

The first duty of a man is to speak, that is his chief business in this world.

THE CHARLOTTETOWN GUARDIAN The People's Paper Read by Everybody

Covers Prince Edward Island Like the Dew

CHARLOTTETOWN, CANADA, THURSDAY, JANUARY 27, 1927

All speech, written or spoken, is a dead language until it finds a willing and prepared hearer.

Annual Subscriptions Delivered \$5.00 By Mail, Canada and U. S. A. \$4.50

Morning Guardian, Founded 1887 Charlottetown Guardian Two Cents

NATIONALIST TROOPS CONCENTRATING FOR AN ATTACK ON SHANGHAI

British Forces Hurrying to China to Protect British Life and Property - It is Feared the Landing of Punjabi Troops Will Incite the Nationalists to Fresh Outbreaks - London Thinks Peace Proposals Will Bring Order Out of Chaos.

(Canadian Press) SHANGHAI, Jan. 26.—Heavy concentration of Cantonese (Nationalist) government troops which is reported on the Chekiang Province front has caused apprehension in Shanghai. Nationalists interpret the concentration as part of a supreme effort to be made by the Cantonese to capture Shanghai before the majority of the British expeditionary force of 20,000 soldiers and sailors arrive at the end of February.

It is also feared that the landing of Punjabi troops tomorrow from Hong Kong will provide the match that will light a new anti-foreign, especially anti-British, conflagration in the provinces held by the Nationalists, which include about half of all China.

In view of the danger and the threat that the nationalists will overrun Chekiang and Kiangsu province in the latter of which Shanghai is situated, the possible necessity of evacuating American women and children from these provinces is under careful consideration.

British Forces Converging on China LONDON, Jan. 26.—British land and naval forces are converging on China as a demonstration of readiness to protect British life and property should they be placed in jeopardy through belligerent acts by the Chinese.

When the fighting ships ordered to proceed to Chinese waters from the various naval bases of the British fleet in the East Indies and the Mediterranean, join the warships already on the scene, there will be assembled the most impressive fleet of British fighting units in foreign waters since the Armistice ended the great war in 1918.

Estimates of the total number of effectives which will be ready for eventualities both on land and sea, place them at between 19,000 to 21,000.

Peace Negotiations LONDON, Jan. 26.—Definite proposals which British official circles hope will bring order out of the chaos in China have been made by Mr. O'Malley, British charge d'affaires, to Eugene Chen, cantonese foreign minister with whom he has been in conference at Hankow.

The proposals would give effect to the points outlined by Sir Austen Chamberlain, foreign secretary, in his recent memorandum. They pertain to certain guarantees and assurances which the British government is anxious to have regarding the British concessions and holdings throughout China.

Fear, Cantonese Attack SHANGHAI, Jan. 26.—Apprehension was felt today that this chief commercial city of the far east and home of many thousands of white foreigners would be attacked in the near future by the Cantonese invading troops.

A new wave of anti-foreign agitation and violence is expected to roll over the Yangtze river basin, from which hundreds of foreigners were ousted in recent weeks, notably in the cities of Hankow and Kukiang when their concessions were taken over by the Cantonese after mob attacks.

The Cantonese or Nationalist government troops are reported forming in heavy force in northern Chekiang province, approximately 100 miles from Shanghai, they intend, it is believed, to attempt to capture Shanghai before the main body of British troops arrive here late in February.

The British, 20,000 strong of both the army and the navy, have been ordered to Shanghai from England and elsewhere with ships of war in large numbers.

Ten Chinese were executed for the mob violence in Foochow after the Cantonese had arrested 200 charged with being implicated in it. Small disorders continue in towns up the Yangtze river but some encouragement was felt when British and American business men returned to their vocations in Hankow.

Race for Shanghai LONDON, Jan. 26.—The race for Shanghai, prize city of the Orient, is on between the British army and navy and the Chinese nationalists. The Cantonese conquest of the great international settlement at the mouth of the Yangtze where 40,000 foreigners reside and many foreign refugees from all parts of China are now gathered and where the immense foreign trade interests of China are centered, must be accomplished within six weeks if the Cantonese are to avoid dealing with the British defense force of 20,000 men, who are hurriedly leaving or will soon leave English ports Malta and India.

