

The San Francisco Call

THURSDAY, APRIL 29, 1897

CHARLES M. SHORTRIDGE, Editor and Proprietor.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—Postage Free: Daily and Sunday Call, one year, by carrier, \$0.15...

BUSINESS OFFICE: 714 Market Street, San Francisco, California.

EDITORIAL ROOMS: 517 Clay Street, Telephone Main-1874

BRANCH OFFICES: 527 Montgomery Street, corner 1st; open until 9:30 o'clock.

OAKLAND OFFICE: 918 Broadway, Oakland, California.

EASTERN OFFICE: Rooms 31 and 32, 100 Broadway, New York City.

THE CALL SPEAKS FOR ALL.

McKinley is a good holiday speaker. He cuts it short.

A park in the Mission is one of the things that come high but we must have.

The European concert will never be called upon to repeat its performance by request.

Eastern investors in mining stock will take notice that there has been no slump in the California output.

Now that the New York demonstration over Philadelphia invites attention to her monument to Washington.

The Greeks have yet a fighting chance, as well as a chance to fight, provided they seek it at the front instead of at Athens.

The tariff topic is dull, but all the same nearly every Californian has some interest in it and had better keep watching it.

King Humbert will have to face the mob as King George faced the attempt of the assassin. It is "an incident of the trade."

There will be more glory for our wheelmen in completing the plan necessary to construct Baboas avenue than in making forty centuries.

Our carnival is ahead of that of Los Angeles, for hers is now behind the times, while ours is still to the front and vanishing in the distance.

It is just as well to remember that Beatrice Harraden's California story is avowedly a work of fiction. She was not writing a guidebook.

The Athenian mob is not the Greek people by any means, and Attic fables may be more than counterbalanced at this juncture by Spartan resolution.

Let us get Belmont avenue completed and then we can go forward to other things, and have a good and broad road on which to recreate ourselves as we go.

The reports of the California mines for 1896 show an increase of gold and a decrease of silver in the output, so we are right in it with the demand of the age.

It is now feared at Washington that the Democrats may prove obstinate after all when the tariff bill comes up in the Senate. The only way to be sure that a donkey won't kick is to kill him.

The Napa Daily Journal gravely informs its readers that the north wind raised three cents in San Francisco recently. That's nothing, for the north wind here raises other things besides wheat.

The floods in the Mississippi are becoming more and more serious, and the danger here has not yet passed. It would be better for the people to get out of the arid districts and irrigate as they need it.

According to reports from New York the wind on Grant day was full of pneumonia, and many a man who took part in the parade and marched bare headed past the monument may yet prove to have literally followed Grant to the tomb.

According to the Riverside Press there are now en route from Mediterranean ports for the Atlantic Coast cities 275,000 boxes of lemons. What a fine large basin of lemonade those tired Greek soldiers would have if the ship should sink.

Adlai Stevenson and a party of capitalists have started for Georgia to look at the gold fields in the mountains of that State, and if they wish a junket tour they are going to the right place; but when they get ready for business in gold-mining they had better come to California.

Politicians who take an interest in conundrums are trying to guess what the Populists will do when they assemble in the proposed convention at Nashville next July. It is believed that none but the middle-class-romanians will be present and this adds to the uncertainty of the result. There is nobody quite so likely to bolt as a Populist who starts out to stick to the road.

The Tulare Register observes that the pure food investigation made in San Francisco disclosed the fact that there is very little pure food to investigate. It is the opinion of a large and roving party of the community that there is very little food anywhere of any kind, but such as we have in San Francisco is pretty good, and what there is of it, and there is plenty of it as it is.

According to reports from Washington those people who thought that Justice Field would retire as soon as Cleveland was out of office are very much mistaken in the man. Field did not hold on simply to spite Cleveland. He likes the place and has an ambition to establish a record for length of service which no one will break. He will stay on the bench, it is believed, until he dies, and candidates for his seat will have to wait for a funeral.

The Oroville Mercury, in announcing the opening of a local creamery this week, declares that in order for it to succeed a preference must be given its product over any imported article. We should say that if the people of that section fail to show this preference the only way that the creamery can get even will be to send its superior product abroad. It will be themselves and not the creamery that the Orovilleans will injure by their failure to take advantage of the home production.

THE MISSION PARK MOVEMENT.

The movement for the establishment of a large park in the Mission has now advanced to a position where it may be fairly considered a practical issue of municipal politics. The promoters of the improvement have organized, have secured the co-operation of large bodies of influential citizens, have suggested a scheme for the proposed park, which merits popular favor, and, in short, have put their plans into such a shape as to compel immediate consideration.

That there should be a park of large extent in the Mission district of the City is a proposition which is not likely to be disputed by any well-informed person. The residents of that portion of the community ought to have within easy range a large pleasure ground for health and recreation. The time has gone by when one park was accounted sufficient for a large city. At the present stage of civilization park areas are regarded less as municipal ornaments than as matters of public necessity, and accordingly in all progressive cities new parks are being opened in all quarters so that the people of every section can derive the benefits to health and bodily vigor from them without being compelled to go great distances in order to reach them.

It is certain that if we are to have a park for the Mission we cannot begin too early to prepare for it. Land can be obtained more cheaply now than at any time in the future. At present there is an abundance of vacant land well located in the Mission and beautifully diversified for park purposes, the price of which is certainly as low now as it will ever be, and this therefore is the best time to arrange for its purchase and conversion to the proposed uses.

