

We have the right to insist upon the execution of certain documents which we consider important. In other words, we would be in a position to grant, if we were to have you offer a lot of proposed testimony to one side, to be kept there for several days instead of being produced on the spot, subject to the scrutiny of both sides in every case, and subject to the objection of being impertinent or immaterial, and subject to the ruling of the chair in every case.

Mr. Sutherland declared that the suggestion was made to save time, and that there was no impropriety in it. He said that when the documents were in a state of confusion, it would be the right to object. This brought Mr. Stedman into the argument. "They should not be entitled to documents until they are ready to offer them," he said.

The idea of bringing in persons and taking possession of their documents for one side before the other was determined, it was entirely improper in an investigating body or court proceeding.

Socialist Objections Futile. Chairman Martin overruled the objection and held that the documents might be marked in the committee counsel, adding that like privileges would be accorded counsel for the Assemblymen.

Mr. Hillquit asked to subpoena any number of men and take away from them their documents, their instruments or their property without the court passing upon the character of the documents and upon whether or not they are properly taken from them. I think it would be an absolutely unheard of proceeding.

Chairman Martin announced that his former ruling would hold, but Mr. Hillquit eventually gained his point when Mrs. Anna Stern, executive secretary of the Bronx local of the Socialist party, was called to produce copies of the by-laws, constitution and other documents of the organization.

Mr. Hillquit endeavored to show in his cross-examination that the work covered both sides of the argument for a proletarian dictatorship, but that the excerpts Mr. Robinson selected were from the chapter dealing with the defenders of the doctrine and not from a chapter dealing with the views of opponents.

Mr. Sutherland—We are willing to have the sergeant at arms have them in his physical possession. Mr. Stedman—After it is offered in evidence he is entitled to it if you think there is danger of loss.

and the answer is: Why, none at all. He is just a good fellow and he had an opinion. It is possible, Mr. Chairman, under this procedure, and I respectfully submit that if we are to have, as you have promised several times, a fair trial, this does—

Chairman Martin overruled the objection, whereupon Mr. Hillquit dramatically announced: "As far as I am concerned, and I think I speak for my associates whenever testified for this kind of case, we shall take absolutely no part in the proceeding. We will not dignify it by taking part in it. It is as if we were absent."

Mr. Hillquit dropped into his chair and after a momentary silence Chairman Martin said: "Proceed." Mr. Stanchfield then offered the red pamphlet in evidence, with Assemblymen Evans and Bloch again dissenting from the chair's ruling.

Mr. Hillquit endeavored to show in his cross-examination that the work covered both sides of the argument for a proletarian dictatorship, but that the excerpts Mr. Robinson selected were from the chapter dealing with the defenders of the doctrine and not from a chapter dealing with the views of opponents.

Mr. Hillquit endeavored to show in his cross-examination that the work covered both sides of the argument for a proletarian dictatorship, but that the excerpts Mr. Robinson selected were from the chapter dealing with the defenders of the doctrine and not from a chapter dealing with the views of opponents.

Mr. Hillquit endeavored to show in his cross-examination that the work covered both sides of the argument for a proletarian dictatorship, but that the excerpts Mr. Robinson selected were from the chapter dealing with the defenders of the doctrine and not from a chapter dealing with the views of opponents.

Mr. Hillquit endeavored to show in his cross-examination that the work covered both sides of the argument for a proletarian dictatorship, but that the excerpts Mr. Robinson selected were from the chapter dealing with the defenders of the doctrine and not from a chapter dealing with the views of opponents.

you pick up the newspapers and you read of rape and you read of the brutality, the bestiality of the great mass of the American people, you will find that we are still such an inferior and beast-like set of creatures that we are far from that fine spirit of idealism which our comrades in Russia are so many thousands years ahead of us.

Chairman Martin overruled the objection, whereupon Mr. Hillquit dramatically announced: "As far as I am concerned, and I think I speak for my associates whenever testified for this kind of case, we shall take absolutely no part in the proceeding. We will not dignify it by taking part in it. It is as if we were absent."

