

SPRATT CLAIMS EVIDENCE CRUDE

SAYS CROWN WITNESSES ARE KINDERGARTEN KIDS

Knew John Day Slightly—Thinks Bullock Aggressive and a General Butcher

Admitting that Dr. Howard mentioned in the evidence the day before was a detective employed by him to look after Bullock...

Mr. Alkman—Then at that time you had not heard you had navy goods in your possession?

Witness—As I told you before I could not remember all conversations. At that time Bullock had made no demand...

Mr. Alkman—Up till April 11 you had no suspicion that there had been goods coming in from an irregular source?

Witness—Yes, I was. Mr. Alkman—How could you be when you have told us everything was straightened out on Saturday, April 8...

Witness—Day and Bullock conversed, and the explanation I got was quite satisfactory. What Bullock told Richard was not true.

Witness—What was that? Mr. Alkman—What was that? Witness—They may have put it in a very much easier way than that.

Witness—Bullock wanted "rush money" was when Bullock wrote the unsigned letter. The other time he wanted money as a favor.

Witness—He said that Dr. Howard had employed him through a Seattle detective agency.

Witness—He did not claim innocence, but asserted it. Mr. Alkman—The prosecution could proceed in a regular legal way if it wanted the books.

Witness—Bullock had stayed in the room and had a conversation. They shortly came into the room again and Day said to Spratt, "everything is all right with Bullock."

Bullock's resignation was accepted by Spratt on March 13 (Bullock's resignation is dated Feb. 24) in which Spratt offered Bullock salary till the end of March...

Witness—Bullock had given Spratt a letter which he had no little to do with Bullock he could not do other than write him the letter he did.

Witness—Bullock had given Spratt a letter which he had no little to do with Bullock he could not do other than write him the letter he did.

WHALING BEGINNING ON WASHINGTON COAST

First Steamer Left for Aberdeen To-day—Good Catches Made on West Coast

(From Wednesday's Daily.) The steamer whaler, Peterson, built at the Moran yard, Seattle, called at the outer wharf last night.

The two steamers which will, of course, be operated under the United States flag, are oil burners and are splendid vessels. They are 45 feet long and 18 feet beam.

At Rose Harbor the record catch is 100 whales on one steamer and at Kyoquat 40, where a number of sperm whales have been captured.

Salinas, Kas. June 21.—George Higgins, custodian of schools at Colby, Kas., was beheaded and instantly killed to-day when he rode a motor cycle.

MAN DECAPITATED. Salinas, Kas. June 21.—George Higgins, custodian of schools at Colby, Kas., was beheaded and instantly killed to-day when he rode a motor cycle.

Annual Track Meet Very Successful—Alfred Wyldie Won School Championship

A more successful track meet than that which took place on the University campus at Mt. Tolmie yesterday has seldom been held in Victoria.

During the progress of the sports popular operatic selections were rendered by the Fifth Regiment band, which had been secured for the occasion and this, with the dainty refreshments served in the gymnasium, added greatly to the enjoyment of the day.

At the conclusion of the sports G. H. Barnard, M. P.; Rev. W. M. Bolton, R. V. Harvey, J. C. Barnacle and J. H. and Mrs. Gillespie officiated in the distribution of the prizes.

Half mile, handicap under sixteen years—1, Creery III, 2, Woodward II, 3, Wiggand, Time, 2:32.

100 yards, open—1, Wyldie, 2, Thorsen, 3, Stone, Time, 11 seconds.

100 yards, boys under twelve years—1, McDougall, 2, yards, 2, Rand, 3, Atkins, scratch, Time, 14 seconds.

75 yards, boys under 10 years—1, Wright, 2, Goddard, Time, 14 seconds.

Quarter mile, open—1, McAnally, 2, Wade I, 3, Devine I, Time, 5:13.

100 yards for boys under fourteen—1, Arbuthnot I, scratch, 2, Quan, 3, Stanley, 2 yards, Time, 13 seconds.

