

PUGSLEY ANSWERS RECENT ATTACKS

Deals With Telegram Sent from St. John to Toronto Paper

Minister of Public Works Says It Was Work of a Paid Slanderer—Bills for Legal Services and the Central Railway Discussed—The Proposed Arbitration.

Ottawa, Sept. 27.—To the Editor of The Telegraph:—Sir—My attention has been called to a telegram from St. John, dated the twenty-fifth instant, to the Mail and Empire, relating to my account with the province of New Brunswick, which bears upon its face such evident proof of having been deliberately sent out at the present stage of the campaign for the purpose of injuring me that I presume it has been also sent to other Conservative papers throughout Canada.

While I do not ordinarily note what is said in the newspapers regarding myself, yet this goes so far beyond what has heretofore been said and is so grossly false, that I feel it my duty to refer to it in this public manner. The telegram gives unmistakable evidence that a most accomplished, unscrupulous and untruthful partisan political writer has again appeared in St. John in the person of the former editor of one of the newspapers of that city, but lately employed at Ottawa as correspondent and political editor of the Tory press of Canada.

The telegram referred to is a tissue of falsehoods and of vile and slanderous insinuations from beginning to end. It states that discoveries have been made which have led Premier Hazen to charge that during my term of office I drew from the treasury over \$40,000 for alleged legal services. So far from this being the case, in all the discussions which have taken place in the legislature, which have been referred to in the telegram, while this investigation was started with the hope of clearing up the matter, I have not been able to find a single instance in which I have been charged with having drawn from the treasury for legal services. On the contrary, I have been charged with having paid out of my pocket for legal services, and this has been done in the most open and public manner.

The business of the railway is rapidly increasing and will prove a valuable asset, at the same time opening up rich and practically inexhaustible oil areas.

WILLIAM PUGSLEY.

SUSSEX FAIR A GREAT SUCCESS

Finest Cattle in Canada Exhibited, Say Judges

Sussex, Sept. 25.—The closing day of the Sussex fair was greeted with ideal weather, in fact the weather throughout the week has been all that could be desired. The management is well pleased with the exhibits, attendance and things in general. The attendance at the close of yesterday was 800 in advance of previous years, today's attendance was fair, about the same as closing day of 1906.

The stock parade on the race track this morning was witnessed by a fair crowd, and was indeed a sight worth seeing. The procession was headed by a beautiful four-year-old horse of H. Montgomery Campbell (president of the society), with his little daughter, Florence, on its back, followed by the remainder of show horses, then the cattle procession, nearly a mile long.

Doctor Standish, of Walkerton, Ont., was judge of horses. The doctor was judge of horses here in 1906. In his remarks he said he noticed a marked improvement in the horses.

W. F. Stevens, of Huntingdon, Que., and Thos. Drysdale, of Allans Corners, Que., were judges of cattle. Mr. Stevens and Drysdale, in their remarks on the cattle show, said that outside of Robert Nees, of Howick (Que.), who imports stock direct from Scotland, Kings county produced the best stock they had seen, and was equal to any exhibit in Canada.

Prize List.

Horses, Driving.

Stallion, 4 years and upwards—1, Ora P. King; 2, Hugh R. McMonagle.

Stallion, 1 year and upwards—Hugh R. McMonagle; 2, J. J. Haslem.

Gelding, 3 years old and upwards—1, McIntyre Bros.; 2, Ora P. King.

Filly, 3 years old and upwards—1, S. J. Goodhue; 2, S. J. Goodhue.

Gelding, 1 year old and upwards—1, H. M. Campbell; 2, S. J. Goodhue.

Horses, Saddle.

Filly, 1 year old and upwards—1, H. M. Campbell; 2, Wm. Creighton; 3, Thos. Bradley.

Spring colt—1, Ora P. King; 2, E. De Blos Bailey; 3, J. J. Haslem; 4, Holmes.

Spring filly—1, H. M. Campbell; 2, Ora P. King; 3, Wm. Creighton; 4, Andrew Forsyth.

Blood mare with foal by side—1, Wm. Creighton; 2, H. M. Campbell; 3, Ora P. King; 4, J. J. Haslem.

Mare to carriage—1, Hugh R. McMonagle; 2, Sam Hannah; 3, H. M. Campbell.

Gelding to carriage—1, Ed. Connelley; 2, S. H. White; 3, Ora P. King.

Matched pair to carriage—1, J. E. McAuley.

Special Prizes.

Best spring foal after society horse—"Dracula"—1, H. M. Campbell; 2, Ora P. King.

Stallion and 3 of his get—1, Ora P. King.

General Purpose.

Stallion 4 years up—1, Hugh R. McMonagle.

Gelding 3 years up—1, H. M. Campbell.

Filly 3 years up—1, Geo. Whalen.

