

COFFROTH YET SILENT ON OFFER FOR JEFFRIES-JOHNSON FIGHT

Says Battle Will Be on July 4—Bowling on the Boom in St. John—General Sporting News of Interest to Times Readers

(New York American.) Not a word as yet from Jim Coffroth, big mogul of the fight promoters, in regard to his offer for the Johnson-Jeffries championship battle. Coffroth insists, as he did the day he arrived in New York from California, that he hasn't given his mind to the business of the Ketchell and Johnson moving picture. Coffroth says yesterday: "I have been besieged by friends, scries, managers and fighters alike to make my intentions known in this matter. It has been proposed to me that I make a three-day fight carnival of an affair, if I had the best contest. It was suggested, and I'm a half bad idea, that in the event of my landing the greatest fight in history that I do as the New Orleans promoters did in the Corbett-Sullivan fight, hold a three day event and decide three great champion ships, the feather, light and heavy weight. Dixon, Skelly, Meyers, McAuliffe, Sullivan and Corbett might on that occasion. "I have as good material to work on as they did. Think of a three-day show with such stars as Abe Attell, Jim Driscoll, Battling Nelson, Puckey McFarland, Lew Powell, and then the big noise, Jeff and Jack. But this is all a suggestion, and nothing may come of it. The chances are that if I were lucky enough to get the Jeffries-Johnson contest, by the time it came around to fight week the heavy weight attraction would assume such importance that I would be literally swamped with business and would not have time to take care of the other fights. But say, there is no counting the chickens until they are hatched. The man who made in first place with his bid is the fellow to take upon how the thing should be played up.

"I have this to fall back upon, however, Jim Jeffries has said dozens of times that he would fight for a percentage that he would fight for me before all others. That, of course, has nothing to do with the present situation. He'd be a fool to fight before my club if I offered him \$50,000 and the other fellow came across with \$100,000. If by any chance there should come a hitch in the bidding, I feel that both men would lean toward me. Jeff fought his last four world title fights for me, and he drew down \$75,000 for his work. If we had had the picture held in those days I dare say he would have doubled his earnings. "Particularly would the Jim Corbett-Jeffries film be a great attraction. The fact that the fight was made less dramatic than the unfortunate end of "Steve" Ketchell, Corbett went down in the middle of the ring on his hands and knees, and I'll never would have seen even "orbit" if he could have seen the picture of himself trying to recover the wind that he had knocked out of him. "The big fight will come off on July 4, this almost sure. If some other fellow is luckier than I am, I will put on a boxing show for July 2. I might get Nelson and Powell, or the best lightweight then before the public. The officers now coming from Seattle are foolish. First off, there is an anti-labor law on the statute books of that section, and they are in such the same position as you are here in New York. Whatever light boxing they have had has been conducted while the authorities winked. The same in Portland. It would be as impossible for them to hold a heavy-weight championship fight as it would be for the local boys to hold one in Madison Square Garden.

"By the way, I may put Jim Driscoll and Abe Attell on Christmas Day for the featherweight championship. The fight will be as important as any I have closed. Crawford and me will work Harvey, if it is possible to get Driscoll to come by that time."

The second boxing entertainment under the management of the Redemptive Athletic Club, Montreal, will take place to night when Manager Crawford of Williamsport, Pa., will meet Al Greenwood of Pittsburg, in a fifteen round contest. Crawford has boxed a ten-round draw with Harry Lewis, and is looked upon as one of the coming middleweights.

Dave Deahler, the Cambridge lightweight, has changed managers and his interests in the future will be looked after by Aleck McLean. The latter believes that Deahler is good enough to meet the topnotchers in his class. He posted a forfeit and challenged Battling Nelson to box Deahler at 135 pounds, weight at 3 o'clock, Nelson is in Boston, and Manager McLean will talk the matter over with the latter.

THE WAY OUT

Change of Food Brought Success and Happiness. An ambitious but delicate girl, after failing to go through school on account of nervousness and hysteria, found in Grape-Nuts the only thing that seemed to build her up and furnish her the peace of health.

"From infancy," she says, "I have not been strong. Being ambitious to learn to do any work I finally got to the High School but soon had to abandon my studies on account of nervous prostration and hysteria. "My food did not agree with me. I was thin and dependent. I could not eat the simplest plain affair for fear it would constantly from nervousness in spite of all sorts of medicines. "This wretched condition continued until I was twenty-five, when I became interested in the letters of those who had cured like mine and who were cured by eating Grape-Nuts.