WHALING BEGINNING ON CANOE CAPSIZES, MAN LOSES LIFE

Third Drowning Accident in Three Weeks Near South Fort George

South Fort George, June 20.—A third drowning accident, within the past two weeks, occurred here under particularly distressing circumstances.

The victim of the capsize was a young Englishman named Henry Baxter, a student from Shropshire. The circumstances surrounding the affair which led up to the death of Baxter are as follows:

At a point where the British navigators have not yet been, the canoe listed violently and capsized. Finding some hold for his pole Baxter evidently took advantage of it and his pole sticking, over-balanced him and he fell into the water.

At the point where the British navigators have not yet been, the canoe listed violently and capsized. Finding some hold for his pole Baxter evidently took advantage of it and his pole sticking, over-balanced him and he fell into the water.

At the point where the British navigators have not yet been, the canoe listed violently and capsized. Finding some hold for his pole Baxter evidently took advantage of it and his pole sticking, over-balanced him and he fell into the water.

At the point where the British navigators have not yet been, the canoe listed violently and capsized. Finding some hold for his pole Baxter evidently took advantage of it and his pole sticking, over-balanced him and he fell into the water.

ENJOYABLE EVENT AT UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

OPIMUM SMUGGLER IS UNDER ARREST

Seattle, Wash. June 21.—One of the cleverest captures of an opium smuggler since the establishment of the department of customs, collection in Seattle was made this morning by Frank P. Loftus, chief customs inspector, and Inspector Frank Chesnut.

During the progress of the sports popular operatic selections were rendered by the Fifth Regiment band, which had been secured for the occasion and this, with the dainty refreshments served in the gymnasium, added greatly to the enjoyment of the day.

At the conclusion of the sports G. H. Barnard, M. P.; Rev. W. M. Bolton, R. V. Harvey, J. C. Barnacle and J. H. and Mrs. Gillespie officiated in the distribution of the prizes.

Half mile, handicap under sixteen years—1, Creery III, 2, Woodward II, 3, Wiggand, Time, 2:32.

100 yards, open—1, Wyldie, 2, Thorsen, 3, Stone, Time, 11 seconds.

100 yards, boys under twelve years—1, McDougall, 2, yards, 2, Rand, 3, Atkins, scratch, Time, 14 seconds.

75 yards, boys under 10 years—1, Wright, 2, Goddard, Time, 14 seconds.

CANOE CAPSIZES, MAN LOSES LIFE

Third Drowning Accident in Three Weeks Near South Fort George

South Fort George, June 20.—A third drowning accident, within the past two weeks, occurred here under particularly distressing circumstances.

The victim of the capsize was a young Englishman named Henry Baxter, a student from Shropshire. The circumstances surrounding the affair which led up to the death of Baxter are as follows:

At a point where the British navigators have not yet been, the canoe listed violently and capsized. Finding some hold for his pole Baxter evidently took advantage of it and his pole sticking, over-balanced him and he fell into the water.

At the point where the British navigators have not yet been, the canoe listed violently and capsized. Finding some hold for his pole Baxter evidently took advantage of it and his pole sticking, over-balanced him and he fell into the water.

At the point where the British navigators have not yet been, the canoe listed violently and capsized. Finding some hold for his pole Baxter evidently took advantage of it and his pole sticking, over-balanced him and he fell into the water.

At the point where the British navigators have not yet been, the canoe listed violently and capsized. Finding some hold for his pole Baxter evidently took advantage of it and his pole sticking, over-balanced him and he fell into the water.

WILL SEND REINDEER TO FORT SMITH

MUCH TO ENGLAND

Benefitted as Result of Free Trade Policy of That Country

Washington, D. C. June 21.—The statement in the senate by Senator Heyburn, of Idaho, that "whatever we have taken from England has been taken at the point of the bayonet," produced the only tense moment of yesterday's debate on the Canadian reciprocity bill.