Gelding 2 years up—1, McIntyre Bros.; 2, J. J. Haslem.

Filly 1 year up—1, Jas. E. Quirk.

Filly 1 year up—1, W. T. Chow; 2, Geo. E. Hornbrook.

Spring colt—1, Harvey Parlee; 2, Arthur Bower; 3, W. J. Patterson.

Spring filly—1, O. R. Roach; 2, S. J. Goodhue.

Mare to carriage—1, Ekanah Hall; 2, Geo. Whalen; 3, W. T. Chow; 4, H. M. Campbell.

Gelding to carriage—1, H. M. Campbell; 2, J. C. H. Benson; 3, E. Hall; 4, W. F. Master.

Team—1, Thos. J. Friars; 2, Wm. Jamieson; 3, McIntyre Bros.

Special Prizes.

H. M. Campbell Cup—1, H. M. Campbell.

Geo. B. Jones, Special.

Won by R. W. Menzie.

Heavy Draught.

Stallion 4 years up—1, R. W. Menzie; 2, Rodgerie Horse Co.

Geo. B. Jones Special Prize—1, R. W. Menzie.

Saddle Horses.

Gelding or mare—1, McIntyre Bros.; 2, Charles Bower; 3, Ora Hayes.

Horticulture.

Squash, marrow—1, Rev. Frank Baird; 2, Wm. J. Patterson; 3, W. J. Patterson.

Squash, Hubbard—1, W. C. Arnold; 2, W. J. Patterson; 3, W. J. Patterson.

Squash, other varieties—1, W. C. Arnold; 2, W. J. Patterson; 3, W. J. Patterson.

Pumpkins—1, W. G. Asbell; 2, J. F. Waller; 3, H. T. Hayes.

Cucumbers—1, Charles Bower; 2, F. G. Lansdowne; 3, Ora Hayes.

Cabbage, white, three large—1, H. T. Hayes; 2, McIntyre Bros.

Cabbage, white, three small—1, McIntyre Bros.; 2, W. J. Patterson; 3, F. G. Lansdowne.

Cabbage, red, three—1, H. T. Hayes; 2, John H. King; 3, McIntyre Bros.

Celery, white plume—1, F. G. Lansdowne; 2, Ora Hayes.

Tomatoes, ripe—1, Ora Hayes.

Tomatoes, green—1, Ora Hayes; 2, Byron McLeod; 3, W. J. King.

Onions—1, Danvers Green—1, H. T. Hayes; 2, Ora Hayes; 3, Charles Bower.

Onions, Red Weatherfield—1, J. T. Hayes; 2, Ora Hayes; 3, Charles Bower.

Melons—1, H. T. Hayes; 2, Ora Hayes; 3, W. C. Arnold.

Corn, common—1, Charles Bower; 2, W. J. Patterson; 3, McIntyre Bros.

Cauliflower, three—1, F. G. Lansdowne.

Beets, long—1, H. T. Hayes; 2, Ora Hayes; 3, W. J. Patterson.

Beets, turnip—1, McIntyre Bros.; 2, Charles Bower; 3, W. J. Patterson.

Collection from school plots—1, Sussex; 2, Kingston.

Parsnips—1, Ora Hayes; 2, J. E. McAuley; 3, McIntyre Bros.

Long red—1, McIntyre Bros.; 2, Hugh R. McMonagle; 3, Ora Hayes.

Carrots, short red—1, McIntyre Bros.; 2, Chas. Bower; 3, Ora Hayes.

Carrots, long white, McIntyre Bros.; 2, Ora Hayes.

Carrots, short white—1, H. T. Hayes.

Turnips, Sweden—1, McIntyre Bros.; 2, S. J. Goodhue; 3, Wm. Jamieson.

Turnips—Aberdeen—1, E. Hall; 2, McIntyre Bros.

Greystone—1, J. E. McAuley; 2, McIntyre Bros.; 3, S. J. Goodhue.

Turnips, any other variety—1, Hugh McIlroy; 2, Wm. Buchanan; 3, E. Hall.

Mangold Wurtzel, globe—1, Wm. J. Patterson; 2, Ora Hayes; 3, McIntyre Bros.

Mangold Wurtzel, long—1, Ora Hayes; 2, McIntyre Bros.

Sugar Beet—1, Ora Hayes; 2, McIntyre Bros.; 3, Wm. J. Patterson.

Assorted roots—1, McIntyre Bros.; 2, Ora Hayes; 3, Wm. J. Patterson.

Special prize given by Sussex Mercantile Club—1, McIntyre Bros.; 2, Wm. J. Patterson; 3, D. H. McNutt; 4, McIntyre Bros.

Potatoes.

Rose of the North—1, Wm. J. Patterson; 2, J. E. McAuley.

Green Mountains—1, E. Hall; 2, Harvey Parlee.