The organization which has undertaken to advance the enterprise has not yet, we believe, devised a plan for the purchase. That important question ought to be settled as speedily as possible. The sum required will be considerable, for the proposed park ought not to contain less than 600 acres, and 1000 acres would be better. To obtain so large a tract will require a large expenditure of purchase money, but the cost will not be greater than what such a park will be worth to the City, and any well-devised scheme for raising the money may be counted on to receive the cordial support of the press and the public generally.

An important feature of the movement in its present form is the proposal to make the park a great zoological garden, surpassing in extent the famed gardens of that kind in London and Paris. This scheme is ambitious and yet seems to have in it sufficient reasonableness to afford a foundation for the hopes of its promoters. It is certainly sufficiently attractive to give an added interest to the scheme for establishing the park and will no doubt do much to gain public favor for the enterprise.

Whatever may be the details adopted the plan in itself is a good one and we trust that a means may be found of accomplishing it within the near future. San Francisco is large enough to need two parks and is rich enough to afford them. The park in the Mission would be in many respects pleasanter even than Golden Gate, since it would be free from winds and fogs, and even if it were not laid out on such a costly scale it would still add much to the attractions of the City and to the health and enjoyment of its people.

THE CITRUS-GROWERS.

The citrus-growers of California have set a good example to men engaged in other industries in the State by the manner in which they are conducting their contest for a full and complete protection to their industry in the new tariff. They have formed a strong organization, outlining a clear plan of work and entrusted it to competent and energetic men. The chances of their success are therefore good, and even if they should fail they will have the satisfaction of knowing they have made a good fight and have done everything in their power to achieve as good a result as possible.

The tariff committee of the association has drawn up an elaborate argument in support of the claim for a duty of 1 cent per pound on all citrus fruits imported into this country and forwarded it to our representatives in Congress. They have not rested, however, with that, but have secured a collection of work and arguments in support of their claims, and accompanied it with a request that the citizens of California generally shall sign upon their respective petitions in Congress the importance of granting this protection to the citrus industry.

It would be difficult to give too much praise to the committee that drew up the arguments for the proposed increase of duties. It covers the subject in a clear and concise manner, and is single superfluous word. Every position is sustained by statistics of the most exact nature, and the showing is one that cannot be refuted in any particular. The press of California and all commercial and industrial bodies can well afford to increase their petitions, and make their arguments so cogently stated, and there can be no question that the desired support will be given.

It is to be regretted that all California industries requiring protection from the new tariff have not been as well supported and advocated. A list of the citrus-growers and an equal capacity for organization and an equal energy in the performance of work were shown in all the departments of our industry, California would have comparatively little to fear from the revision of the tariff by the Senate. The example of the citrus-growers is therefore worthy of being well considered by the people generally, and as it is not yet too late to act, all industries of California having claims to be presented during the tariff legislation should take steps at once to present them as effectively and as forcibly as have been the claims of the growers of citrus fruits.

SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY.

"If there is a doubting Thomas in the community," says the Visalia Delta, "who has taken a pessimistic view regarding the building of the great canal, the individual may now visit a point a short distance beyond the outskirts of Visalia and see a large number of men and teams busily employed in constructing the road-bed of said railway." One does not have to be a doubting Thomas to see that. In the effect of calling for the canal, the effect of calling for the canal is much money which otherwise would have been used in the development of South African properties. The good results of the past year, therefore, furnish a basis for expecting better results in the future, and the mining interests of the State have in every respect a bright outlook before them.

ALL FOR NO HNG

Sweet Mamie was a fair young thing, but her papa was a lecher. And when he heard the doorbell ring he softly said: "Who's there?" He got up and went to the door. He was getting rather hot by then. "Yes, papa, dear?" said Mamie. "Yes, when it comes to the door, he stayed on, just like the other men. And pale and wan grew Mamie. There came a voice from the door and she thought it was, 'hey me!' By and by she saw a man and she said good-by to Mamie. Now Mamie, as she went to bed (she went, though, all the same) she sobbed and sobbed, for she was dead—so mortified was Mamie. Then she saw a sign on the wall. Before she said her last word: 'I'll be right back, my dear!' And, oh, how mad she was!"

"THE TELEPHONE IN LAW."

A PRECEDENT MADE IN FERDINAND WARD'S TRIAL IN 1886. Communication in New York San Francisco. In regard to the admission of telephone messages as evidence, permit me to add to your article printed on Sunday, headed "The Telephone in Law."

had instructed him what to do with two checks—one for \$71,800 on the Marine National Bank, and one for \$770,000 on the First National Bank. He swore positively that Ward was the person with whom he had had the conversation. Benjamin F. Tracy and Bourke Cochran, witnesses for Ward, protested against this testimony, declaring that it was incompetent and unjust. Judge Barrett, trial judge, decided against Cochran, and admitted the telephone conversation as evidence. On the following day, October 27, Benjamin F. Tracy, brother of the preceding witness, swore he had been standing with his head within eighteen inches of the telephone at the time the witness in question had had the conversation with Ward, and that he had heard Ward's voice distinctly, and that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear. The law, however, for the defence declared that such a statement was inadmissible, and the prosecution showed a letter from the witness to the effect that he had heard the witness say to him, 'Come over the telephone without his brother had the receiver to hear.