"I had little faith, but procured a box and after the first night I experienced a peculiar satisfied feeling that I had never gained from any ordinary food. I slept and rested better that night and in a few days began to grow stronger. "I had a new feeling of peace and restfulness. In a few weeks, to my great joy, my nervousness and hysteria left me and life became bright and hopeful. "I resumed my studies and later taught ten months with ease of course, using Grape-Nuts every day. It is now four years since I began to use Grape-Nuts, I am as mistress of a happy home and the old weakness has never returned. "Read the little book, 'The Road to Wellville,' in pkgs. 'There a Reason.' "Ever read the above letter? A new one appears from time to time. They are genuine, true, and full of human interest."

"INSURGENT" SENATORS CAUSING POLITICIANS ANXIOUS MOMENTS

Possibility of Democrats Capturing Control of the Washington Senate—Much Work Piling Up for Congress—Medical School Inspection—Foreigners Making Most of Opportunities

(By F. J. Dyer.) Washington, Nov. 7.—That this is the somnolent period in Washington, the season of "sweet doing nothing," that comes just before the capitol awakes to greet the rushing hosts of legislators and lobbyists, is attested by the editorial in the like news, and an item which at any other time would be scorned, is now received with respectful attention, and is probably for half a column or a column of space anxiously canvassed.

Will Democrats Rule Senate? This much by way of premise to explain why there is much commotion being given to the possibility that the Democrats may capture control of the senate. This is one way that they figure it out. The senate stands in this year of grace as a Republican, so far as the surface indications go. That is, there are sixty Republicans to thirty-five Democrats, giving the Republicans a majority of twenty-five to twenty-eight of the Republicans. It would take a big flop by fifteen Republicans to loosen the stranglehold on the senate possessed by the grand old party. Is this an impossible contingency? Let us see.

Some Phases of Local Situation AS TO HOCKEY The Stand of Fredericton and Moncton—Sackville Not Likely in N. B. League In commenting on certain views expressed by the sporting editor of the Fredericton Standard as to the future of hockey and baseball, in which opinion was expressed that hockey players might ignore the governing body, the Moncton Standard remarks tonight "it may be true and a writer would not be surprised to see such a movement, but very wisely indeed, the hockey players might prefer the example furnished by the ball-players, who at the end of the baseball season made frantic efforts to get re-elected for football. This M. P. A. A. Association is a body of men who are both the Moncton and Fredericton players would not be surprised, it might well follow the advice given them by particularly as they are about the places where there has been any hint of semi-professional hockey. They might as well expect to see a two-team league in the proposed New Brunswick League. The plan seems to be that Moncton should be ignored in the formation of the league. The plan seems to be that Moncton should be ignored in the formation of the league. The plan seems to be that Moncton should be ignored in the formation of the league.

SEVEN WARSHIPS TO START THE CANADIAN NAVY Bill to Provide This Will Be Introduced at Ottawa This Session—Cost Ten to Twelve Millions Ottawa, Nov. 8.—The bill which the government will bring down for the establishment of the Canadian navy will provide, it is understood, for the construction of three second class cruisers and four torpedo craft, either powerful torpedo boats or destroyers. These seven vessels will constitute the beginning of Canada's navy building. They will cost between \$10,000,000 and \$12,000,000 to put in commission and their upkeep will involve an annual expense of about \$3,000,000 a year.

HE HAPPENED TO SEE AN AD.

For D. D. D. Get a Trial Bottle, and is Cured of Eczema. Dear Sir, I was a sufferer for about two years with eczema on the legs and ankles. I tried three or four different doctors and none of them did me any good. I then went to a skin specialist and he told me to get a trial bottle of D. D. D. I had read the "Sunday World" and I happened to see your ad. I bought a bottle and it did me so much good I sent for a \$1.00 bottle and a case of soap. This is all healed and I don't think it will return. I have advised several others to use it and the results have been the same. (Signed) I. W. CORN. The results are the same in every case.—D. D. D. Prescription instantly soothes and relieves the itching and permanent cures Eczema and all kinds of skin diseases. If you are a sufferer why not try D. D. D. at once. For free sample bottle of D. D. D. Prescription write to the D. D. D. Laboratory, Department 37, 39 Levee St., Toronto. For sale by all druggists.