Mr. Hillquit endeavored to show in his cross-examination that the work covered both sides of the argument for a proletarian dictatorship, but that the excerpts Mr. Robinson selected were from the chapter dealing with the defenders of the doctrine and not from a chapter dealing with the views of opponents.

Mr. Hillquit endeavored to show in his cross-examination that the work covered both sides of the argument for a proletarian dictatorship, but that the excerpts Mr. Robinson selected were from the chapter dealing with the defenders of the doctrine and not from a chapter dealing with the views of opponents.

Mr. Hillquit endeavored to show in his cross-examination that the work covered both sides of the argument for a proletarian dictatorship, but that the excerpts Mr. Robinson selected were from the chapter dealing with the defenders of the doctrine and not from a chapter dealing with the views of opponents.

Mr. Hillquit endeavored to show in his cross-examination that the work covered both sides of the argument for a proletarian dictatorship, but that the excerpts Mr. Robinson selected were from the chapter dealing with the defenders of the doctrine and not from a chapter dealing with the views of opponents.

Mr. Hillquit endeavored to show in his cross-examination that the work covered both sides of the argument for a proletarian dictatorship, but that the excerpts Mr. Robinson selected were from the chapter dealing with the defenders of the doctrine and not from a chapter dealing with the views of opponents.

Chairman Martin overruled the objection, whereupon Mr. Hillquit dramatically announced: "As far as I am concerned, and I think I speak for my associates whenever testified for this kind of case, we shall take absolutely no part in the proceeding. We will not dignify it by taking part in it. It is as if we were absent."

Mr. Hillquit endeavored to show in his cross-examination that the work covered both sides of the argument for a proletarian dictatorship, but that the excerpts Mr. Robinson selected were from the chapter dealing with the defenders of the doctrine and not from a chapter dealing with the views of opponents.

Mr. Hillquit endeavored to show in his cross-examination that the work covered both sides of the argument for a proletarian dictatorship, but that the excerpts Mr. Robinson selected were from the chapter dealing with the defenders of the doctrine and not from a chapter dealing with the views of opponents.

Mr. Hillquit endeavored to show in his cross-examination that the work covered both sides of the argument for a proletarian dictatorship, but that the excerpts Mr. Robinson selected were from the chapter dealing with the defenders of the doctrine and not from a chapter dealing with the views of opponents.

Mr. Hillquit endeavored to show in his cross-examination that the work covered both sides of the argument for a proletarian dictatorship, but that the excerpts Mr. Robinson selected were from the chapter dealing with the defenders of the doctrine and not from a chapter dealing with the views of opponents.

Mr. Hillquit endeavored to show in his cross-examination that the work covered both sides of the argument for a proletarian dictatorship, but that the excerpts Mr. Robinson selected were from the chapter dealing with the defenders of the doctrine and not from a chapter dealing with the views of opponents.

Mr. Hillquit endeavored to show in his cross-examination that the work covered both sides of the argument for a proletarian dictatorship, but that the excerpts Mr. Robinson selected were from the chapter dealing with the defenders of the doctrine and not from a chapter dealing with the views of opponents.

Chairman Martin overruled the objection, whereupon Mr. Hillquit dramatically announced: "As far as I am concerned, and I think I speak for my associates whenever testified for this kind of case, we shall take absolutely no part in the proceeding. We will not dignify it by taking part in it. It is as if we were absent."

Mr. Hillquit endeavored to show in his cross-examination that the work covered both sides of the argument for a proletarian dictatorship, but that the excerpts Mr. Robinson selected were from the chapter dealing with the defenders of the doctrine and not from a chapter dealing with the views of opponents.

Mr. Hillquit endeavored to show in his cross-examination that the work covered both sides of the argument for a proletarian dictatorship, but that the excerpts Mr. Robinson selected were from the chapter dealing with the defenders of the doctrine and not from a chapter dealing with the views of opponents.

