

The Evening Times-Star

You can find hundreds of interesting and profitable ways to use classified advertising...

St. John people have learned to use Times-Star rental ads. You will get prompt results if you take this convenient way of securing a desirable tenant.

VOL. XX., No. 303 PAGES ONE TO EIGHT ST. JOHN, N. B., THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 1924 SIXTEEN PAGES—ONE CENT

Saint John Industries Are Many, Detailed List Shows Chief Justices Gives Evidence

INDUSTRIES IN CITY TABULATED BY TRADE BOARD Some are Outstanding in Dominion, Empire and World. NUMBER LISTED 161 Timely Exposition of Situation as City Rises on Wave of Optimism.

Some few weeks ago the Board of Trade was requested by the statistical department, Ottawa, to forward to them a list of the manufacturing industries of St. John. This list has been completed, so far as the board secretary has been able to secure the information, and has been sent forward to Ottawa. A personal of this list will tend to strengthen the spirit of optimism which has come to St. John, and demonstrate to any who might be sceptical, that right in this city there are being manufactured a great many of the articles that its citizens need, and which that is being sent outside. It may come as a surprise to even our own people to learn just what St. John is manufacturing, and it will be a pleasant surprise. The publication of this list is timely in connection with the appeal being made for development of the Maritimes and support for local products.

Some Outstanding Ones The list has on it 161 names of firms who are manufacturing here and this means a lot of persons are finding employment in these factories and shops. Included in the list will be found, it was said with pride, the largest sugar refinery in the British Empire, the largest dry dock in the world, and the largest brush factory in the Empire and (Continued on page 15, column 1.)

OBJECT TO SLANG English Radio Fans Have Difficulty in Understanding U. S. Lingo. London, Sept. 25.—(United Press).—English radio fans in touch with American stations declare there is a crying need for a wireless dictionary. They say they can't make head or tail of such Americanisms as "hard-boiled," "oodles," "cat's eye-brows," "ham," "wow," "south paw," and "iron man."

Radio papers here started an agitation against the mysterious lingo from overseas, saying "the old King's English is good enough for us" but the younger generation is eagerly mastering the use of such expressions as "knock 'em for a row of slabs" and "fiddle" while baffled parents listen in with disgust. It was hoped that esperanto might bridge the difference between peoples not speaking the same language but now even esperanto disciples declare it is impossible for them to cope with the Anglo-American slang.

Young Girl Kills Lover's Father (United Press). Paris, Sept. 25.—Frattated in her ardent love for a lad of 15, Marie Rosegnol, a pretty little girl of 14, shot and killed her sweetheart's father, a man named Chillon, at Privas, in the Ardèche Department. The children had become engaged, but could not be married until the boy's father asked for a legal dispensation on account of their youth. The father refused to give this, and said they would have to wait until they were old enough to know their own minds. The girl stole her father's army revolver and hid behind a patch of shrubbery in the Chillon garden until M. Chillon came out for his morning walk. She fired twice, killing him instantly. He wanted to prevent our happiness, and it was all his fault, Marie said when she was arrested.

Bankers' Chief From Irish Immigrant boy to president of the American Bankers' Association will be the career of William E. Knox, founded out at the meeting of the association in Chicago, September 28 to October 3. Knox now is vice president of the association and will succeed to the highest office. He is president of the Bowers Savings Bank, New York City.

CONSERVATIVE WINS IN B. C. BY-ELECTION Vote Result Leaves Liberals With Twenty-Four Out of Forty-Eight Seats. Vernon, B. C., Sept. 25.—With only two very small polls to hear from A. O. Cochrane, Conservative, leader, J. C. McDonald, Liberal, by 180 votes in yesterday's by-election in North Okanagan.

Swiss Landslide Takes Life Toll Bern, Switzerland, Sept. 25.—A landslide last night obliterated a large part of the mountain village of Somos, in the Tesin Canton crushing 12 houses into ruins and partially burying them. The destruction was increased by a wild mountain stream which overflowed because of the landslide and inundated part of the village. A number of inhabitants were killed or swept away. Thus far three bodies have been found.