WEDDINGS Fanjoo-Thorne. The home of George Watson, 236 City Road, was last night the scene of a very interesting event when Stanley W. Fanjoo and Miss Retic L. Thorne, both of Johnston, Queens county, were united in marriage by Rev. Wellington Camp, pastor of Leinster street church. Mr. and Mrs. Fanjoo will reside in this city.

VITAL TABLETS The Great Brain and Nerve Food. Cure Tired Brain, Strengthen the Nerves, Purify the Blood, Cure Rheumatism and all other ailments. More golden than the gold of the East. That fairy islands can unfold—You twice as fast as the East and sing in mystic, maddening murmuring. Tell me, most marvelous, Mr. and Mrs. How much is that, and how much profit?—Chancellor Leffer.

For sale at all drug stores or by mail from the Scobell Drug Co., St. Catharines, Ont.

THE world's foremost scientists have proclaimed that the heavy, black soil of the Western Canada plains is the richest in the constituents or qualities required to produce the highest grade of wheat in the world.

Operating 74 Elevators in the "Heart" of the Choicest Wheat Districts we get the First Pick of Western Crop. The flour produced from this "choicest" wheat is the finest, most nutritious and has the greatest strength. You procure the highest quality of flour in the world when you buy PURITY FLOUR. Western Canada Flour Mills Co. Limited. "MORE BREAD AND BETTER BREAD."

GRAND NEWS FOR WOMEN

Mrs. E. P. Richards Tells How Dodd's Kidney Pills Cured Her. After suffering for twenty-eight years from Pains and Weakness and Sleeplessness—Dodd's Kidney Pills the Only Medicine She Wants. Cottle's Cove, Notre Dame Bay, Nfld., Nov. 8.—(Special)—Grand news for suffering women is that being gathered broadcast by Mrs. Elizabeth P. Richards of this place. For years she suffered from agonizing kidney trouble and those agonizing pains many women who have found relief in Dodd's Kidney Pills and she wants all suffering women to know it. For twenty-eight years she has been out of the hospital except for a few minutes at a time. My back ached so I could not get up and I tried all kinds of medicine but it did not come to the relief that there was no cure for me when reading advertisements led me to try Dodd's Kidney Pills. I got well and rise refreshed every morning. Dodd's Kidney Pills are all the medicine I want. The woman who has healthy kidneys will never know the pains and weakness that make the hardy work living. Dodd's Kidney Pills always make healthy kidneys.

CITIZENS ASK RETIRING ALLOWANCE FOR SECY MANNING At the meeting of the board of school trustees last night a petition was presented through the chairman signed by more than 200 prominent citizens asking that a retiring allowance be granted to the secretary, Edward Manning, who has severed his connection with the board about January 1st. The document was referred to a special meeting of the board to be held on an early date. The chairman brought up the question of establishing a night school, which was left with the chairman and Dr. Bridges. There is a Victoria school was discussed. It was admitted the sanitation was old fashioned and should be improved, but nothing was decided on as it was claimed that the board had no money for the work. Those present, besides the chairman, A. B. Zinn and Messrs. Smith, Russell, Day, Nasse, Dr. Bridges and Trust Officer McManis, were referred to a meeting in connection with a retaining wall around the Winter street area. He said that if the lot was left as it is the fuel room and lavatory would fill with water. It will have to be attended to sooner or later, it would cost more and there would be a continued risk.

OVERVALUED THE DOG

Sometimes humorous incidents are concealed in the dry and formal reports of government departments. A short paragraph in the recent rulings of the Inter-departmental Commission tells how the owner of a dog was "bitten" by the anxiety of his agent to make it appear to the shipper that it was a valuable animal when, in fact, it was only one of the common curs whose name is not registered in the blue book of shipment. This particular dog was offered to the express company for shipment, and a valuation of \$600 was placed on it. At that valuation the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping charge would have been \$2. Query: Could the express company except the revised valuation, the company being responsible for its safe transportation, a charge of \$45 was made to transfer the animal safely to the consignee, who, however, declined to pay the charges on the ground that the total value of the dog was not more than \$15, on which valuation the shipping