Beauty of Hebron—1, Wm. J. Patterson; 2, McIntyre Bros.; 3, H. T. Hayes.

Queen—1, McIntyre Bros.; 2, H. T. Hayes.

Coppers—1, W. T. Chow; 2, McIntyre Bros.; 3, Wm. J. Patterson.

Empire State—1, 2, F. G. Lansdowne.

American Wonder—1, McIntyre Bros.; 2, Wm. J. Patterson; 3, H. T. Hayes.

Freeman—1, E. Hall; 2, Harvey Parlee.

Early Harvest—1, Wm. J. Patterson.

Carmen No. 1—1, Wm. J. Patterson; 2, Wm. J. Patterson; 3, H. T. Hayes.

Delaware—1, Wm. Buchanan; 2, H. M. Campbell.

Dakota Eye or Snowflake—1, H. T. Hayes; 2, J. E. McAuley.

Parkhurst Prize—1, Wm. J. Patterson; 2, John W. Patterson.

Any other variety—1, Wm. J. Patterson; 2, McIntyre Bros.; 3, Chas. Bower.

Fruit Class.

Apples, assortment—1, H. N. Arnold; 2, Jessie T. Prescott.

Apples, Wealthy—1, J. T. Prescott; 2, Wm. J. Patterson; 3, H. T. Hayes.

Apples, Fameuse—1, H. N. Arnold; 2, F. G. Lansdowne; 3, W. C. Arnold.

Apples, Ben Davis—1, Wm. J. Patterson; 2, McIntyre Bros.; 3, W. J. Patterson.

Apples, New Brunswick—1, W. C. Arnold; 2, Byron McLeod; 3, F. G. Lansdowne.

Apples, Alexander—1, John W. Patterson; 2, H. T. Hayes; 3, F. G. Lansdowne.

Apples, Yellow Transparent—1, H. T. Hayes; 2, W. J. Patterson; 3, H. N. Arnold.

Apples, Golden Russet—1, H. T. Hayes; 2, W. J. Patterson; 3, H. N. Arnold.

Apples, Northern Spy—1, F. G. Lansdowne; 2, W. J. Patterson; 3, W. J. Patterson.

Plums—only one entry—1, E. Quirk.

Apples, Wolfe Winter—1, W. J. Patterson.

Apples, Bishop Pippin—1, Ora Hayes.

Apples, Harrow—1, McIntyre Bros.; 2, McIntyre Bros.; 3, W. J. Patterson.

Mrs. W. J. King.

Assortment pickles—1, Mrs. J. E. McAuley; 2, Mrs. W. J. King.

Wheat, white, one bushel—1, H. T. Hayes; 2, J. E. McAuley; 3, McIntyre Bros.

Wheat, red, one bushel—1, Ora Hayes; 2, W. J. Patterson; 3, Wm. Jamieson.

Oats, white, Banner—1, William Jamieson; 2, W. J. Patterson; 3, Harvey Parlee.

Oats, white, any variety—1, W. F. Moher; 2, Charles Bower; 3, McIntyre Bros.

Oats, black—1, E. Hall; 2, McIntyre Bros.

Oats, two-rowed—1, McIntyre Bros.; 2, McIntyre Bros.; 3, Wm. J. Patterson.

Barley, six-rowed—1, Wm. J. King; 2, McIntyre Bros.; 3, W. J. Patterson.

Buckwheat, smooth—1, Harvey Parlee; 2, W. J. Patterson.

Buckwheat, rough—1, John H. King; 2, W. C. Arnold; 3, McIntyre Bros.

J. J. Haslem.

Field peas—1, W. J. King.

Beans, white—1, Wm. Jamieson; 2, Beans, colored—1, Chas. Bower; 2, W. J. Patterson; 3, Ora Hayes.

Three stock corn—1, McIntyre Bros.; 2, W. J. Patterson; 3, James Doherty.

Three stock flint corn—1, F. G. Lansdowne; 2, McIntyre Bros.; 3, McIntyre Bros.

Sheaf of wheat, white—1, Ora Hayes; 2, McIntyre Bros.

Sheaf of wheat, red—1, W. J. Patterson; 2, McIntyre Bros.

Sheaf of oats, white—1, McIntyre Bros.; 2, McIntyre Bros.; 3, Ora Hayes.

Sheaf of oats, black—1, McIntyre Bros.; 2, McIntyre Bros.; 3, Ora Hayes.

Sheaf of barley, two-rowed—1, Harvey Parlee; 2, McIntyre Bros.; 3, Wm. J. Patterson.

Sheaf of barley, six-rowed—1, Wm. J. King; 2, Wm. J. Patterson; 3, McIntyre Bros.

Assorted filled grain—1, McIntyre Bros.; 2, Wm. J. Patterson; 3, Chas. Bower.

Dairy Class.