Mr. Hillquit endeavored to show in his cross-examination that the work covered both sides of the argument for a proletarian dictatorship, but that the excerpts Mr. Robinson selected were from the chapter dealing with the defenders of the doctrine and not from a chapter dealing with the views of opponents.

Mr. Hillquit endeavored to show in his cross-examination that the work covered both sides of the argument for a proletarian dictatorship, but that the excerpts Mr. Robinson selected were from the chapter dealing with the defenders of the doctrine and not from a chapter dealing with the views of opponents.

Mr. Hillquit endeavored to show in his cross-examination that the work covered both sides of the argument for a proletarian dictatorship, but that the excerpts Mr. Robinson selected were from the chapter dealing with the defenders of the doctrine and not from a chapter dealing with the views of opponents.

Mr. Hillquit endeavored to show in his cross-examination that the work covered both sides of the argument for a proletarian dictatorship, but that the excerpts Mr. Robinson selected were from the chapter dealing with the defenders of the doctrine and not from a chapter dealing with the views of opponents.

Chairman Martin overruled the objection, whereupon Mr. Hillquit dramatically announced: "As far as I am concerned, and I think I speak for my associates whenever testified for this kind of case, we shall take absolutely no part in the proceeding. We will not dignify it by taking part in it. It is as if we were absent."

Mr. Hillquit endeavored to show in his cross-examination that the work covered both sides of the argument for a proletarian dictatorship, but that the excerpts Mr. Robinson selected were from the chapter dealing with the defenders of the doctrine and not from a chapter dealing with the views of opponents.

Mr. Hillquit endeavored to show in his cross-examination that the work covered both sides of the argument for a proletarian dictatorship, but that the excerpts Mr. Robinson selected were from the chapter dealing with the defenders of the doctrine and not from a chapter dealing with the views of opponents.

Mr. Hillquit endeavored to show in his cross-examination that the work covered both sides of the argument for a proletarian dictatorship, but that the excerpts Mr. Robinson selected were from the chapter dealing with the defenders of the doctrine and not from a chapter dealing with the views of opponents.

Mr. Hillquit endeavored to show in his cross-examination that the work covered both sides of the argument for a proletarian dictatorship, but that the excerpts Mr. Robinson selected were from the chapter dealing with the defenders of the doctrine and not from a chapter dealing with the views of opponents.

Mr. Hillquit endeavored to show in his cross-examination that the work covered both sides of the argument for a proletarian dictatorship, but that the excerpts Mr. Robinson selected were from the chapter dealing with the defenders of the doctrine and not from a chapter dealing with the views of opponents.

Mr. Hillquit endeavored to show in his cross-examination that the work covered both sides of the argument for a proletarian dictatorship, but that the excerpts Mr. Robinson selected were from the chapter dealing with the defenders of the doctrine and not from a chapter dealing with the views of opponents.

McCreery's English Clothes. TAILORED IN AMERICA FOR JAMES MCCREERY & COMPANY. Amnesty Offer to Kidnappers. Capt. Field to Run Estate.

Clothing Prices Will Be Higher Next Fall and Winter. The New York Times. BUSINESS WORLD.

Yet This Annual Brill Sale Offers the Finest Clothing in America. KUPPENHEIMER AND OUR OWN. At Substantial Reductions From This Past Season's Prices.

At Substantial Reductions From This Past Season's Prices. \$75, \$80, \$85 and \$90 Overcoats and Suits, at \$67.50.

At Substantial Reductions From This Past Season's Prices. \$85, \$87.50 and \$70 Overcoats and Suits, at \$57.50.

At Substantial Reductions From This Past Season's Prices. \$95, \$100, \$115, \$125 and \$135 Overcoats and Suits on Sale at 49th and 42d Street Stores Only, at \$87.50.

Brill Brothers. THE KUPPENHEIMER HOUSE IN NEW YORK. 279 Broadway, Broadway, at 49th St., 47 Cortlandt Street, 2 Flatbush Ave.