bar. It appears to me you intend to do nothing. You are too late now for any profession, and I utterly decline to supply you with sufficient funds to enable you to loaf. You are preparing a wretched future for yourself, and it would be cruel and wrong for me to encourage you in this. Do you seriously intend to make no attempt to help yourself? Secondly, your infamous intimacy with this man, Wilde, must cease, or I will disown you and stop all money supplies, and, if necessary, I will go personally and tell him so. I am not going to try to analyse this intimacy, and make no accusations. But to pose as a thing is as bad as to be it. With my own eyes, from this window, I saw you in a disgusting and



MR. OSCAR WILDE.

loathsome familiarity. It was proved by your manner and the expression on your countenance. It turned my blood cold. Never have I seen such a sight in human nature as I saw in your horrible face. I hear now, on good authority, that his wife is petitioning for a divorce from him, on the grounds of—unnatural crimes. Is this true, and do you know it? If it is, what is your position going about with him as a woman? The horror has crossed my mind that you may possibly be brought into this. Whether true or not, posing seems to me to be equivalent to a criminal relationship. If I thought the actual thing true, I should be justified in shooting him on the spot. These English Christian cowards—men they call themselves—want waking up. I will stand this no longer. I will stop all money or insist on your leaving the country.—Your disgusted so-called father,

"QUEENSBERRY."

Sir E. Clarke: Is there any foundation for the statement as to a petition for divorce?

Plaintiff: Not the slightest.

"WHAT A FUNNY LITTLE MAN."

Sir E. Clarke informed the jury that Lord Alfred Douglas replied to the letter by wiring:—

"Queensberry.—Carter's Hotel.—What a funny little man you are.—Alfred Douglas."
(Much laughter.)

The answer of Lord Queensbury was dated Tuesday, April 3:—

"You impertinent young jackanapes, I request you not to send me such messages by telegraph, and if you go on sending me impertinent messages I will give you the thrashing you so strictly deserve. Your only excuse is that you must be crazy. I learn from an Oxford man that that was your reputation there. If I catch you with this man, Wilde, I will make a public scandal in a way you little dream of. It is already a suppressed one. I prefer an open one, unless the acquaintance ceases. I shall carry out my threat, and I shall not let you down to a mere pittance. So you know what to expect,

"QUEENSBERRY."

A STINKING SCANDAL.

The next letter, said the learned counsel, was from Lord Queensberry to Mr. A. Montgomery, the father of the lady who was formerly defendant's wife, and who was the mother of Lord Alfred. The writer said, "I have changed my mind, and, as I am not at all right, having been very much upset by what has happened during the last ten days, I do not see why I should dance attendance upon you, particularly as I do not know what it is you want to know, or whether it is only curiosity on your part. Your daughter is the person who is supporting my son in defying me. I received a quibbling and prevaricating message from her, saying the boy denied being at the Savoy Hotel this year. Why send such a telegram unless the boy denies staying there with Oscar Wilde? As a matter of fact, he did so, and there has been a stinking scandal, I know that they were warned off, but the proprietor will not allow this. This hideous scandal has been going on for years. Your daughter must be mad the way she is behaving. She evidently thinks I want to make out a case against my son. Nothing of the kind. I have made out a case against Oscar Wilde. I said to him, "I do not accuse you of being a —, but you look like one, and you pose as one." If I were certain of the actual fact I would shoot the fellow at sight. I accuse him of posing. I will mark him if he does not stop. I don't believe Wilde will now dare to defy me. He plainly showed the white feather. He is a damned our and coward of the Rosebery-Gladstone Royal insult that came to me through my other son—that she worked that. I saw Drumlanrig on the river last night, and it rather upset me." Lord Drumlanrig, the learned counsel explained, was the defendant's eldest son, who recently died. The letter continued:—"It shall be known some day that Rosebery not only insulted me by lying to the Queen (which makes her as bad as him) and Gladstone, but, also, has made a life-long quarrel between my son and me." In a letter following from Scotland on the 21st of August, 1894, Lord Queensberry addressed Lord Douglas as "an abortion and a reptile. You are no son of mine, and I never thought you were." On the 29th of August he addressed him as "You miserable creature," and went on, "If you are my son it is only confirming to me how right I was to face horror and misery rather than bring others into the world. That was my reason for breaking off with your mother. So dissatisfied was I that when you were quite a baby I shed bitterest tears that I had brought such a creature into the world; that I had unintentionally committed such a crime. You



MARQUESS OF QUEENSBERRY.

must be demoted. There is madness on your mother's side. Few families in this Christian country are without it if you look into them. It all depends on yourself whether I make you any further allowances." Replying to his counsel, plaintiff said he utterly disregarded Lord Queensberry's requests that he should discontinue seeing Lord Alfred Douglas. He made some modification in one passage of "Dorian Gray" obediently to a suggestion of the late Mr. Walter Pater.