It is repeatedly emphasized by the British foreign office, however, that there will be no clash between the British and Cantonese unless British lives and property in Shanghai are endangered. The British defence force will make an effort to prevent the Cantonese from entering and occupying the City of Shanghai if strong enough to do so.

The Foreign Office maintains that the emphasis given by the press to the precautionary measures distorts the whole picture of the Chinese problem confronting the country. It is alleged that it will take a month to six weeks to move the British troops to Shanghai. The precautionary steps therefore must be earlier than by other countries such as Japan, which is only a few days steaming from Shanghai, and the United States, which dispatches troops from the Philippines.

Lieut. General, Sir Philip Chetwood, commander in chief at Aldershot, in saying farewell to the troops departing for China today said: "There is no state of war in China and won't be if we can prevent it. You are going to protect property we hold by treaty. Keep your temper smilingly."

CANADA'S TOTAL WHEAT YIELD

The Production Last Year Estimated at 406,269,000 Bushels. OTTAWA, Jan. 26.—Canada's total yield of wheat for the year 1926 is estimated at 406,269,000 bushels from 22,768,449 acres, as compared with 411,375,700 bushels from 21,972,732 acres in 1925 and with 386,564,525 bushels from 22,084,320 acres the annual averages for the four years 1922-25.

The total for 1926, it is announced in a crop report issued late this afternoon by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, comprises 22,442,000 bushels from 880,154 acres of fall wheat and 383,827,000 bushels from 21,888,295 acres of spring wheat.

Finds No Evidence Of a Rebellion MEXICO CITY, Jan. 26.—General Alejandro Mango, military commander, who has just returned from the state of Jalisco is quoted in a despatch from Tepic printed by El Universal Grafic, as declaring "wholly false" the reports that Archbishop Croco Y Jimenez of Guadalajara is at the head of a rebel army or has risen in arms against the government.

General Mango, the despatch adds, asserted that he had not found any Catholic army and had not found anything to fight except groups of bandits, some of them calling themselves bandits.

Montreal Doctor Wins High Honor

(Special to The Guardian) PARIS, Jan. 26.—Before returning on the steamer Paris to New York, on his way home to Montreal Dr. Arthur Rousseau, Dean of the Faculty of Medicine at Laval University, was officially notified that he had been elected corresponding member by 53 votes in 56 of the Academy of Medicine of Paris.

Dr. Rousseau was selected in place of three other noted medical men, Doctors Long of Geneva; Petran of Sweden; and Jatowski of Warsaw, Poland.

Resigns As Chief Of General Staff

(Canadian Press) OTTAWA, Jan. 26.—The resignation of Major General J. H. MacBrien, C. B., C.M.G., D. S. O., Canadian general staff will take effect almost immediately, it was learned here this afternoon.

When interviewed General MacBrien said that he had no definite plans.

"Do you care to give any reason for your resignation?" he was asked.

"There are reasons," he replied, "but I do not care to give them just now."

OTTAWA, Ont., Jan. 26.—The Minister of Defence, Colonel the Hon. J. L. Ralston, declined to comment tonight on the resignation of Major General J. H. MacBrien from the post of chief of staff of the Canadian militia.

It is understood that the matter will come up before the cabinet very soon.

Wins Dog Derby

(Canadian Press) THE PAS, Man., Jan. 26.—Emil St. Goddard repeated his performance of Tuesday and finished first in the second days racing of The Pas Dog Derby today.

200 DEATHS FROM 'FLU IN LONDON

Prevalence of Disease In England and Wales is Noted in League of Nations Bulletin. (Canadian Press) LONDON, Jan. 26.—Nearly 200 deaths from influenza in London corded with the authorities. In during the last week have been reported from the poorer districts of the city people had to stand in line to obtain death certificates.

Reports to the Minister of Health show that 470 persons died from the disease last week in the 105 largest towns outside London.

During the last five weeks there have been 500 more deaths from influenza than for the corresponding period last year.

