

WHISKY TRUST DENIES IT ALL.

Answer to Attorney-General Moloney's Charges Filed in Judge Tuley's Court.

The Cattle Feeding and Distilling company filed its answer in Judge Tuley's court yesterday to the information in the quo warranto proceedings brought against it by Attorney-General Moloney. The answer denies all the allegations in the bill of information and charges that the suit was brought in the interest of private persons and not in the interest of the people of the State. The answer avers that the information is insufficient and that the defendant is not bound to answer at all, and without admitting the sufficiency of the bill the denials follow generally and in answer to the specific charges. The defendant denies that it has perverted or abused its charter, claiming that it acted as a legally incorporated body and within the scope of its franchise in a legal and proper manner. The suit was begun, it avers, in the interest of Samuel Woolner, Jacob and Henry Schwabacher, and John H. Francis. These men, it alleges, are trying to get possession of some of the plants owned and controlled by the corporation. The answer states that before filing the petition for leave to file the information against it a dispute and contention arose between it and these four men, who are stockholders in the corporation. They leased these plants to the corporation for twenty-five years, the rental to be based on a valuation made every five years. When it came to revaluing the property they refused to remain parties to the terms of the lease, and on the ground that the rent was not paid they sought to regain possession of the property.

Levy Mayer, counsel for Attorney-General Moloney in the latter's case against the whisky trust, said that he was unable to be in court when the trust filed its answer yesterday. "I have not read or seen the answer," said he. "If it charges that the information was filed by the Attorney-General to subserve private purposes; the private purposes of any members of the trust, then it libels a high official of the State and alleges not only what is untrue, but what is entirely immaterial. If the whisky trust is an illegal monopoly, as the information charges, then no mud slinging by the defense constitutes an answer. The prosecution is not concerned in any way with the internal dissensions which led to the withdrawal of any members of the trust. It is resorting to questionable tactics when it undertakes to attack the motives which impelled the filing of the Attorney-General's information."

President Greenhut of the whisky trust, who is at the Grand Pacific, said last evening: "The money derived from the sale of the \$1,000,000 of bonds the other week has enabled the trust to meet all special demands against it and put its business in good shape. We have quieted the alarm of the holders of our rebate certificates by the deposit of \$2,500,000 of bonds, and we have no more trouble from that source. The only contention we now have to deal with is this slow moving quo warranto proceeding."