OSCAR IS LATE.

On the court re-assembling after the adjournment, Mr. Oscar Wilde apologised to his lordship for keeping the jury waiting some minutes. Replying to Sir E. Clark, he said he helped the bookseller's assistant, Shelley, because he was in difficulties, and was a young man interested in literary subjects. Taylor was educated at Marlborough. Nothing had come to plaintiff's knowledge against the character of certain persons mentioned in cross-examination that day. He had never been at Camera-square or Park 1920-03-16, first taken proceedings against Lord Queensberry owing to pressure brought upon him by the Queensberry family.

On the conclusion of the re-examination a letter was put in from Lord A. Douglas to his father, accusing him of meanly depriving him of money. If necessary he should defend himself with a revolver. "If he (Wilde) or I shoot you we shall be acting in self-defence against a violent and dangerous rough. If you were dead nobody would miss you." After the reading of

correspondence between Lord Queensberry and Mr. Wilde's solicitors, the case for the plaintiff closed.

Mr. Carson at once began his address to the jury for the defence. He said the Marquess of Queensberry withdrew nothing, and what he had done was premeditatedly done. Taylor was the pivot of the whole case, and he, the proprietor of the extraordinary den in Little College, was absent. These various men would be called on defendant's behalf, and would prove for what purpose they were introduced by Taylor to Oscar Wilde, who had strange associates as a man of art, and who had so generous and democratic a soul that he could accommodate himself to the valet, the coachman, and the newspaper boy. (Laughter.) From plaintiff's writings and course of life, defendant was justified in assuming that Wilde was addicted to certain habits. The idea of "The Priest and the Acolyte," and of "Dorian Gray" was precisely the same idea as that disclosed in Wilde's letters to Lord A. Douglas. What would be the horror of any member of the jury finding that his own son, under the domination of a person like Mr. Oscar Wilde, had written contributions in the "Chameleon," disclosing the results of that education in certain tendencies of the mind? If they came to the conclusion that Mr. Oscar Wilde's book, "Dorian Gray," was of the description he had submitted to them, there could be no answer to the plea of justification, and Lord Queensberry was bound to have acted as he had in the interests of his own son. Wilde's anxiety to get the letters from Wood was explained by the relations which had previously existed between them. He gave Wood £15 to get him off to America and an additional £5 at a farewell luncheon. Wilde thought by this means he had got rid of Wood, but, observed the learned counsel, "he has not. Wood is here and will be examined." Mr. Beerbohm Tree acted with the most perfect propriety in handing to Wilde a letter which had been addressed to the theatre. He was anxious this should be understood, because he was told Mr. Tree had already cabled from America. Sir E. Clarke agreed with him there was not the slightest reflection upon Mr. Tree.

Mr. Justice Collins: He acted with the most perfect propriety.

Mr. Carson resumed his address with a reference to plaintiff's correspondence with Lord A. Douglas—"My own dear boy.—Your red rose-leaved lips were made for the music of song no less than for the madness of kissing. Your slim, gilt soul walks between passion and poetry. Hyacinthus, whom Apollo loved so madly, was you in Greek days." "Beautiful!" exclaimed the learned counsel; "an abominable piece of disgusting immorality." His second letter, addressed from the Savoy Hotel, suggested the same thoughts. He (Mr. Carson) was not there to suggest that anything took place between this young man and Wilde, but he was there to say that Wilde had conceived a vile, abominable passion for Lord Alfred Douglas, who was in a dangerous position, for he had become so dominated by Wilde that he even threatened to shoot his own father.

Mr. Carson was continuing his address at 4.30, when the court again adjourned.

Lord Queensberry was again admitted to bail.

PROCEEDINGS AT BOW-STREET POLICE-COURT.

TAYLOR PLACED IN THE DOCK.

STARTLING EVIDENCE AGAINST THE MEN.

PRISONERS REMANDED IN CUSTODY.

MAGISTRATE REFUSES BAIL.

The doors of Bow-street Police-court were besieged at an early hour on Saturday morning, it being known that Oscar Wilde, who had been arrested on Friday night on a warrant, granted shortly after the termination of the Wilde-Queensberry case, would be placed in the dock. A few minutes before ten o'clock the doors were opened, but only representatives of the press were admitted. They quickly seized upon all available accommodation. After a few minutes' delay, it was decided that the case should be taken in the extradition court upstairs. Thereupon there was a wild rush for this part of the building on the part of the public, who had by this time got within the gates. The small court was thronged to its fullest capacity by an assemblage of well-dressed men. Only one woman was present, and, seated immediately behind the dock, was the object of a great deal of curious and audible speculation. Mr. C. F. Gill, who in the libel action acted as junior to Mr. Carson, Q.C., in defending the Marquess of Queensberry, entered at eleven o'clock. A moment later Sir Augustus Harris appeared, followed by several gentlemen, understood to be connected with the drama. Sir John Bridge took his seat at five minutes past eleven. Simultaneously, the door of the passage leading from the cells was thrown open and the prisoner was seen approaching, carrying a silk hat in his hand. He advanced with an easy and even a stately step. He was wearing the overcoat which he wore at the Old Bailey, with heavy velvet collar and cuffs. Having reached the centre of the dock, Wilde calmly deposited his hat upon the seat at his side, bowed slightly to Sir John, then, crossing his arms over the rails, he bent slightly forward and listened attentively to the opening sentences which fell from Mr. Gill.