Butter, tub or crock—1, Wm. J. King; 2, John H. King; 3, J. E. McAuley; 4, Byron McLeod.

Butter, rolls or prints—1, Wm. J. King; 2, E. Hall; 3, John H. King; 4, J. E. McAuley; 5, Byron McLeod.

The dairy entries were small considering the fair being held in the midst of dairy district. Of the two entries of butter and prints two seconds and two thirds were given.

Special prize given by Maritime Public Co. for best print butter—1, Wm. J. King; 2, E. Hall.

Art.

Sketch from nature—1, Katherine Kirk; 2, Miss Mary Allison.

Animal drawing—1, Dorothy Buchanan; 2, Miss Mary Allison.

Figure drawing—1, Mrs. J. Everett Keith; 2, Miss Mary Allison.

Figure drawing from life—1, Dorothy Buchanan.

Assort. drawings—1, Dorothy Buchanan.

Oil painting—1, Miss Mary Allison; 2, Miss Jean Langstaff.

Oil painting collection—1, Miss Lottie Maggs; 2, Katherine Kirk.

Painting drawing (children)—1, Miss Mary Allison; 2, Miss Grace O'Dell.

School Competition—Pennmanship.

Competition by grades 1, 2 and 3 of town and village schools and grades 1 and 2 of county schools—1, Helen White, Sussex; 2, Violet Nash, Lime Hill; 3, Evelyn E. Saunders, Kingston.

Competition by grades 1, 5 and 6 of town and village schools and 3 and 4 of county schools—1, Agnes Wilson, Bloomfield; 2, Bessie Russell, Sussex; 3, Vera Ganong, Snider Mountain.

Competition by grades 1, 2 and 3 of town and village schools—1, A. M. Ricker, Hatfield's Point; 2, Cecil McEwen, Sussex; 3, Talmage Case, Hatfield's Point.

Competition by grades 4, 5 and 6 of town and village schools and grades 3 and 4 of county schools—1, A. C. Langstroth, Kingston; 2, Alta Parlee, Parleville; 3, Laura Crawford, Kingston.

Competition by grades 7 and 8 of town and village schools and 5 and 6 of county schools—1, Mary Allison, Sussex; 2, Zeta Williams, Bloomfield; 3, Milton Gregg, Snider Mountain.

The judges were: T. B. Kidner and M. C. Eveleigh.

The bean guessing contest run by the Rambler Hockey Club in the main building of the exhibition, was a success. The Morris chair, which they offered for the nearest guess of how many beans in a jar was won by Wm. D. Golding, who made two guesses, 7,654 and 7,656, and the actual count was 7,655.

The salvage corps also had a guessing contest of how many links in a chain, and the prize, a Morris chair, was won by Miss Jean Manchester, of a police constable, who guessed the actual number of links, 1,106.

Sussex, Sept. 26.—Manager S. J. Goodhue expressed himself this evening as being well pleased with the results of the Sussex fair and wishes to thank his staff for their valuable assistance. The restaurant in the main building run by the management was a grand success. In former years this restaurant has been handled by the different churches.

A comparative statement as below shows the gradual increase since the exhibitions were inaugurated in Sussex, the attendance for the different years being—

1906.....4,000
1907.....4,722
1908.....5,674
1909.....5,698
1910.....5,926
1911.....6,529
1912.....6,404
1913.....7,412

W. E. McIntyre Found Guilty at Woodstock

Woodstock, N. B., Sept. 25.—The case against the St. John liquor dealers, before Magistrate Dibble, dragged along all day. W. P. Jones appeared for the prosecution and J. B. M. Baxter and J. C. Hartley for the defence. Fred Blair, Wm. M. Collins and others gave evidence.

W. E. McIntyre sworn, said that he resided in St. John, was president of the company formerly known as McIntyre & Co., and had no knowledge of the shipment of liquor to Carleton county. He had no understanding or made no arrangement by which his eyes were shut as to where the liquor was going. The order for liquor came from Houlton, Maine. His directions were simply to ship the liquor to Carleton county. He believed that the liquor was destined for Maine. He was president and held about all the shares in the company. Ceneau was not now in the company. He has refused orders for shipment to counties under the Scott Act.

Mr. Baxter, addressing his honor, said that Mr. McIntyre did not violate the law. He did not wish to argue the case fully as he did not expect it to go before the supreme court, for his clients have no difficulty in finding for the defendant. According to the law it must be proved that McIntyre shipped the goods himself or by a person who was acting under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre is a smuggler. He has no right to get his liquor by transit through Carleton Co. It is for the prosecution to show that the goods were shipped by McIntyre or by a person under his charge; this had not been proved. He certainly did not violate the law. He admitted that he did ship the goods but he might have violated the United States law. There is nothing to connect the shipment with McIntyre. It is nonsense to say that McIntyre