

FROM HIS STANDPOINT

WISCHNEWETZKY'S TESTIMONY ABOUT HIS DOMESTIC TROUBLES.

He Says That His Wife Hung the Charges on Economy—He Did Display Temper When She Talked English to the Children and One Quarrel Began Over a Stew for Dinner—Thaddeus B. Wakeman, Secretary of the Doctors' Institute, on the Stand—Other Witnesses Testify.

"It was economy, economy most of the time. Mme. Wischnewetzky's continual solicitude concerning the payment of our debts was extremely distressing to me," said Dr. Lazaro Wischnewetzky, the Russian son-in-law of the late William D. Kelley, yesterday afternoon when he took the stand to give his version of the domestic troubles that ended in Mme. Wischnewetzky's coming to Chicago with her three children to make her way in the world for herself and for the sake of the three little ones.

Judge Baker's court was engaged all day yesterday hearing the evidence in the habeas corpus proceedings which the Russian doctor has begun to secure the custody of his three children. In the morning Mrs. Wischnewetzky resumed the stand for cross-examination, but her story of cruelty remained practically unshaken in spite of the long series of cross-questions directed against her by the doctor's attorneys. She maintained that her literary ability, combined with the able ideas of sociology contributed by her husband, had furnished their means of support during their unromantic courtship and marriage in Switzerland. Afterwards the assistance gained from her father's estate, together with the business ability in borrowing money from friends, formed the family's income while the doctor was establishing his institute at Fifth avenue and Twenty-eighth street in New York.

Influenced Her to Return.

Thaddeus B. Wakeman, a New York lawyer and the Secretary of Dr. Wischnewetzky's institute, said that the institute was being rapidly established on a firm financial basis and would soon pay a good income. He had known the family a number of years. He told how Mrs. Wischnewetzky came to him after the family quarrel of Jan. 9, 1891, and showed him her blackened face and asked his advice concerning a separation. He influenced her to go back to her husband, advice which she accepted, and never afterward did he know of domestic troubles until, to his surprise, he found Mrs. Wischnewetzky had suddenly left with her three children for Chicago. The witness testified that the fate of the institute depended upon whether or not the doctor regained possession of his children, as he was entirely wrapped up in his love for them and their welfare. He described the doctor as a nervous, demonstrative man, insistent upon his views and opinions, but ready to take advice when the first burst of his passion had subsided. He told how he had come to Chicago in the interest of the doctor and had tried to persuade Mrs. Wischnewetzky to return, a proposal which she flatly refused to consider. Then he attempted to influence her to allow the children to see their father, but again was unsuccessful. His view of the whole case was that if Mrs. Wischnewetzky did not return the three children the institute was doomed. He also stated, as a side issue, that his interest in the institute was mostly in the creditors' behalf, and he was also pecuniarily interested in it himself. His motive in the habeas corpus case, he said, was to adjust the difficulty between the doctor and his wife.

Quarreled Over a Russian Stew.

Dr. Wischnewetzky was then called to the stand. He gave his version of the troubles existing between his wife and himself. After about five years of ideal married life the trouble began. He denied that he had ever used vile and abusive language to her, or had heaped other indignities upon her. He also swore that he had never struck her intentionally. He admitted that he became enraged when his wife conversed with the children and the servants in English. He disliked to hear the English language, he said, when he was tired. The quarrel of Jan. 9, 1891, he claimed, grew out of his wife's failure to provide one of the ingredients of a Russian stew. In the quarrel, according to his version of the case, he acted as the peacemaker and his wife was the assailant. He admitted that he made use of vile terms, but he claimed he did not apply them directly to her. He then told a pathetic story of his grief when he learned his wife had suddenly left home with the children.

He will resume the stand for cross-examination at 9:30 o'clock this morning.