Mr. C. F. Gill, raising immediately the prisoner was placed in the dock, said he appeared to prosecute the prisoner on a series of charges of inciting lads to commit a terrible crime and of actually committing acts of gross indecency, offences under the eleventh section of the Criminal Law Amendment Act. With regard to the nature of the case, he did not think it desirable that he should trouble the court with an opening statement of detail. No good purpose would be served by going into this matter in an opening speech, and he would indicate to the court generally what had occurred and the evidence he proposed to adduce. The nature of the charges upon which he should ask for the prisoner to be ultimately committed for trial would depend upon the evidence disclosed. The case which he proposed to go into in the first instance related to the conduct of the prisoner with regard to a young man named Charles Parker. It would appear that in 1893 the prisoner Wilde was staying at the Savoy Hotel. He stayed there from the 2nd of March down to the 29th of March. At the same time there was living at Little College-street, Westminster, in the upper part of a house, a man named Taylor. He was a man closely connected with the prisoner Wilde, and the evidence would show that he was engaged in acting for Wilde in procuring for Wilde young men with whom he should afterwards commit acts of gross indecency. The prisoner would

be charged with conspiring with this man for the purpose of procuring these lads for the commission of acts of indecency. Prisoner was in the habit of visiting this man, Taylor, at Little College-street, and in the course of the case there would be evidence as to the condition of these things at these addresses. This man occupied rooms, where Wilde was in the habit of going. He would shortly state the way in which this young man, Parker, was approached. He was a servant out of a place, and had been in the employment of a gentleman as a valet. When in the company of his brother, William Parker, a groom, on the day ending February or the beginning of March, 1893, in St. James's Restaurant, they were approached by Taylor, who accosted them and offered them a drink. He took their addresses and invited them to his place in Little College-street. Having got them there, he spoke to them, and said that he would arrange to introduce them to Oscar Wilde. There were two or three interviews between Taylor and these lads at this time, Wilde being in communication by telegram with Taylor. Wilde was at this time—in March—staying at the Savoy Hotel, and these lads were informed that an introduction to Wilde had been arranged to take place at a dinner which they were to come to. Accordingly, Charles Parker and his brother went to Kettner's Restaurant. There they met Taylor. They were taken to a private room, where there was a table laid for dinner for four people. In a little while Wilde arrived at the place, and then the lads were entertained at a sumptuous dinner provided by Wilde. At the close of the dinner Wilde announced to Taylor that Charles Parker was the boy for him, and on making that statement he turned and asked the boy whether he would come with him. He consented to go with him. Leaving Taylor and Parker's brother, Wilde drove to the Savoy Hotel with Charles Parker. This was on the 13th or 14th of March. They went to a sitting-room, which opened into a bedroom. In the sitting-room Wilde plied the lad with drink, and then took him into the bedroom. He kept him there two hours, and then gave him two sovereigns, and sent him away, telling him to come again that day week. The boy did so. Afterwards Wilde invited Parker to meet him at St. James's-place several times. Here prisoner had rooms. After leaving St. James's-place, prisoner would take Parker to Kettner's or the Solferino Restaurant, afterwards to the Pavilion, or some other music-hall. Camera-square and Park-walk were other places where these acts were committed, and at the latter address the attention of people was attracted to prisoner's visits. Unfortunately, it would be necessary to put into the witness-box this youth, Parker, although he had now returned to a respectable mode of life. The character of the house at Little College-street would also be proved, although naturally the police had had great difficulty in proving this horrible business. Counsel next dealt with that part of the case which the prosecution proposed to prove in respect to prisoner's conduct with boys at the Savoy Hotel, the proprietors of which refrained from proceedings in order to avoid a scandal. This case, concluded Mr. Gill, was of vast importance to the public. There was only one end to a life of this kind, and that was being brought to justice.

PARKER IN THE BOX.

Charles Parker was then called, and as he entered the witness-box the prisoner, who, by this time was seated and supporting his head on his gloved hand, looked steadily for a moment at the youth. Parker is a good-looking, well set up young man of nineteen years. He was smartly dressed, having a full depth of white collar and a light velvet cuffed overcoat approximating somewhat to the Newmarket cut. Answering Mr. Gill, he said he was formerly a valet. In 1893 he was out of employment. When visiting St. James's Restaurant he was spoken to by a man named Alfred Taylor.