Celebrate Jubilee Of Church Founding Kitchener, Ont., Sept. 25.—Members of the Presbyterian Synod of Toronto and Kingston, now in annual session, held a special service here last night to mark the jubilee of the founding of the Presbyterian Church in Canada. The chief address of the evening was delivered by Dr. Clarence MacKinnon of Halifax, moderator of the General Assembly.

Wire Briefs London, Sept. 25.—The Egyptian Premier, Said Zagloul Pasha, went to Downing street at 10.30 o'clock this morning to begin his conversations with Premier MacDonald regarding the status of the Sudan. Detroit, Sept. 25.—The freighter Clifton, overdue here from Sturgeon Bay, since Monday night, put in at Oscoda, on Lake Huron, on Monday night and left Tuesday forenoon, according to a telephone message today from that port. New York, Sept. 25.—(United Press).—The flappers here are a staunch friend in the Right Reverend T. F. Gallor, Episcopalian Bishop of Memphis, Tenn. On his return from England he said—"The girls of today are just as sweet and good as they were in any other century or any other time."

SEEK TO PROVE THAT LIQUOR TREATY WITH BRITAIN IS ILLEGAL Association Says Pact Means Loss of Business to U. S. Ships. ASK INJUNCTION Would Restrain Cunard Line From Bringing Liquor Into Ports. (By United Press). New York, Sept. 25.—Stung by the loss to American steamers of hundreds of passengers, who preferred to travel on the liquor-carrying ships of Britain, the Neptune Association, an organization of American deck officers, has filed a suit in the United States District Court here to test the constitutionality of the Liquor Treaty with Great Britain. The action requests the issuance of an injunction restraining the Cunard Steamship Company and the captain of seven of its liners from bringing liquor within the waters of the United States. Federal authorities are asked by this port regardless of the treaty with England, which it terms a violation of the eighteenth amendment and National Prohibition Law. Judge Winslow has set a hearing on the action for September 30.

CHICAGO YOUTHS LONG FOR FREEDOM Move to Release or Transfer Them From Joliet Reported Under Way. By H. H. ROBERTSON. (United Press Staff Correspondent). Chicago, Sept. 25.—Nathan F. Leo, Joliet, Ill., and Richard Loeb, murderers of Robert Frank, want to be free. With but 18 days of their life sentences served in Joliet, the two 19-year-old millionaires' sons, who so blithely confessed murdering a little boy for money and a thrill, have already initiated a move which they hope will at least result in their transfer to some institution besides the State Penitentiary at Joliet.

JAPS PROTEST U. S. WARSHIP'S ACTION Stopping of Hokurei Maru Complaint, But Incident is Denied. Tokyo, Sept. 25.—(United News).—Anti-American sentiment in Jingo groups here was exemplified when four members of the Takikoshi political group called at the American Embassy yesterday and declared that the rumored halting of the steamship Hokurei Maru by an American gunboat constituted an insult to Japan. The story of the halting of the ship, which has been denied, had been carried in the vernacular newspapers, which said that American warships stopped the Hokurei Maru for 30 minutes while firing blank charges during manoeuvres off the Foo on August 18. Jefferson Caffery, American chargé d'affaires here denied the story and referred the Takikoshi to the Foreign Office, which also denied the story. The Takikoshi retired when told that the reports were incorrect. It will be recalled that the Takikoshi group figured in an anti-American demonstration at the Hotel Imperial in June.

Free Glasses His Gift to N. Y. Pupils New York, Sept. 25.—Every public school pupil of the city who needs eyeglasses, but cannot afford to pay for them, will be provided both with the preliminary eye test and the glasses, free of charge, by Dr. Barnett Becker, wealthy optician. Dr. Becker said that for some time he has been testing the most appropriate way in which to show his gratitude for the opportunity found on coming here from Poland 20 years ago, a period during which he decided today to offer assistance to needy school children with defective eyes. The cost of the glasses would cost him about \$20,000.

