relation to the business then carried on, and the fact that the voice at the telephone was not identified does not render the conversation inadmissible.

But the Court properly added: "The ruling here announced is intended to ermine really the admirable to the ruling here announced is intended." determine really the admissibility of such conversations in such circumstances, but not the effect of and but not the effect of such evidence after its admission. It may be entitled each instance to much a little each instance to much or little weight in the estimation of the triers of fact, according to their minutes of the standard of the triers of the standard of the triers of the standard of the according to their views of its credibility and of the other testimony in support or contradiction of :4" or contradiction of it."

We have always felt doubtful as to whether the court did not go a little too in this case. It is evident that a share a last. far in this case. It is evident that a clerk in an ordinary shop, in apparent charge thereof has a sementary shop. charge thereof, has a somewhat different authority to speak for his employer than an unknown person constitution of the speak for his employer than an unknown person constitution of the speak for his employer than an unknown person constitution of the speak for his employer. than an unknown person speaking over a telephone. In each case it is a question of presumptive avidence. tion of presumptive evidence, but the presumption is very much stronger in the case of the clerk in the case of the clerk in the store than of the speaker over the telephone. The question as to where is the alert tion as to where is the clerk is absolutely determined; as to where is the speaker over the telephone. over the telephone is only a matter of very great probability.

On the second point, that an identification of the voice of the speaker ough the telephone is not through the telephone is not necessary to make his declarations admissible, we think the court went to a superior of the voice of the specific went to a superior of the voice of the specific went to a superior of the voice of the specific went to a superior of the voice of the specific went to a superior of the voice of the specific went to a superior of the voice of the specific went to a superior of the voice of the specific went to a superior of the voice of the specific went to a superior of the voice of the specific went to a superior of the voice of the specific went to a superior of the voice of the specific went to a superior of the voice of the specific went to a superior of the voice of the specific went to a superior of the voice of the specific went to a superior of the voice of the specific went to a superior of the voice of the specific went to a superior of the voice of the specific went to a superior of the voice of the specific went to a superior of the voice of the specific went to a superior of the voice of the specific went to a superior of the voice of the specific went to a superior of the voice of the specific went to a superior of the voice of the specific went to a superior of the voice of the specific went to a superior of the voice of the specific went to a superior of the voice of the specific went to a superior of the voice of the specific went to a superior of the voice of the specific went to a superior of the voice of the specific went to a superior of the voice of the specific went to a superior of the voice of the specific went to a superior of the voice of the specific went to a superior of the voice of the specific went to a superior of the voice of the specific went to a superior of the voice of the specific went to a superior of the voice of the specific went to a superior of the voice of the specific went to a superior of the voice of the specific went to a superior of the voice of the specific went to a superior of the voice of the specific went to a superior of the voice think the court went to a very great extreme, and we doubt whether this ruling should be followed

A rather curious case decided some years before the one last cited, (Sullivan Kuykenhall 82 Ky 482, 76 Am. B should be followed. v. Kuykenhall 82 Ky. 483; 56 Am. Rep., 901), was that of a conversation which took place. not directly between 41. took place, not directly between the parties over the telephone, but through the operator in charge of a public toleral. operator in charge of a public telephone station. It was held by a divided what that the person who received the that the person who received the message from the operator could state what was told him where there was stated in the operator could state what the was told him where there was evidence that the other party did in fact use the telephone at that time. It is evident that it telephone at that time. It is evident that the operator could not be expected remember the conversation. remember the conversation. It would seem, however, that this case also goes pretty far, and that the statement of the stateme pretty far, and that the statements of the party who alleges that he receives such a message should be strongly correlated. a message should be strongly corroborated, at least as to the presence of the other party at the other and of the minute. other party at the other end of the wire at the time testified.

In a recent case, Banning v. Banning (80 Cal. 271; 13 Am. St. Rep., 156), it sheld that the fact that a married warmen. was held that the fact that a married woman is not personally present before a notary at the time be toleral. notary at the time he takes her acknowledgment through a telephone, in being three or four miles from him. being three or four miles from him, will not vitiate such deed, because, due the absence of fraud accident or miles from him, will not vitiate such deed, because, due the absence of fraud, accident or mistake, the certificate of the notary in due form is conclusive of the material form.

In this case it was clearly proved that the acknowledgment was made ough the telephone form is conclusive of the material facts therein stated. through the telephone.

These appear to be all the decisions so far on the question.—New York L. J.

PET ANIMALS.—The keeping of pet animals has ever been a favorite habit of glishmen. It manifests itself at an acre-Englishmen. It manifests itself at an early age. Scarce has the boy assumed the dignity of knickerbockers than he had a series as the boy assumed the dignity of knickerbockers than he had a series as the boy assumed the dignity of knickerbockers than he had a series as the boy assumed the series as the boy assumed the series as the boy assumed than he had a series as the boy as the series as the dignity of knickerbockers than he begins to keep white mice, and become