

FACTS, FACTS, FACTS INDISPUTABLE.

Everybody knows who have tried, and those who have not, should call at once and be convinced that we sell "better goods" for "less money" than any house in this vicinity.

We have enlarged our premises by taking in the store lately occupied by Mr. Akerly, York Street, making connection with both buildings by an entrance or passage, so that one can enter by Queen Street and pass through to York Street. By so doing giving us the largest and most commodious

CLOTHING —AND— BOOT AND SHOE

establishment in the city.

There never was a time when it was more to your interest to buy

CLOTHING, CUSTOM AND READY-MADE, HATS, CAPS, GENTS' FURNISHING GOODS,

Trunks, Portmanteaux, Valises,

Men's Boots and Shoes,

at our store than now. We have an immense stock of elegant and serviceable

Fall and Winter Goods,

purchased from all the leading American, British, and Canadian manufacturers.

We call special attention to our

OVERCOATINGS, ULSTERS, OVERCOATS, REEFERS.

Give the boys a chance on

BOY'S ULSTERS, —AND— OVERCOATS,

which we offer at prices which are simply unapproachably low. Don't take our word for it, but come and see

T. W. Smith & Son
York and Queen streets,
Fredericton, Sept. 20, 1882

1882

E
EDGECOMBE'S is the popular place for Staple and Fancy Goods, on account of the immense variety shown, and the popular prices which prevail.

D
DRY GOODS are always in demand and dry appreciated, but especially at this festive season is a handsome present in that line particularly appropriate.

G
Goods in Fancy Novelties, Bricks, Brack, Choice Nick Nacks and Xmas requisites, will be found as well as those of a more staple and substantial character.

E
Every effort has been made this season to place stock in the different departments, as would suit the requirements of the community; and enlarged premises, afford ample room to show them.

C
CHRISTMAS only comes once a year, and the heart and purse strings naturally open to deeds of love and good will in the bestowment of gifts and kind words.

O
Old and young, rich and poor, married or single, may all meet here, and find something to gratify their taste, according to their ability to purchase.

M
Money is a great power for good, as evil, and judiciously expended carries blessings into every household. Therefore do good by spending it in that way.

B
Bring your friends with you and have a good time whenever you visit the "Albion House," and walk upstairs and see the beautiful things Santa Claus has left in such abundance.

E
EDGECOMBE, F. B., wishes all his friends and patrons a pleasant time during the coming Holidays, and hopes they may have a very happy New Year in

1883

Fredericton, Dec. 13, 1882

Communications.

To the Editor of the Maritime Farmer:
Sir, I have thought it directed to you from reading a day or two ago, that paragraph in the MARITIME FARMER congratulating the Militia of York on again receiving into their ranks a new recruit, it may be quite open army) so distinguished a commander, such a brilliant strategist, and consummate master of military tactics, as Henry Adams Cropley. Well was it for Walseley's laurels that this did not occur before the Egyptian campaign. But I must not say more as already I feel "the blood surging wildly thro' my veins." But what is the fate of the poor Deer Islanders? Are they to be left with only a dried codfish as a shield and a boat hook their only weapon? Does the Captain's insatiable thirst for military glory, and his desire to be the first to mention of his officers and men. His reappearance in the 71st gives good assurance that occasionally there will be "fun for the boys in camp."

AN OLD 71STER.
Ottawa, Dec. 13, 1882

Maritime Farmer.

FREDERICTON, N. B., December 20, 1882.

Ames Agricultural Interest.

The first (after the opening complimentary and congratulatory sentences) longest and most important paragraph in the Governor's speech, at the opening of the Ontario Legislature, last Wednesday, was devoted to Agriculture. It noted the extremely gratifying progress which the great industry in the Province, during the past twelve years, the important services rendered it by the work of the Agricultural College and Experimental Farm, and the Report of the Agricultural Commission, and to very important advantages which have already been secured by the Bureau of Statistics established last year. The statistical and other information relating to the agricultural interests, His Honor added, "collected by the Bureau strikingly exhibits the magnitude and importance of these material resources. In the production of cereals, especially, it is now ascertained that Ontario holds a foremost place in the great Empire, and that the fertile fields of this continent. A system which, besides its other objects, provides for annually publishing carefully gathered statistics of the farm, the forest and the factory is a valuable agency for exhibiting the growth and capabilities of the Province, and cannot fail to prove of essential aid to the farmer, and emigration from other lands." Ontario, even if there was no other reason, worthy of the title of "the leading Province," for the interest taken by its people and legislature in the development of its agricultural capabilities. The Agricultural College at Guelph, that attracts students from all parts of the Dominion, is doing a great work, and the Agricultural Commission, in their elaborate report, present to those who study its volume a most instructive view of the condition of agriculture, and most invaluable suggestions on all matters of "general farming" and subsidiary subjects.

New Brunswick will follow the example of Ontario in developing and encouraging the interest which is "the basis of a nation's wealth." An Agricultural College for the Province, or the Maritime Provinces combined, will be probably established in the near future. The present Stock Farm will be expanded into an experimental station, and form an adjunct to such an institution. In the many instances of the establishment of the Stock Farm, the Legislature, through the Board of Agriculture, have laid the basis of solid improvement. We notice that a certain journal in St. John, which seems to delight to spread abroad ill-natured reports, and to be in perpetual opposition to the interests of the Province, gives currency to a rumor prejudicial to the management of that institution. We have no doubt that the report, which will be submitted at the present meeting of the Agricultural Board of the stock and prospects of the farm, will prove the rumor to be false, a mere discharge of spiteful humor by people who will see nothing good in the farm itself, because it is the work of their political opponents.