FLOODS IN FRANCE HOLD UP TRAFFIC Loss of Life is Reported After Severe Storm Sweeps Country. Paris, Sept. 25.—A storm of cyclonic violence is raging in southeastern France, particularly in the departments of Vaucluse, Bouches du Rhone and Gard. The ancient city of Orange has been particularly hard hit, a deluge of rain flooding the railway station, washing out the track and cutting the main railway from Paris to Marseilles, while on the other bank of the Rhone a mile of track was washed away. A bridge collapsed during the passage of a locomotive. Two bodies were found in the debris and it was feared others also perished. The railroad workers were struck by lightning, and many thousands of travelers are stalled. In view of the seriousness of the situation, Minister of Public Works Peytral has gone to the scene.

AGREEMENT RUMOR DENIED BY ULSTER Deputy Premier Says Report Published is Not According to Fact. London, Sept. 25.—That an agreement had been reached between Premier Craig of Ulster and President Cosgrave of the Irish Free State on the already initiated a move which they hope will at least result in their transfer to some institution besides the State Penitentiary at Joliet. Simultaneous with the return from Joliet of Clarence S. Darrow, chief counsel, during the hearing before Judge Caverly, word reached the State's Attorney's office here that the two young prisoners had grown green of both boys are bruised and caloused, and they are not happy.

STOP COURT ACTION Peggy Joyce and Latest Husband Settle Their Marital Differences. New York, N. Y., Sept. 25.—Count and Countess Gonia Morner, the latter known professionally as Peggy Joyce, actress, have agreed to settle out of court their marital difficulties. Frank C. Delaney, attorney for Miss Joyce, announced last night. He said that a compact had been drawn up in which the court agrees to withdraw his suit for annulment of his marriage. Miss Joyce consents to withdraw her suit for separation.

Air Trip Across Pacific Planned Honolulu, Sept. 25.—Plans for a trans-Pacific flight by airplane from San Francisco to the Philippines and Australia, with several Pacific countries and the army and navy co-operating were announced here today by the Pan-Pacific Union. A visit might also be made to New Zealand. Each purpose of the flight will be to study the possible establishment of five or more permanent air lines linking countries bordering on the Pacific Ocean. Says Anglo-German Parleys Not Ended Berlin, Sept. 25.—The German foreign office issued a statement today explaining that the Anglo-German commercial negotiations had not broken down, as reported, but only had been postponed. They will be resumed shortly, the statement adds, with every prospect of a satisfactory conclusion. (Continued on page 2, column 5.)

RETAILERS WANT MANUFACTURERS TO CHANGE POLICY Pass Resolution Asking for Equalization in Treatment. DISCOUNTS Dominion Secretary Urges Merchants to Force Hand of Manufacturers. (By Times-Star Staff Correspondent). Montreal, Sept. 25.—A resolution giving to the Dominion executive of the Retail Merchants' Association authority to take action in a movement now on foot to force the manufacturers to bring about a change in their trading policy which would mean an equalization in their treatment of all retailers, was unanimously passed at this morning's session of the convention of the N. B. R. M. A. now being held here. E. M. Townson, Dominion secretary, in an address prior to the resolution, said some large retailers were receiving super-discounts which enabled them to undersell even the wholesaler. He urged the retailers and wholesalers to get together and force the hand of the manufacturers in this respect. If the manufacturer violated his contract with the wholesaler, he should be held to his part of the bargain by refusing to buy his goods. The whole underlying idea was that all should be treated alike. A. Macpherson of Montreal submitted a report of the Dominion meeting and R. A. Macaulay of St. John spoke on the "Buy at Home" campaign.

Her Slavery Ended A tale of modern slavery was unfolded in the Federal Court in Buffalo, N. Y., when Mrs. Maria Guatterl appeared against her husband and his second wife. The second wife had kept her prisoner behind barred doors in a little room above her husband's soft drink establishment. Mrs. Guatterl said. Only her two children (shown with her above) were allowed to visit her during six months. One day she dropped a note out the window. A pedestrian found it and turned it over to police. The husband, despite his first wife's willingness for a reunion, has been deported.