GENEVA, Switzerland, Jan. 26.—Widespread prevalence of the influenza in England and Wales is noted in a bulletin issued today by the health section of the League of Nations. The epidemic is continuing in Denmark, the Netherlands, and Switzerland, increasing in Bulgaria and diminishing in Spain.

Coolidge Rejects Nationalist Demands

(Special to The Guardian) WASHINGTON, Jan. 26.—President Coolidge has rejected the Chinese nationalist demands for immediate treaty equality despite the grave anti-foreign movement menacing American lives and property in China. His decision will be outlined in an official state department memorandum to be made public here and abroad tomorrow.

The memorandum will express the sympathy of the government with Chinese aspirations and will commit the United States to revision of the so-called unequal treaties as soon as a stable representative Chinese government is able to negotiate.

The memorandum will insist that abrogation of extra territorial treaty privileges under which American troops are maintained in China be by gradual and progressive steps rather than by immediate and complete change.

Settlement Of Wage Dispute

(Canadian Press) MONTREAL, Que., Jan. 26.—Settlement of the wage dispute involving 30,000 rail shippers on nine Canadian Railways, was announced here today by the Railway Association of Canada.

The men asked 10 cents an hour increase. Settlement was effected on a basis of increases between two and four cents an hour.

The agreement is the result of negotiations which have been proceeding for some months between the Railway Association of Canada and division No. 4 railway employees in railway shop trade. The revision of certain working conditions was also effected.

Chief of Staff Kept Busy Answering 'Phone Calls

(Special to The Guardian) OTTAWA, Ont., Jan. 26.—As a result of despatches appearing in morning papers, suggesting the probable participation by Canada of war which may occur with China the telephone bell of Major-General MacBrien, chief of the general staff, rang constantly all morning.

The militia officers, ex-service men and others assured him that if their services were needed they would be at once forthcoming. Numerous telegrams were also received.

The offers were promised consideration when the approximate time arrived, if it ever did.

Pope's Order Does Not Affect Canada

(Canadian Press) TORONTO, Jan. 26.—The action of the Pope in ordering the dissolution of all Catholic boy Scout organizations in Italian cities under 20,000 population, will have no effect on the Catholic boy Scouts movement in Canada. This assurance was given by Rev. Father A. E. Noon of St. Peter's Roman Catholic Church here today.

GUILTY WITH A STRONG RECOMMENDATION FOR MERCY

Was the Verdict Brought in Yesterday by the Jury on the Manslaughter Case. Addresses of the Chief Justice and the Attorney General.

The trial of Dennis Peters and Louis McCoubrey charged with manslaughter in connection with the death of George Roberts and Albert Youland concluded yesterday afternoon.

The jury retired at 12.30 to consider a verdict and returned at 2.30 with the verdict of guilty with a strong recommendation of mercy.

Shortly after the morning's session opened Attorney-General Stewart addressed the jury:

The Attorney General's Address. In addressing the jury on behalf of the Crown, Attorney-General Stewart said he could not do better than to follow the example of his learned friend and compliment the jury who had so closely followed the case.

He thought it would be a serious injustice were he to prolong the case or keep you longer than necessary. A great many things were not necessary to be considered in arriving at a verdict. Now was the proper time for the Crown to "sift the chaff from the wheat."

He thought that what may be disregarded in the present case is the fact that I have no client. The Crown represents the people of the whole province. Counsel for the defence is different he must do all in his power to see his client freed. My learned friend in his excellent address, pleaded for mercy, and spoke of forgiving. It is not within our province to forgive. You have only one duty according to your oath—to return a verdict according to the evidence.

In considering the charge we must consider first with what intent the prisoners charged; second, what evidence is there to support the charge. Now I wish first to consider the charge. Under British justice every man is considered innocent until he is proven guilty. The Court will instruct you as to the law. The word "manslaughter" has rather a sinister meaning. But that is not for you to consider. (Here the Attorney General explained the meaning of manslaughter, etc. and quoted extracts from the Criminal Code.)

