

## ASTORIA

Infants and Children.  
The Kind You Have  
Always Bought

Keeps the  
Signature

of  
J. H. Fletcher

In Use  
For Over  
Thirty Years  
ASTORIA

THE CENTRAL COMPANY, NEW YORK CITY.

## la First

Western Prairie Provinces  
canvassed with the advantages of  
skatchewan.

Four years has averaged  
ushels each year, (many in-  
re).

Final purposes. Prairie land  
at from \$12 to \$15 per acre  
even regarding the Wapella

MYTE,  
Id. of Trade Immigration Co.  
Wapella, Sask.

## BIRTHS.

W.-At Cambridge, Mass., on the  
11th inst., to the wife of Mr. and  
Mrs. E. C. Law, printer, of Boston,  
boy.

LARD—In this city, June 24th, to the  
wife of Arthur E. Clare, a son, 2  
Rock street.

OTT—On June 24th, to Mr. and Mrs.  
Edward A. Hoyt, of 287 Rockland  
road, a son.

## MARRIAGES.

AGED-MARKS—At Moncton, on  
June 19th, at the residence of the  
bride's parents, by the Rev. D. Mc-  
Donald, D. W. Harrell Magee to Agnes  
Louise, daughter of John H. Marks,  
Nichol-Hamilton—On June 3rd,  
1907, at the residence of Rev. T. F.  
Potheringham, Robert H. Nichol, of  
this city to Frances E. Hamilton, of

## 123 ACRES \$1,800.

25 acres of this land is in rich tillage,  
sitting 50 tons of hay; 300 apple trees;  
sature for 15 cows, watered by never  
failing spring; abundance of wood and  
timber for home use, and some to sell.  
1-2 story house of eight rooms with  
baths, neatly painted, barn 42x46,  
apboarded walls and nice dry cellar,  
good shed and carriage house; abun-  
dant supply of pure well water; only  
1-2 miles from stores, school, etc.,  
near neighbors. The owner has other  
nearness and to make quick sale price  
reduced to only \$1,800. \$1,200 down  
by cash. See prospectus at Hammond  
street, Bangor, Maine. For pictures of  
list No. C-205, page 5. "Spitous"  
use 18c copy mailed free by E. A.  
Froust Co., Augusta, Maine.

## WHOLESALE LIQUORS

WM. L. WILLIAMS, Successor to M.  
J. Finn, Wholesale and Retail Wine  
and Spirit Merchant, 110 and 112 Prince  
William St. Established 1870. Write  
for family price list. 25-11-17

nd Mrs. Crocker will leave by the  
F. R. express for their honeymoon  
which will be spent in B-tion, New  
York, Washington and other Amer-  
ican cities.

The bride's travelling costume will be  
of navy blue tulle with old rose hat.  
The bride was the recipient of many  
very handsome and costly presents.  
Among the presents was a beautiful  
carved oak rocker from the bride's  
travelling class at the U. N. B., the  
diamond of '99. The groom's present to  
the bride was a handsome pearl and  
diamond pendant, while to the maid of  
honor he gave a hoop of pearls.

Among those present from outside  
points were Mrs. Christopher Crocker  
and Miss Mabel Crocker, of Millerton;  
Mr. and Mrs. Jack Miller, of New-  
castle, and Mrs. Harry Robertson, St.  
John.

REED - COLWELL.

The marriage took place at four  
o'clock yesterday afternoon, at Miss  
Lillian Colwell, youngest daughter of  
W. H. Colwell, to Rev. P. C. Reed, of  
Toledo, Ohio. The ceremony, which  
was performed by Rev. W. W. McMan-  
ster, took place at the home of the bride,  
110 Middle street. The bride was at-  
tired in a costume of white silk with  
embroidered trimmings. Miss Jeannette  
Brittain, of Annapolis, N. S., was  
bridesmaid.

Mr. and Mrs. Reed left last evening  
for a trip through Nova Scotia. They  
will go to Toledo in about a month,  
where they will reside.

## SURVIVOR OF C. P. R. WRECK TELLS OF O'CONNOR'S DEATH.

Moncton Man Escaped Injury, But Has Suffered a Great  
Shock—Italian Laborers on Strike—A Marriage  
in the Railway Town.

MONCTON, N. B., July 4.—After escap-  
ing death by the margin of an  
hour, Breaux McCreedy, his nerves  
partially shattered, has been ordered  
to his home in this city for a week's  
rest. He was in the recent C. P. R.  
wreck, near Butler, Ont., in which ten  
Chinese, Japanese and white men were  
killed and so fearful were the sights  
witnessed, and so narrow was his own  
escape that McCreedy's nerves were  
completely upset and collapsed while  
on guard the night after the wreck.  
His own escape from death was a nar-  
row one. McCreedy was one of the  
guards in charge of a number of  
some Chinese en route from Vancouver  
to Montreal. Thomas O'Connor, of  
St. John, was the other guard. About  
an hour before the wreck, O'Connor  
went on guard and McCreedy retired  
to a car at the rear of the train to  
sleep. When the collision took place  
the car in which O'Connor was on  
guard and in which McCreedy would  
have been had the guard not changed,  
was telescoped and smashed to pieces,  
O'Connor being instantly killed.