AGED U. S. SEA CAPTAIN IS DIRECTING ARTILLERY FORCES AGAINST SHANGHAI D. C. BESS (United Press Staff Correspondent). Copyright 1924, by The United Press. Shanghai, Sept. 24.—Lawrence Kearney, grizzled American sea captain and adventurer, is directing the artillery preparations of Chi Hsieh Yuan's armies before Shanghai, the United Press learned today. A hardened free-booter who has seen service in Canadian, Chilean and Chinese forces, and spent 40 years filibustering in the Orient. Kearney was organizing a Chinese branch of the Ku Klux Klan here three months ago. Driven from the city by the Ku Klux police, the American joined the forces at the outbreak of hostilities. He became military advisor to General Chi Hsieh Yuan. His was the genius that conceived the plan of using oil drums to roll the Kiangsu artillery across the rice paddies to positions from which the enemy positions could be shelled. For a week since the latest offensive spent itself, Kearney has been directing preparations for a new bombardment.

Loan To Germany Discussed in London London, Sept. 25.—Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, president of the German Reichsbank, is in London conferring with leading United States and British financiers regarding the proposed loan to Germany under the Dawes plan according to the Morrison Post, which says the deliberations are reported to be following a favorable course.

Weather Report Synopsis—The high pressure now centered in the St. Lawrence valley extends from the Mississippi to the Maritime Provinces, while over the middle Western States and Newfoundland there are important depressions. The weather has become much cooler in the western provinces. Forecasts: Fine: Local Frosts. Maritime—Fresh northwesterly winds, fine and cool today and Friday. Light local frosts tonight. Gulf and North Shore—Northwest winds, fine and cool today and on Friday. Northern New England—Fair tonight, heavy frost in interior; Friday fair, not much change in temperature, gentle north and east winds. Toronto, Sept. 25.—Temperatures: Highest during Stations 8 a.m. Yesterday night Victoria ... 42 58 52 Calgary ... 34 60 52 Edmonton ... 30 58 40 Winnipeg ... 44 76 44 Toronto ... 53 60 42 Montreal ... 44 54 34 St. John ... 52 56 40 Halifax ... 46 62 52 New York ... 58 64 52

Her Slavery Ended (Image of a woman and child)

AGED U. S. SEA CAPTAIN IS DIRECTING ARTILLERY FORCES AGAINST SHANGHAI (Image of a man in military uniform)

Loan To Germany Discussed in London (Image of a man in a suit)

STOP COURT ACTION (Image of a man in a suit)

Weather Report (Image of a weather map)

SIR DOUGLAS HAZEN TELLS OF MEETING WITH PLAINTIFF Says Mr. Hanson Denied Responsibility for Change in Decree. P. J. HUGHES CALLED Counsel for Plaintiff Takes Stand at Instance of Defence. (By Times-Star Staff Correspondent). Fredericton, Sept. 25.—Interest in the Hanson-Cleaner libel case was heightened today by the appearance of Chief Justice Sir Douglas Hazen as a witness. He testified that Mr. Hanson went to his room in the Barker House last February and declared he was not responsible for altering the Nevvers decree and, when told that Dr. Allen said he was getting old and liable to make a mistake. Other witnesses were called by counsel for the Cleaner to give evidence by which they claim they will establish the truth of the statements that Mr. Hanson after being consulted by one party in a court case became counsel for the other and that he advised setting a case during an election campaign in which he was a candidate, after having previously advised against a settlement. P. J. Hughes called. When the case was resumed this morning, W. P. Jones, K. C. for the defence, called P. J. Hughes, K. C. as his counsel for the plaintiff. He was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a horse. This was in 1918. Mr. Hughes was asked about a letter from Sillp & Hanson regarding the Merrifield-Camp matter. The letter was produced and shown that the legal firm was then acting for Merrifield. A letter from McLellan & Hughes was also submitted. It notified Merrifield that he would be withdrawing from the case. It was a claim of Camp Bros. for the loss of a