Through carelessness or negligence he is killed that is "manslaughter." What you have to consider is there evidence before you to show the deaths of Youland and Roberts was caused by violation of some law or through negligence which could have been avoided. If you are found in the pocket of the Crown had not done this, you would be remiss in your duty. You gentlemen have examined the bottle and I will leave it to yourselves. I am not going to take further time in discussing whether the prisoners were drunk. It is not necessary to prove the guilt of the prisoners. The question is did they bring about the death of these men by violation of any of the ordinary laws. Peters had charge of the car, ownership of which was listed in the Crown's evidence. It was his wife. He was driving her here.

The Attorney General read from the Motor Vehicle Act regarding the qualifications and requirements of chauffeurs. These men covered the road between Charlottetown and Riverside Park four times in twenty-four hours. So long as Peters drove all went well, when the drivers were changed, and McCoubrey, who was put at the wheel had no license to drive. Prior to this he had driven only thirty-six miles, and then a Chevrolet. You said about liquor, he do more practice why didn't he do so in the daytime instead of at midnight. McCoubrey admits that he

not. One thing we do know, McCoubrey was selling liquor—we have that from their own lips. Then take the evidence of Leo Bradley. Prohibition Inspector, but yourself in their place. Would you if crossing Hillsboro Bridge pass the inspectors and stop at the cross roads to allow the inspectors to search you? The inspectors did not intend to search them. Mr. Bradley said the prisoners pulled ahead and went in the direction of Tea Hill for the 48 Road. McCoubrey's story—that the inspectors went down the 48 Road, indicated extreme temperatures in your hearing Mr. Bradley's evidence. If those prisoners had liquor in the car "they would have to work hard." The inspectors turned back and they got to Tea Hill and parked their car by the road. There was a great deal of evidence regarding Vernon River on the afternoon and evening. If liquor was sold there it would not be sold openly. A lot of liquor could be there without there being any drunkenness. This evidence meant strong 52, Capreol 42, and North Bay 31.

Toronto entered the lists as one of the coldest southern Ontario points when the mercury dropped to 17 below, the lowest so far for the season.

Did not know the road. Does this show incompetence to drive? The fact that the four men didn't know the road was shown by the fact of two policemen and who are bet that they didn't follow the directions given them by Mr. Praught via to follow the telephone wires. They received directions afterwards but couldn't tell definitely where they received them. Regarding the second turn to the right, he asked by Mr. Bentley, Mr. Stewart read from the evidence of witness said he understood that he had to turn twice to the right. This witness, said the Attorney General, admits that they disregarded the directions which were given them. "We now come to the wharf?" said the Attorney General. We which would aid in their sobriety, have only the evidence of McCoubrey and it is largely a blur. It would be of value and worth consideration if for you to decide if these men were under the influence of liquor when the car went over the wharf. Another bit of evidence—if there was no liquor in the car how was it a bottle of it impossible for any man using his senses to mistake the "South" end of the wharf. It is port wharf without the railway tracks and with different planking in the car how was it possible for the Crown had not done this, you would be remiss in your duty. You gentlemen have examined the bottle and I will leave it to yourselves. I am not going to take further time in discussing whether the prisoners were drunk. It is not necessary to prove the guilt of the prisoners. The question is did they bring about the death of these men by violation of any of the ordinary laws. Peters had charge of the car, ownership of which was listed in the Crown's evidence. It was his wife. He was driving her here.

The Attorney General read from the Motor Vehicle Act regarding the qualifications and requirements of chauffeurs. These men covered the road between Charlottetown and Riverside Park four times in twenty-four hours. So long as Peters drove all went well, when the drivers were changed, and McCoubrey, who was put at the wheel had no license to drive. Prior to this he had driven only thirty-six miles, and then a Chevrolet. You said about liquor, he do more practice why didn't he do so in the daytime instead of at midnight. McCoubrey admits that he

Was there not gross negligence (Continued on page 3)

CANADA HAS RECOMMENDED NEW SUBZERO AERODROME CHAMPION FOR MONTREAL

White River Yields Supremacy to Horpe Payne in Northern Ontario With 56 Below Zero. (Canadian Press) TORONTO, Jan. 26.—Canada today has a new subzero champion in Horpe Payne, in the northern section of this province with 56 below zero. In addition Ontario is experiencing its coldest day in many years.