*Mr. C. O. Humphreys, solicitor, who defends the prisoner, at this stage interposed with an objection to the putting of any leading questions.

Witness was continuing his replies to Mr. Gill as to what conversation he had with Alfred Taylor on this particular occasion, when the learned counsel startled the court by the sudden intimation that Taylor had been arrested, and he would postpone further examination of Parker pending Taylor's arrival in the dock.

Mr. C. O. Humphreys: May I ask you, Sir John, how long you propose to sit to-day? I have important engagements, and it is a serious matter to me personally.

Sir John Bridge: I propose to sit with reason as long as we have witnesses to go on with.

TAYLOR PLACED IN THE DOCK.

At this juncture Detective-inspector Marshall announced "Alfred Taylor," and in obedience to the call a young man of similar build and address to Parker stepped briskly into the dock and took his stand on Wilde's left.

Parker, replying to Mr. Gill, said he now identified Taylor as the man who conversed with him in St. James's Restaurant, and subsequently introduced him to Wilde. On the occasion referred to Taylor said Wilde was a good man, and gave him an address in Little College-street. He was there introduced to Wilde in company with his brother, William Parker. Witness went on to say that Taylor gave them the little College-street address, so that he and his brother might call there. They did so. When they got into the place they saw Taylor's rooms. He had a drawing-room, bedroom, and kind of kitchen place. One of the rooms, the drawing-room, was very well furnished.

Sir J. Bridge: Did you go by appointment?—Witness: Yes, sir.

Continuing, in reply to Mr. Gill, witness said he did not notice the windows of the room. It was in the morning that he called. Witness did not see any servant. He did not think the rooms were lighted. He was sure that they were not. He saw Taylor there. No one else was present.

What did Taylor say?

Witness: I forget now.

Mr. Gill pressed the question.

Witness then said that Taylor stated that he had arranged for him and his brother to be introduced to Mr. Wilde. He thought Kettner's or the Solferino was the place at which the introduction was to take place. The introduction was to take place at dinner, at half-past seven in the evening.

Sir John Bridge: What is Kettner's?

Mr. Gill: A restaurant. They are both restaurants.

Witness, further answering Mr. Gill, said that after this conversation they all three came out of the house together. That evening he and his brother went to the restaurant, and they proceeded upstairs to a private dining-room. Before going there they had met Taylor at the St. James's bar, and they all three went to the restaurant together. Dinner was laid for four in a private room. The table was lighted with candles with red shades. Witness and his brother and Taylor waited for Wilde in this room. The latter then came in. Witness had never seen Wilde before. Taylor introduced them to him, saying, "This is Mr. Charles Parker, and this is Mr. William Parker." They then had dinner together.

Was it a good dinner?—Yes; very good. (A laugh.)

What wine?—Champagne.

Anything besides—after dinner?—Yes, coffee and brandy.

Did you smoke?—Yes.

What?—Cigarettes.

Did you see who paid for the dinner?—Wilde wrote out a cheque.

Witness, answering further questions, said that after dinner Wilde said: "This is the boy for me. Will you come to the Savoy Hotel with me?" They went together in a hansom to the Savoy Hotel, arriving there about ten

PROCEEDINGS AT BOW-STREET POLICE-COURT.

TAYLOR PLACED IN THE DOCK.

STARTLING EVIDENCE AGAINST THE MEN.

PRISONERS REMANDED IN CUSTODY.

MAGISTRATE REFUSES BAIL.

The doors of Bow-street Police-court were besieged at an early hour on Saturday morning, it being known that Oscar Wilde, who had been arrested on Friday night on a warrant, granted shortly after the termination of the Wilde-Queensberry case, would be placed in the dock. A few minutes before ten o'clock the doors were opened, but only representatives of the press were admitted. They quickly seized upon all available accommodation. After a few minutes' delay, it was decided that the case should be taken in the extradition court upstairs. Thereupon there was a wild rush for this part of the building on the part of the public, who had by this time got within the gates. The small court was thronged to its fullest capacity by an assemblage of well-dressed men. Only one woman was present, and, seated immediately behind the dock, was the object of a great deal of curious and audible speculation. Mr. C. F. Gill, who in the libel action acted as junior to Mr. Carson, Q.C., in defending the Marquess of Queensberry, entered at eleven o'clock. A moment later Sir Augustus Harris appeared, followed by several gentlemen, understood to be connected with the drama. Sir John Bridge took his seat at five minutes past eleven. Simultaneously, the door of the passage leading from the cells was thrown open and the prisoner was seen approaching, carrying a silk hat in his hand. He advanced with an easy and even a stately step. He was wearing the overcoat which he wore at the Old Bailey, with heavy velvet collar and cuffs. Having reached the centre of the dock, Wilde calmly deposited his hat upon the seat at his side, bowed slightly to Sir John, then, crossing his arms over the rails, he bent slightly forward and listened attentively to the opening sentences which fell from Mr. Gill.