## H. W. WOODS RE-ELECTED HIGH CHIEF RANGER.

Following is a complete list of the  
High Court L. O. F. officers elected for  
the ensuing year at the meeting yester-  
day afternoon:  
H. W. Woods, Welford, H. C. R.; G.  
G. Scovell, M. P. P., Belleisle, H. V. C.  
R.; F. W. Emmerson, Moncton, H. S.;  
J. Y. Russell, St. John, H. T.; Dr. C.  
S. Melvin, St. John, H. P.; R. H.  
Davis, Richfield, H. C. S.; Thomas  
Murray, Sackville, H. S.; G. H. Mc-  
Gillivray, Hampton, H. S.; Rev. H. B.  
Cock, Barrington, H. S.; J. E. King,  
Blackville, H. S.; J. S. Mrs. C.  
H. Taylor, Hartland, H. S.; Colum-  
bus Craig, Perth, H. S.; W. E. J.  
Neve, St. John, H. S.; W. D. M.  
Hamm, Grand Bay, H. S.; D. M.  
Petticoat, H. S.; J. E. Bernier,  
Edmundston, H. S.; J. G. Hall, St.  
Mary's, H. S.; D. Bradley, St. John,  
H. S.

When the high chief, ranger called  
the High Court to order it was nearly  
three o'clock, as a large group photo-  
graph of the delegates in front of the  
old Mechanics' Institute took up quite  
a little time.

The first business was the report read  
by D. G. Langley of the special com-  
mittee on sections 1, 2 and 4 of the H.  
C. ranger's report, and it was as fol-  
lows:

"That whenever the summons that will  
come to all came to our beloved, trust-  
ed and honored leader, Dr. Oronohy-  
teka, on the third day of March last,  
our beloved orator lost all that the word  
leader implies. Seldom does any order  
owe so much to a single man as our  
order owes to our late supreme chief.  
Great hearted and broad minded, yet  
loving and gentle as a child, he fell  
slept. The High Court desires to  
place on record its love and apprecia-  
tion of him in life and his deep sorrow  
because of his death. Your committee  
would recommend that this resolution  
be engrossed on the minutes of the  
High Court and a copy be forwarded to  
the supreme executive.

"It is a matter of great satisfaction  
that the mantle of Dr. Oronohy-  
teka had fallen upon the shoulders of so able  
and distinguished a brother as the Hon.  
Elliott G. Stevenson, who for many  
years had been the able and trusted

counsel of our late beloved supreme  
chief, and that the High Court of the  
jurisdiction pledge to our new leader  
that loyalty which has ever charac-  
terized New Brunswick Foresters, and  
that each member of the High Court  
should resolve today to stand as firm  
as they had entertained the principles of For-  
estry."

This report was received and adopted  
by a standing vote.

The committee on new business  
through the chairman, M. E. Grass, re-  
ported that there was no matter for  
their consideration.

Rev. B. H. Thomas in a very neat  
speech extended from this High  
Court to the members of the courts in  
St. John and Fairville for the hand-  
some and hospitable entertainment of  
this and other delegates.

This was seconded by G. A. Wilson and  
passed unanimously.

On behalf of the central committee of  
St. John, C. W. G. Langley, its  
organizer, accepted the vote of thanks  
and assured those present that St. John  
would be pleased to entertain the High  
Court at any time in the near future.

The amended sections of the report  
were then read. This section now  
reads as follows:

"That the Supreme Court be request-  
ed to provide sub-section 5 of which  
was paid to brethren receiving total and  
permanent disability benefit, old age or  
pension and other benefits, and that the  
supreme court should make some pro-  
vision under such terms as may be  
equitable for the continuation of such  
benefits to brethren over seventy years  
of age."

This section was amended, was re-  
solved and adopted.

The next order of business was the  
nomination and election of officers.  
The high chief, ranger appointed J. E.  
Stevenson and Mr. Mullin, and the high  
vice appointed Dr. Purdy as scrutineers.  
While the ballots were being passed  
Prof. Perry, high organist, entertained  
the High Court with some choice  
selections on the piano.

(Continued on page eleven.)

## COLLINS REMANDED TO JAIL TO STAND HIS TRIAL FOR THE THIRD TIME.

Jury After Being Out All Night  
Were Still Unable to Agree  
and at Ten O'clock This  
Morning, Were Dismissed  
by Chief Justice Tuck

HOPWELL CAPE, N. B., July 3.—  
His Honor Chief Justice Tuck in be-  
ginning his charge to the jury said the  
case had been admirably worked by  
the crown. The counsel for the  
Crown had left nothing undone and the  
senior counsel for the defense had  
made an address that would not fail to  
make a favorable impression. The pris-  
oner had been most ably defended, Hon.  
Mr. McKeown cutting short a  
trip to England and appearing here  
for a mere pittance where his services  
could be valued at \$500 a day. His  
Crown to prove their case and the re-  
sources it possessed. Could the pris-  
oner if he had wealth, done better than  
he did or been better defended? Des-  
perately well known to anyone who has  
heard him speak. There was no testi-  
mony that any one was seen com-  
mitting the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind was presented  
to a competent jury, it would be  
guilty of the crime. Murderers do not  
take anyone with them to witness their  
crime. Direct evidence, if any, is  
usually given by the witnesses. There  
was no testimony that any one was seen  
committing the murder, that was left to  
their judgment. If circumstantial evi-  
dence of the proper kind