Reports filtering through from the waves which early today brought tied up telegraph and telephone lines indicated extreme temperatures in all parts of the province. White River struggled hard for supremacy and very reluctantly surrendered to its new conqueror with 54 below.

Doucet, Que., with many wins to its credit was "heated" half way through the struggle and stopped at 22 below in comparatively "balm" condition, outstripped by the many other contestants including there below. Arrived drunkness. This evidence meant strong 52, Capreol 42, and North Bay 31.

Toronto entered the lists as one of the coldest southern Ontario points when the mercury dropped to 17 below, the lowest so far for the season.

Did not know the road. Does this show incompetence to drive? The fact that the four men didn't know the road was shown by the fact of two policemen and who are bet that they didn't follow the directions given them by Mr. Praught via to follow the telephone wires. They received directions afterwards but couldn't tell definitely where they received them. Regarding the second turn to the right, he asked by Mr. Bentley, Mr. Stewart read from the evidence of witness said he understood that he had to turn twice to the right. This witness, said the Attorney General, admits that they disregarded the directions which were given them. "We now come to the wharf?" said the Attorney General. We which would aid in their sobriety, have only the evidence of McCoubrey and it is largely a blur. It would be of value and worth consideration if for you to decide if these men were under the influence of liquor when the car went over the wharf. Another bit of evidence—if there was no liquor in the car how was it a bottle of it impossible for any man using his senses to mistake the "South" end of the wharf. It is port wharf without the railway tracks and with different planking in the car how was it possible for the Crown had not done this, you would be remiss in your duty. You gentlemen have examined the bottle and I will leave it to yourselves. I am not going to take further time in discussing whether the prisoners were drunk. It is not necessary to prove the guilt of the prisoners. The question is did they bring about the death of these men by violation of any of the ordinary laws. Peters had charge of the car, ownership of which was listed in the Crown's evidence. It was his wife. He was driving her here.

The Attorney General read from the Motor Vehicle Act regarding the qualifications and requirements of chauffeurs. These men covered the road between Charlottetown and Riverside Park four times in twenty-four hours. So long as Peters drove all went well, when the drivers were changed, and McCoubrey, who was put at the wheel had no license to drive. Prior to this he had driven only thirty-six miles, and then a Chevrolet. You said about liquor, he do more practice why didn't he do so in the daytime instead of at midnight. McCoubrey admits that he

Was there not gross negligence (Continued on page 3)

Did not know the road. Does this show incompetence to drive? The fact that the four men didn't know the road was shown by the fact of two policemen and who are bet that they didn't follow the directions given them by Mr. Praught via to follow the telephone wires. They received directions afterwards but couldn't tell definitely where they received them. Regarding the second turn to the right, he asked by Mr. Bentley, Mr. Stewart read from the evidence of witness said he understood that he had to turn twice to the right. This witness, said the Attorney General, admits that they disregarded the directions which were given them. "We now come to the wharf?" said the Attorney General. We which would aid in their sobriety, have only the evidence of McCoubrey and it is largely a blur. It would be of value and worth consideration if for you to decide if these men were under the influence of liquor when the car went over the wharf. Another bit of evidence—if there was no liquor in the car how was it a bottle of it impossible for any man using his senses to mistake the "South" end of the wharf. It is port wharf without the railway tracks and with different planking in the car how was it possible for the Crown had not done this, you would be remiss in your duty. You gentlemen have examined the bottle and I will leave it to yourselves. I am not going to take further time in discussing whether the prisoners were drunk. It is not necessary to prove the guilt of the prisoners. The question is did they bring about the death of these men by violation of any of the ordinary laws. Peters had charge of the car, ownership of which was listed in the Crown's evidence. It was his wife. He was driving her here.