Mr. C. F. Gill, rising immediately the prisoner was placed in the dock, said he appeared to prosecute the prisoner on a series of charges of inciting lads to commit a terrible crime and of actually committing acts of gross indecency, offences under the eleventh section of the Criminal Law Amendment Act. With regard to the nature of the case, he did not think it desirable that he should trouble the court with an opening statement of detail. No good purpose would be served by going into this matter in an opening speech, and he would indicate to the court generally what had occurred and the evidence he proposed to adduce. The nature of the charges upon which he should ask for the prisoner to be ultimately committed for trial would depend upon the evidence disclosed. The case which he proposed to go into in the first instance related to the conduct of the prisoner with regard to a young man named Charles Parker. It would appear that in 1893 the prisoner Wilde was staying at the Savoy Hotel. He stayed there from the 2nd of March down to the 29th of March. At the same time there was living at Little College-street, Westminster, in the upper part of a house, a man named Taylor. He was a man closely connected with the prisoner Wilde, and the evidence would show that he was engaged in acting for Wilde in procuring for Wilde young men with whom he should afterwards commit acts of gross indecency. The prisoner would

be charged with conspiring with this man for the purpose of procuring these lads for the commission of acts of indecency. Prisoner was in the habit of visiting this man, Taylor, at Little College-street, and in the course of the case there would be evidence as to the condition of these things at these addresses. This man occupied rooms, where Wilde was in the habit of going. He would shortly state the way in which this young man, Parker, was approached. He was a servant out of a place, and had been in the employment of a gentleman as a valet. When in the company of his brother, William Parker, a groom, on the day ending February or the beginning of March, 1893, in St. James's Restaurant, they were approached by Taylor, who accosted them and offered them a drink. He took their addresses and invited them to his place in Little College-street. Having got them there, he spoke to them, and said that he would arrange to introduce them to Oscar Wilde. There were two or three interviews between Taylor and these lads at this time, Wilde being in communication by telegram with Taylor. Wilde was at this time—in March—staying at the Savoy Hotel, and these lads were informed that an introduction to Wilde had been arranged to take place at a dinner which they were to come to. Accordingly, Charles Parker and his brother went to Kettner's Restaurant. There they met Taylor. They were taken to a private room, where there was a table laid for dinner for four people. In a little while Wilde arrived at the place, and then the lads were entertained at a sumptuous dinner provided by Wilde. At the close of the dinner Wilde announced to Taylor that Charles Parker was the boy for him, and on making that statement he turned and asked the boy whether he would come with him. He consented to go with him. Leaving Taylor and Parker's brother, Wilde drove to the Savoy Hotel with Charles Parker. This was on the 13th or 14th of March. They went to a sitting-room, which opened into a bedroom. In the sitting-room Wilde plied the lad with drink, and then took him into the bedroom. He kept him there two hours, and then gave him two sovereigns, and sent him away, telling him to come again that day week. The boy did so. Afterwards Wilde invited Parker to meet him at St. James's-place several times. Here prisoner had rooms. After leaving St. James's-place, prisoner would take Parker to Kettner's or the Solferino Restaurant, afterwards to the Pavilion, or some other music-hall. Camera-square and Park-walk were other places where these acts were committed, and at the latter address the attention of people was attracted to prisoner's visits. Unfortunately, it would be necessary to put into the witness-box this youth, Parker, although he had now returned to a respectable mode of life. The character of the house at Little College-street would also be proved, although naturally the police had had great difficulty in proving this horrible business. Counsel next dealt with that part of the case which the prosecution proposed to prove in respect to prisoner's conduct with boys at the Savoy Hotel, the proprietors of which refrained from proceedings in order to avoid a scandal. This case, concluded Mr. Gill, was of vast importance to the public. There was only one end to a life of this kind, and that was being brought to justice.

PARKER IN THE BOX.

Charles Parker was then called, and as he entered the witness-box the prisoner, who, by this time was seated and supporting his head on his gloved hand, looked steadily for a moment at the youth. Parker is a good-looking, well set up young man of nineteen years. He was smartly dressed, having a full depth of white collar and a light velvet cuffed overcoat approximating somewhat to the Newmarket cut. Answering Mr. Gill, he said he was formerly a valet. In Jissen Women's University Library. When visiting St. James's Restaurant he was spoken to by a man named Alfred Taylor.

* Mr. C. O. Humphreys, solicitor, who defends the prisoner, at this stage interposed with an objection to the putting of any leading questions.

Witness was continuing his replies to Mr. Gill as to what conversation he had with Alfred Taylor on this particular occasion, when the learned counsel startled the court by the sudden intimation that Taylor had been arrested, and he would postpone further examination of Parker pending Taylor's arrival in the dock.