Senator Nelson of Minnesota, declared that his only hope of benefit from the reciprocity agreement was that it might lead to annexation of Canada. He met Senator Gallinger's argument that reciprocity ought to be given to Mexico and all other nations, if given to Canada, by saying that this country could not hope to annex all the rest of the world.

"I am convinced," added Senator Gallinger, "that when this bill passes there are many Republicans on this side who will join Democrats in backing up the foundation stones of the protective tariff system. We will be fortunate if the whole structure of protection does not fall."

Geneva, June 21.—Extraordinary experiments showing the possibility of suspending life for an indefinite period have been carried out by Prof. Raoul Pictet, of this city. In one case he took some live gold fish, froze them in water to 20 degrees centigrade below zero, and then after three months, gradually warmed the blocks of ice and brought back the fish to life.

Geneva, June 21.—Extraordinary experiments showing the possibility of suspending life for an indefinite period have been carried out by Prof. Raoul Pictet, of this city. In one case he took some live gold fish, froze them in water to 20 degrees centigrade below zero, and then after three months, gradually warmed the blocks of ice and brought back the fish to life.

Geneva, June 21.—Extraordinary experiments showing the possibility of suspending life for an indefinite period have been carried out by Prof. Raoul Pictet, of this city. In one case he took some live gold fish, froze them in water to 20 degrees centigrade below zero, and then after three months, gradually warmed the blocks of ice and brought back the fish to life.

SCOUTS POPULAR

Will Be Given Place of Honor at Review by the King on July 4

London, June 21.—Canada is to-day given a new place in London's grand old and thronged streets, thanks to the Canadian Boy Scouts and their pass through thoroughfare to thoroughfare in the big sightseeing trunks. This morning as they came opposite Westminster Abbey, a whole hundred of them suddenly burst out with ear-piercing yells:

"Keep her low, keep her low; let her go; C-A-N-A-D-A; Here we are, Rah, Rah, Rah!"

The boys have come up for the day from their encampment in the grounds of Rothampton House, Barnes, ten miles out of London, and the crowd began to know the healthy, leather-lunged set of youngsters who let off high spirits with almost terrifying effect.

The boys are under the command of Lieut.-Colonel Munden Cole of Montreal, and are camped amid picturesque rural surroundings. They are in the pink of condition and delighted with the arrangements for their comfort.

Besides taking part in the coronation procession with the English Scouts they will line up at Constitution Hill. A long row of eight-footing lads, before them after the coronation, the chief event being the inspection of the Boy Scouts by the King in Windsor park on July 4.

About 300 boys will be inspected by His Majesty. The Canadian contingent will occupy the top of honor on the right of the first division.

WILL RETIRE TO PRIVATE LIFE

NEGROES RESPITED

Okla. City, Okla. June 21.—Five negroes, sentenced to be hanged to-day for the murder of W. H. Archie, a post-office clerk, were reprieved on the night of March 9, have been given a new lease of life. John Henry Prather was given a respite until July 7, while the others were reprieved until the 10th.

Geneva, June 21.—Extraordinary experiments showing the possibility of suspending life for an indefinite period have been carried out by Prof. Raoul Pictet, of this city. In one case he took some live gold fish, froze them in water to 20 degrees centigrade below zero, and then after three months, gradually warmed the blocks of ice and brought back the fish to life.

Geneva, June 21.—Extraordinary experiments showing the possibility of suspending life for an indefinite period have been carried out by Prof. Raoul Pictet, of this city. In one case he took some live gold fish, froze them in water to 20 degrees centigrade below zero, and then after three months, gradually warmed the blocks of ice and brought back the fish to life.

Geneva, June 21.—Extraordinary experiments showing the possibility of suspending life for an indefinite period have been carried out by Prof. Raoul Pictet, of this city. In one case he took some live gold fish, froze them in water to 20 degrees centigrade below zero, and then after three months, gradually warmed the blocks of ice and brought back the fish to life.