The Attorney General read from the Motor Vehicle Act regarding the qualifications and requirements of chauffeurs. These men covered the road between Charlottetown and Riverside Park four times in twenty-four hours. So long as Peters drove all went well, when the drivers were changed, and McCoubrey, who was put at the wheel had no license to drive. Prior to this he had driven only thirty-six miles, and then a Chevrolet. You said about liquor, he do more practice why didn't he do so in the daytime instead of at midnight. McCoubrey admits that he

Was there not gross negligence (Continued on page 3)

Did not know the road. Does this show incompetence to drive? The fact that the four men didn't know the road was shown by the fact of two policemen and who are bet that they didn't follow the directions given them by Mr. Praught via to follow the telephone wires. They received directions afterwards but couldn't tell definitely where they received them. Regarding the second turn to the right, he asked by Mr. Bentley, Mr. Stewart read from the evidence of witness said he understood that he had to turn twice to the right. This witness, said the Attorney General, admits that they disregarded the directions which were given them. "We now come to the wharf?" said the Attorney General. We which would aid in their sobriety, have only the evidence of McCoubrey and it is largely a blur. It would be of value and worth consideration if for you to decide if these men were under the influence of liquor when the car went over the wharf. Another bit of evidence—if there was no liquor in the car how was it a bottle of it impossible for any man using his senses to mistake the "South" end of the wharf. It is port wharf without the railway tracks and with different planking in the car how was it possible for the Crown had not done this, you would be remiss in your duty. You gentlemen have examined the bottle and I will leave it to yourselves. I am not going to take further time in discussing whether the prisoners were drunk. It is not necessary to prove the guilt of the prisoners. The question is did they bring about the death of these men by violation of any of the ordinary laws. Peters had charge of the car, ownership of which was listed in the Crown's evidence. It was his wife. He was driving her here.

The Attorney General read from the Motor Vehicle Act regarding the qualifications and requirements of chauffeurs. These men covered the road between Charlottetown and Riverside Park four times in twenty-four hours. So long as Peters drove all went well, when the drivers were changed, and McCoubrey, who was put at the wheel had no license to drive. Prior to this he had driven only thirty-six miles, and then a Chevrolet. You said about liquor, he do more practice why didn't he do so in the daytime instead of at midnight. McCoubrey admits that he

Was there not gross negligence (Continued on page 3)

Did not know the road. Does this show incompetence to drive? The fact that the four men didn't know the road was shown by the fact of two policemen and who are bet that they didn't follow the directions given them by Mr. Praught via to follow the telephone wires. They received directions afterwards but couldn't tell definitely where they received them. Regarding the second turn to the right, he asked by Mr. Bentley, Mr. Stewart read from the evidence of witness said he understood that he had to turn twice to the right. This witness, said the Attorney General, admits that they disregarded the directions which were given them. "We now come to the wharf?" said the Attorney General. We which would aid in their sobriety, have only the evidence of McCoubrey and it is largely a blur. It would be of value and worth consideration if for you to decide if these men were under the influence of liquor when the car went over the wharf. Another bit of evidence—if there was no liquor in the car how was it a bottle of it impossible for any man using his senses to mistake the "South" end of the wharf. It is port wharf without the railway tracks and with different planking in the car how was it possible for the Crown had not done this, you would be remiss in your duty. You gentlemen have examined the bottle and I will leave it to yourselves. I am not going to take further time in discussing whether the prisoners were drunk. It is not necessary to prove the guilt of the prisoners. The question is did they bring about the death of these men by violation of any of the ordinary laws. Peters had charge of the car, ownership of which was listed in the Crown's evidence. It was his wife. He was driving her here.

The Attorney General read from the Motor Vehicle Act regarding the qualifications and requirements of chauffeurs. These men covered the road between Charlottetown and Riverside Park four times in twenty-four hours. So long as Peters drove all went well, when the drivers were changed, and McCoubrey, who was put at the wheel had no license to drive. Prior to this he had driven only thirty-six miles, and then a Chevrolet. You said about liquor, he do more practice why didn't he do so in the daytime instead of at midnight. McCoubrey admits that he

Was there not gross negligence (Continued on page 3)