Mr. C. O. Humphreys: May I ask you, Sir John, how long you propose to sit to-day? I have important engagements, and it is a serious matter to me personally.

Sir John Bridge: I propose to sit within reason as long as we have witnesses to go on with.

TAYLOR PLACED IN THE DOCK.

At this juncture Detective-inspector Marshall announced "Alfred Taylor," and in obedience to the call a young man of similar build and address to Parker stepped briskly into the dock and took his stand on Wilde's left.

Parker, replying to Mr. Gill, said he now identified Taylor as the man who conversed with him in St. James's Restaurant, and subsequently introduced him to Wilde. On the occasion referred to Taylor said Wilde was a good man, and gave him an address in Little College-street. He was there introduced to Wilde in company with his brother, William Parker. Witness went on to say that Taylor gave them the little College-street address, so that he and his brother might call there. They did so. When they got into the place they saw Taylor's rooms. He had a drawing-room, bedroom, and kind of kitchen place. One of the rooms, the drawing-room, was very well furnished.

Sir J. Bridge: Did you go by appointment?—Witness: Yes, sir.

Continuing, in reply to Mr. Gill, witness said he did not notice the windows of the room. It was in the morning that he called. Witness did not see any servant. He did not think the rooms were lighted. He was sure that they were not. He saw Taylor there. No one else was present.

What did Taylor say?

Witness: I forget now.

Mr. Gill pressed the question.

Witness then said that Taylor stated that he had arranged for him and his brother to be introduced to Mr. Wilde. He thought Kettner's or the Solferino was the place at which the introduction was to take place. The introduction was to take place at dinner, at half-past seven in the evening.

Sir John Bridge: What is Kettner's?

Mr. Gill: A restaurant. They are both restaurants.

Witness, further answering Mr. Gill, said that after this conversation they all three came out of the house together. That evening he and his brother went to the restaurant, and they proceeded upstairs to a private dining-room. Before going there they had met Taylor at the St. James's bar, and they all three went to the restaurant together. Dinner was laid for four in a private room. The table was lighted with candles with red shades. Witness and his brother and Taylor waited for Wilde in this room. The latter then came in. Witness had never seen Wilde before. Taylor introduced them to him, saying, "This is Mr. Charles Parker, and this is Mr. William Parker." They then had dinner together.

Was it a good dinner?—Yes; very good. (A laugh.)

What wine?—Champagne.

Anything besides—after dinner?—Yes, coffee and brandy.

Did you smoke?—Yes.

What?—Cigarettes.

Did you see who paid for the dinner?—Wilde wrote out a cheque.

Witness, answering further questions, said that after dinner Wilde said: "This is the boy for me. Will you come to the Savoy Hotel with me?" They went together in a hansom to the Savoy Hotel, arriving there about ten

o'clock. They proceeded to the second or third floor and went to a sitting-room. No one was there but witness and Wilde, who ordered whisky and soda, and two were brought. After the waiter had gone Wilde said, "Come into my bedroom." There was a door leading into a bedroom. They both went into the bedroom. After they had been there two hours, witness left, Wilde giving him £2, and telling him to call again there in a week at eleven o'clock at night. Witness did so, and similar misconduct took place. Prisoner and witness supped together on chicken and champagne. They were alone, and witness stayed at the hotel on this occasion about an hour and a half. Wilde gave him £3 on leaving, and told him to buy some clothes. After that he saw Wilde from time to time. Wilde gave him besides money a silver cigarette case and a gold ring. He also went to Wilde's address in St. James's-place, which he first visited between four and five o'clock one afternoon. Criminal acts took place. He went there very often, and at one time he visited Wilde's rooms nearly every day. Once he accompanied Wilde to the Crystal Palace, and on another occasion they had a box at the Pavilion Music-hall. Witness took one room at Park-walk (near Wilde's house, at Tite-street, Chelsea), and Wilde visited him there once, but nothing took place. There was a little unpleasantness with the landlady, and witness left. At one time he stayed in Camera-square, which is in the same vicinity. He also visited Wilde at the Albemarle. Eight or nine months ago Wilde was driving near Trafalgar-square in a hansom. On seeing witness, he pulled up, and said, "How are you? You are looking as pretty as ever." (Laughter.) Parker uttered these words with some hesitancy, and blushed deeply.

As the examination of this witness had proceeded Wilde moved restlessly about the corner of the dock in which he had seated himself, and occasionally passed his hands across his face in a way indicative of distress of mind. Parker resumed by saying he was arrested with Taylor last year in a raid at Fitzroy-street, Fitzroy-square, and since then he had given up his evil companionship. He did not see a woman's dress at Little College-street.

Mr. C. O. Humphreys here announced that he had instructed counsel for the defence, and Mr. Travers Humphreys, who was with Sir Edward Clarke and Mr. Mathews at the Old Bailey, now entered the court, and took his seat at the barristers' table.