Geneva, June 21.—Extraordinary experiments showing the possibility of suspending life for an indefinite period have been carried out by Prof. Raoul Pictet, of this city. In one case he took some live gold fish, froze them in water to 20 degrees centigrade below zero, and then after three months, gradually warmed the blocks of ice and brought back the fish to life.

Geneva, June 21.—Extraordinary experiments showing the possibility of suspending life for an indefinite period have been carried out by Prof. Raoul Pictet, of this city. In one case he took some live gold fish, froze them in water to 20 degrees centigrade below zero, and then after three months, gradually warmed the blocks of ice and brought back the fish to life.

Geneva, June 21.—Extraordinary experiments showing the possibility of suspending life for an indefinite period have been carried out by Prof. Raoul Pictet, of this city. In one case he took some live gold fish, froze them in water to 20 degrees centigrade below zero, and then after three months, gradually warmed the blocks of ice and brought back the fish to life.

IN THE POLICE COURT

HONOR PAID TO LATE AGENT OF MARINE DEPT.

A pleasing ceremony was enacted Wednesday in the marine and fisheries local office on Wharf street, when Captain James Gaudin, recently retired from the marine and fisheries department agency here, was presented with valuable tokens of the esteem of his colleagues on the occasion of his retirement after 19 years of service in the department. The presentation consisted of a combination apparatus in silver combining a watch, an aneroid barometer, a thermometer, and a compass. The first three pieces were in the form of a ship's lights, and the compass rested above. In addition to this valuable and interesting present the beautiful case of pipes and a capacious tobacco jar.

The presentation was made in the office by J. A. Thompson, the senior inspector, in the presence of the entire staff. In addition to paying his personal tribute to the retiring agent the inspector read and presented him with the following address:

"Sir: We, the undersigned officers and staff of the marine department in Victoria, B. C., take great pleasure in presenting you with these tokens, which can, however, but feebly express the esteem and appreciation which we feel towards you. During the twenty odd years that you have acted in so fair and friendly a manner as to win the affection of all.

"It is with sincere regret to us, your late co-workers, that your new duties must necessarily interrupt our business relations. We are gratified to know that our present friendly personal relations cannot be changed.

"We sincerely wish that success will attend you in your new duties, and that you will long be gratified to your family and friends and us."

Captain Gaudin suitably replied, expressing his regret that his health had compelled him to give up his duties, and thanking the staff for all their kindness towards him and assuring them that he would ever treasure the tokens of their regard.

AWAITS SOLUTION

Can a Nuisance Be Committed Against Something That Does Not Exist?

(From Wednesday's Daily.) Is it possible to commit a nuisance upon something that does not exist? That is one of the questions which Mr. Justice Greer has to decide in the case of British Canadian Securities Ltd., versus the city, wherein the latter is charged with erecting a comfort station in such proximity to the proposed building of the Dominion Trust company—whilst the plaintiff company is having erected—as to be detrimental to its interests.

At the present time the building of the Dominion Trust company does not exist, and the comfort station lists only in part, and as may be known, the scene of both is near the Causeway in a prominent part of the city. In his judgment Mr. Justice Greer holds that the city has no legal right to build the comfort station where it is. City solicitor McDiarmid appeared for the city and M. B. Jackson and H. C. Hartington represented the plaintiff company.

In framing his argument the plaintiff solicitor stated that the gist of his opponent's case was that the building of the comfort station was a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once the building was erected it would be time enough to complain of nuisances, but in the meantime he could not see why the city should be held liable for the erection of the comfort station. Of course the council had no right to pass a by-law to commit a nuisance. Nothing could give them the power to do that. But in the present case the nuisance was committed. The building in question was not erected and therefore he failed to see how anything could be regarded as a nuisance against it. Once