Did not know the road. Does this show incompetence to drive? The fact that the four men didn't know the road was shown by the fact of two policemen and who are bet that they didn't follow the directions given them by Mr. Praught via to follow the telephone wires. They received directions afterwards but couldn't tell definitely where they received them. Regarding the second turn to the right, he asked by Mr. Bentley, Mr. Stewart read from the evidence of witness said he understood that he had to turn twice to the right. This witness, said the Attorney General, admits that they disregarded the directions which were given them. "We now come to the wharf?" said the Attorney General. We which would aid in their sobriety, have only the evidence of McCoubrey and it is largely a blur. It would be of value and worth consideration if for you to decide if these men were under the influence of liquor when the car went over the wharf. Another bit of evidence—if there was no liquor in the car how was it a bottle of it impossible for any man using his senses to mistake the "South" end of the wharf. It is port wharf without the railway tracks and with different planking in the car how was it possible for the Crown had not done this, you would be remiss in your duty. You gentlemen have examined the bottle and I will leave it to yourselves. I am not going to take further time in discussing whether the prisoners were drunk. It is not necessary to prove the guilt of the prisoners. The question is did they bring about the death of these men by violation of any of the ordinary laws. Peters had charge of the car, ownership of which was listed in the Crown's evidence. It was his wife. He was driving her here.

The Attorney General read from the Motor Vehicle Act regarding the qualifications and requirements of chauffeurs. These men covered the road between Charlottetown and Riverside Park four times in twenty-four hours. So long as Peters drove all went well, when the drivers were changed, and McCoubrey, who was put at the wheel had no license to drive. Prior to this he had driven only thirty-six miles, and then a Chevrolet. You said about liquor, he do more practice why didn't he do so in the daytime instead of at midnight. McCoubrey admits that he

Was there not gross negligence (Continued on page 3)

Did not know the road. Does this show incompetence to drive? The fact that the four men didn't know the road was shown by the fact of two policemen and who are bet that they didn't follow the directions given them by Mr. Praught via to follow the telephone wires. They received directions afterwards but couldn't tell definitely where they received them. Regarding the second turn to the right, he asked by Mr. Bentley, Mr. Stewart read from the evidence of witness said he understood that he had to turn twice to the right. This witness, said the Attorney General, admits that they disregarded the directions which were given them. "We now come to the wharf?" said the Attorney General. We which would aid in their sobriety, have only the evidence of McCoubrey and it is largely a blur. It would be of value and worth consideration if for you to decide if these men were under the influence of liquor when the car went over the wharf. Another bit of evidence—if there was no liquor in the car how was it a bottle of it impossible for any man using his senses to mistake the "South" end of the wharf. It is port wharf without the railway tracks and with different planking in the car how was it possible for the Crown had not done this, you would be remiss in your duty. You gentlemen have examined the bottle and I will leave it to yourselves. I am not going to take further time in discussing whether the prisoners were drunk. It is not necessary to prove the guilt of the prisoners. The question is did they bring about the death of these men by violation of any of the ordinary laws. Peters had charge of the car, ownership of which was listed in the Crown's evidence. It was his wife. He was driving her here.

The Attorney General read from the Motor Vehicle Act regarding the qualifications and requirements of chauffeurs. These men covered the road between Charlottetown and Riverside Park four times in twenty-four hours. So long as Peters drove all went well, when the drivers were changed, and McCoubrey, who was put at the wheel had no license to drive. Prior to this he had driven only thirty-six miles, and then a Chevrolet. You said about liquor, he do more practice why didn't he do so in the daytime instead of at midnight. McCoubrey admits that he

Was there not gross negligence (Continued on page 3)

Did not know the road. Does this show incompetence to drive? The fact that the four men didn't know the road was shown by the fact of two policemen and who are bet that they didn't follow the directions given them by Mr. Praught via to follow the telephone wires. They received directions afterwards but couldn't tell definitely where they received them. Regarding the second turn to the right, he asked by Mr. Bentley, Mr. Stewart read from the evidence of witness said he understood that he had to turn twice to the right. This witness, said the Attorney General, admits that they disregarded the directions which were given them. "We now come to the wharf?" said the Attorney General. We which would aid in their sobriety, have only the evidence of McCoubrey and it is largely a blur. It would be of value and worth consideration if for you to decide if these men were under the influence of liquor when the car went over the wharf. Another bit of evidence—if there was no liquor in the car how was it a bottle of it impossible for any man using his senses to mistake the "South" end of the wharf. It is port wharf without the railway tracks and with different planking in the car how was it possible for the Crown had not done this, you would be remiss in your duty. You gentlemen have examined the bottle and I will leave it to yourselves. I am not going to take further time in discussing whether the prisoners were drunk. It is not necessary to prove the guilt of the prisoners. The question is did they bring about the death of these men by violation of any of the ordinary laws. Peters had charge of the car, ownership of which was listed in the Crown's evidence. It was his wife. He was driving her here.