Mr. Travers Humphreys applied that his cross-examination of witness might be received. They had been taken quite by surprise in this matter.

Mr. Gill said he did not desire to bring the witness there again.

Mr. Travers Humphreys said he would give his friend notice if he wished to cross-examine him at any adjourned hearing.

The application was granted.

The evidence having been read over and signed, he was bound over to give evidence at the sessions at the Central Criminal Court.

The court then adjourned the gossip in court was that Sir Edward Clarke had written to Wilde's solicitor expressing his willingness to defend the prisoner without fee. On inquiry, this statement proved to be well-founded.

On the court resuming, William Parker, a brother of the former witness, and strongly resembling him, was called. He deposed to being formerly a groom. In March, 1893, he, like his brother, was out of employment. He met Taylor at St. James's Restaurant under the circumstances already described by his brother, Charles Taylor, to introduce him to Oscar Wilde, "who was a gentleman and a good man for money." The witness was being further questioned, but complained of feeling unwell. The usher thereupon accommodated him with a seat. Parker, whose face was suffused with a death-like paleness, said, faintly, that Taylor suggested the introduction to Wilde, so that he and his brother might act as women of a certain class. He and his brother met Taylor and went to a restaurant, where in a private room they were introduced to Wilde. Taylor and Wilde were drunk. After good dinner, and champagne with the remainder Wilde turned to Charles and remarked, "This is the boy for me. Are you

coming to the Savoy." They went away together. That was the only time he ever saw Wilde. Subsequently witness received a communication from his brother, but he did not meet prisoner again.

Mr. Travers Humphreys did not cross-examine this witness on behalf of Wilde, but put a question as to the time at which the introduction to Taylor took place. It was in March, 1893.

Sir John Bridge (to Taylor): Do you wish to put any questions?
Taylor: No; I won't say anything at present.

Mr. Gill intimated that this was as far as he would go that day in this class of evidence against Wilde, but he would call a witness against the prisoner Alfred Taylor.

The next witness was Mrs. Grant, a middle-aged, rather good-looking woman, dressed in black. She said she was the wife of William Grant, and lived at 13, Little College-street. The prisoner, Taylor, occupied rooms there for a year and eight months, beginning in 1892 and ending in 1893. The rooms he occupied consisted of a sitting-room, bedroom, bath-room, and kitchen, for which he paid £3 a month. The apartments were furnished very nicely. The linen in the bedroom was very good. The windows of the room were very dark, especially the sitting-room, there being muslin strained over the glass, lace curtains, and dark curtains. There was no daylight. The sitting-room was lit by candles.

Was there anything peculiar about the bed?—There was no bedstead. There was a full-size spring mattress on the floor. Did he furnish the place himself?—Yes. Witness continued that Taylor kept no servant. He did his own cooking. He was visited by a great many gentlemen—young gentlemen. Witness was always given to understand that Taylor was a bachelor.

Sir John Bridge: You saw no woman there?
Witness: Oh, no.
Mr. Gill: What were the ages of the young gentlemen who called?—Witness: From sixteen upwards. (Sensation.)

Answering the questions by Mr. Gill, witness said that she had seen ladies' wigs and things for fancy dress about the rooms—stockings and shoes, and things of that kind. Mr. Taylor was very fond of scent. He used to burn it and use it also. He had a large number of scent bottles.

Have you seen his nightdress?—Witness: His nightshirt.
How was it fastened?—With a gold brooch or pin.

Further questioned, witness said that she could not identify Wilde as one whom she had seen at the house.

The Magistrate (to Wilde): Stand up. (Prisoner Wilde rose.)
Witness: I cannot identify him.

Answering the questions, she said she had heard Taylor call some one who was there "Oscar." In one January, 1893, a young man named Woods was staying about three weeks, and he had seen a boy named Sidney Mavor who had slept all night with Taylor. A boy named Charley Mason had slept there. The gentlemen who came to tea came from four to six o'clock. Witness had seen Taylor sewing on buttons. (Laughter.) He decorated the rooms. He and Woods used to go out together. There were others who stayed there all the night besides the names she had given. Letters and telegrams used to arrive for Taylor. Shortly before Taylor left a sergeant of police came to the house as a friend of Mr. Taylor's, and placed himself in such a position that he could hear Taylor's voice. Witness knew that the house was watched. Witness had heard Taylor calling young men "Charley, dear." Taylor never told her what his occupation was.

Sir J. Bridge: Was there nothing to show what business he followed?—He said he was a gentleman.
Sir J. Bridge: Taylor, do you wish to ask any questions of the witness?
Taylor: Not at present, sir.

Sir J. Bridge (to witness): Did you ever see the person called "Oscar"?
Witness: No.

Mrs. Grant was then bound over to give evidence, if necessary, at the Central Criminal Court.