The Attorney General read from the Motor Vehicle Act regarding the qualifications and requirements of chauffeurs. These men covered the road between Charlottetown and Riverside Park four times in twenty-four hours. So long as Peters drove all went well, when the drivers were changed, and McCoubrey, who was put at the wheel had no license to drive. Prior to this he had driven only thirty-six miles, and then a Chevrolet. You said about liquor, he do more practice why didn't he do so in the daytime instead of at midnight. McCoubrey admits that he

Was there not gross negligence (Continued on page 3)

Did not know the road. Does this show incompetence to drive? The fact that the four men didn't know the road was shown by the fact of two policemen and who are bet that they didn't follow the directions given them by Mr. Praught via to follow the telephone wires. They received directions afterwards but couldn't tell definitely where they received them. Regarding the second turn to the right, he asked by Mr. Bentley, Mr. Stewart read from the evidence of witness said he understood that he had to turn twice to the right. This witness, said the Attorney General, admits that they disregarded the directions which were given them. "We now come to the wharf?" said the Attorney General. We which would aid in their sobriety, have only the evidence of McCoubrey and it is largely a blur. It would be of value and worth consideration if for you to decide if these men were under the influence of liquor when the car went over the wharf. Another bit of evidence—if there was no liquor in the car how was it a bottle of it impossible for any man using his senses to mistake the "South" end of the wharf. It is port wharf without the railway tracks and with different planking in the car how was it possible for the Crown had not done this, you would be remiss in your duty. You gentlemen have examined the bottle and I will leave it to yourselves. I am not going to take further time in discussing whether the prisoners were drunk. It is not necessary to prove the guilt of the prisoners. The question is did they bring about the death of these men by violation of any of the ordinary laws. Peters had charge of the car, ownership of which was listed in the Crown's evidence. It was his wife. He was driving her here.

Condensed Specials RATE—4c. per word, net each insertion in this column. *WANTED—A LIST CARRIER—Apply at Guardian Office. *YOU WANT GOOD ENVELOPES Prices 50 for 200, 100 for 350 250 for 550, 500 for \$1.00, 1000 for \$1.95. Postpaid, Guardian Office, Guardian Job Printer. *FOR SALE—12 SMALL SIZED boxes and 14 piano boxes. Miller Bros., Music Store. 3549-1-25-31. *HOME MADE POTTED MEAT, Fresh sausages, Saunders, Newson & Co., East End Market Bldg. *THREE CHOICE FARMS FOR sale. Apply to Harry Jenkins, Market Building, Charlottetown. 8740-1-141f. WANTED—REGISTERED FARMSTEAD bull for Mt. Carmel Farm's Institute. Write L. A. Arsenault, Sec'y, Box 5, Mount Carmel. 3595-1-27-41. JNO. A. MACDONALD—LAND Surveyor, Hermanville, P. E. I. 3552-12-28, 1

A COLD IN THE FEET IS BETTER THAN ONE IN THE HEAD. Illustration of a person wearing a hat and boots.

TORONTO, Jan. 27.—Maritime moderate to fresh northwesterly winds, fair and very cold. Toronto, clear 30-16b Montreal, clear 26-14b Quebec, clear 16-20b Charlottetown, clear 17-5b Halifax, cloudy 30-10 St. John, clear 30-4b Boston, cloudy 42-14 New York, cloudy 42-12 High tide this afternoon at 5:02 and tomorrow morning at 6:45. Sun sets this afternoon at 4:59 and rises tomorrow morning at 7:25. New moon Wednesday, Feb. 2nd, 1:30 a. m.

THIRTY-SEVEN LIVES LOST (Canadian Press) O