Alfred Woods, a slim, fair-looking youth, next called, deposed he was formerly a clerk, and he knew Mr. Alfred Taylor. In January, 1893, he was staying with Taylor at 13, Little College-street. At that time he had been out of employment about a week. Taylor had no legitimate occupation. He knew Oscar Wilde, whose acquaintance he made at the Cafe Royal in January, 1893, about three months before witness went to America. He was alone at the time he met Wilde. They went to the Cafe Florence, in Rupert-street, and had supper together in a private room. On leaving the Cafe Florence Wilde took him to his house, in Times-street, Chelsea. Wilde's family were away at Torquay. He and Wilde went to bed.

Mr. Travers Humphreys objected to leading questions.
Mr. Gill: I wish to save your client by not going much into details.

Resuming his evidence, Woods said he was under the influence of drink, as he not only had taken champagne with his supper, but had also had whisky, brandy, and, at Wilde's house, hock and seltzer. Wilde gave him £3 before leaving the Cafe Florence. He again went to Times-street, at prisoner's request, and had supper. There was no servant there, and Wilde went into the pantry for the food. They did not repeat the same acts on that occasion. He once met Wilde at Taylor's rooms, in Little College-street. He had lunched and dined at the Cafe Florence with Wilde on two occasions. He had also seen Wilde at tea at 36, Langham-street, where witness had a bed and sitting-room. No impropriety took place. Witness afterwards took rooms at 4, Great Russell-street, but he could not remember whether Wilde visited him there. Witness occupied the rooms in Great Russell-street until his departure for America. Wilde gave him £3 or £4 on several occasions, also a watch and chain. About this time he expressed a wish to get away from "Wilde and these people."

Mr. Gill: Let us deal with the case from the point of view of Wilde alone, but I believe there were one or two other people who came to these tea parties?—Yes.

One or two who are out of the country at the present time, I think?—Yes.

Resuming, witness told Taylor he wished to go to America, and Taylor communicated this to Wilde. There was a meeting in Little College-street, at which witness agreed to hand over certain letters to Wilde. After the letters had been given up Wilde gave him two £10 notes and two £5 notes. Next day they lunched at the Cafe Florence, where Wilde gave him another £5. Witness then left for the United States, where he remained fourteen months.

Sir John Bridge: Was it in consequence of something that was said to you that you went to the Cafe Royal?—Yes. I had received a telegram from a gentleman who had met me at Taylor's, or that you had heard of Taylor's?—Yes.

Mr. Gill: Was that the first time you saw Wilde—that time at the Cafe Royal?—Yes. Sidney Arthur Mavor, a young man of good appearance, said that he first knew Taylor in Little College-street, where witness visited him. He had stayed with him there. At that time witness had no occupation. Occasionally he went there to tea parties, and met several men. Witness first met Oscar Wilde at Kettner's Restaurant, he thought, in September, 1892. Witness on that occasion was with Taylor and Leila Alfred Douglas. They dined there, but witness did not know who paid for the dinner. He did not know what Taylor's occupation was. A week or two after he met Wilde the latter sent him a silver cigarette case. In October of that year he met Wilde at the Albemarle, this being their second meeting. They had supper together alone in a private sitting-room. There was a bedroom off the sitting-room, and witness found that Wilde had taken a bedroom for him at the hotel. This bedroom of witness's opened off Wilde's bedroom. They had wine for supper.

What took place between you that night?—Nothing.
Where did you pass the night?—In my bedroom.

Why did you sleep there that night?—Because I stayed there very late, and it was a long way for me to go home to Notting Hill.

Sir J. Bridge: Was the bed taken when you got there?—Yes.
Mr. Gill: And you went to stay all night with a man you had only seen once. Did he pay for you?—He paid the bill.

Further examined, witness said he left the next morning. He thought Wilde was staying in town. He didn't know that Wilde took these rooms for one night only. Witness had stayed at Taylor's and slept with Taylor, perhaps, three times. Taylor's sitting-room sometimes smelt of incense. He had not seen it lit artificially in the daytime. At the time he stayed with Taylor witness was out of employment. Witness had seen Wilde at this room. He used to call him "Oscar," and Wilde called him "Sidney."

Sir J. Bridge: Did Wilde ever give you any money?—Witness: Never.

M. Anton Migge deposed that the Savoy Hotel was one of the hotels in which he pursued his vocation as a masseur. In March, 1893, Oscar Wilde was staying at the Savoy Hotel. He went to massage Wilde from the 16th to the 20th of March at ten o'clock in the morning. One morning witness went into Wilde's room for massage and there saw a young man in prisoner's bed. He must have been from sixteen to eighteen years of age. Wilde was at the time dressing himself, and he said to witness, "I feel much better. I have no time to have the treatment this morning. I am very busy."

Did you ever massage Wilde after that?—No.