The Small Cists.

Within the last week or so, relief has come to the monetary tightness in the upper Canada, of which we spoke in our last issue. The congestion, as the *Globe* calls it, has been relieved, and a free circulation has been established. The small crisis is past. Little speculators have been "squeezed out," and some failures have occurred among business men. The case of these unfortunate is a warning to business men generally not to be led away by speculation excitement, or to lose their heads in the endeavor to become suddenly rich, but to be content with doing a fairly profitable business. In cases of fever, there are preliminary symptoms which taken care of in time will a long and dangerous illness; so, if the lesson of these "furies" were attended to, a severe financial crisis might be averted. But, it is vain to hope, that, warnings or experience of past financial disaster will restrain the speculative, gambling spirit, in a community. But for some time, at least, the pace will be slower. The banks having strained their resources have raised the rate of discounts, and there will not be much money out for a long time. The money market is tight, and all legitimate needs.

We mentioned last week, that the cause of the monetary tightness was, one heading by the farmers of their grain. Now, having given up hope of a rise in prices, or urged by immediate necessity, they are bringing it forward. The circumstances through which the question, hold that farmers gain nothing by holding back crops. A table has been compiled by the statistician to the "New York Produce Exchange," showing the price of wheat at New York during the first half and the last half of each of the last sixteen years. So far this table teaches anything, it shows that the farmer who holds his wheat at a first opportunity realizes a greater sum in a series of years than does the farmer who holds his wheat over the winter. The *Globe*, writing on this subject, says:

Of course it might be possible for a lucky trader to strike every year that particular time in which the price of wheat is highest. But on the other hand it is quite possible that a man of extensive holdings might hold one wheat and lose money by it; or he might sell at once and lose money. The fact is, however, that the market is so thoroughly under the control of rings and speculators that the possession of foresight is sometimes an absolute detriment to a business man. The circumstances under which he founds his judgment may be all right, but at the last moment some combination for "pulling" or "bearing" the market irrespective of real values is made, and his whole calculation falls to pieces. This being the case, the table mentioned proving that in a series of years there is nothing gained by holding back crops, farmers would do well to consider whether for the sake of a problematical gain they can afford to incur the certain losses from rot, shrinkage, evaporation, etc., which often reduces the bulk of wheat by as much as fifteen per cent. in six months.

IT MAY SAVE YOUR LIFE.

The manufacturers have yet to hear of a single case of Dyspepsia or Biliousness, when Zosma was used as directed, in which it was not more than satisfactory. Many write that it is a wonderful remedy. We can show where as high as 40 pounds were gained by its use in breaking up chronic Biliousness and Dyspepsia. Its friends increase every day, and all who use as directed are surprised and gratified.

The Investigation.

The investigation into the causes of the disaster that befell the "Cedar Grove," held before Capt Scott, R. N., at St. John, terminated on Thursday. A great sensation was caused by a statement in writing made by Mr. Fairall, cousin of Miss Fairall, who was drowned, accusing the second officer, Mr. Pearson, of being the direct cause of the loss of the steamer and charging the S. S. Company with neglecting the provisions of the Merchant Service Act, with regard to the providing of life belts, and making regulations for the manning of boats in event of necessity. The statement raised the impression that the "Cedar Grove" was ill provided with life saving apparatus, and that the unfortunate young girl was at first deceived as to the reality of the danger, and then left, in a base and cowardly manner, to be swept to her death. All his statements were flatly contradicted by the most principal witnesses, Mr. McAvity and Mr. Pearson. And those who heard or read the testimony are left in a state of painful doubt as to whether Mr. Fairall was possessed by an "unaccountable feeling," that something was wrong, and by a desire to bring a charge against the Company was not deceived by his own suspicions in putting the case or whether the witness is not through some mistake the cause of the disaster, did not outwear fact. As the ship was not lost in a furious storm, but was steered miles out of its course upon the breakers, the first inference is that it was lost through ignorance or carelessness. If the second officer was the "damned oaf" quoted by Mr. McAvity, as the witness quoted in his affidavit, it is not surprising that he had, while under the influence of the narcotic drug which made him sleepy and stupid, the charge of the ship during the watch from midnight to 3 A. M., when it departed from its safe course, the conclusion would be that there was no rebutting testimony, that the second officer was the cause of the disaster. Experts said as Capt. Scott, in reported to have stated, that "the little silver box" contained, or had a compound of opium and liquor. As Mr. Pearson, says he was suffering from "acute bronchitis," he may have used this compound for relief, though it is against him, that he denied that the box contained such a compound, but was used as a perfume bottle. Whether he used the compound as a recipe for his complaint, or as a habit, the testimony of other witnesses goes to show that he was not drowsy or stupid during the watch, and his own, that Capt. Fritz, was up on deck during the disaster.

The testimony of the witnesses contradicted the statement of Mr. Fairall regarding the cowardly behaviour of officers and crew in leaving his cousin to be swept to death. Both the Captain, who was drowned himself, and the chief steward, exerted themselves to save him. Mr. Fairall possessed himself of some of the most valuable property on board, and he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars from some of the men of the "Cedar Grove" at Canoe, and as he could not have personal knowledge of what took place on board the ship, he based his statement on what was said by men who were not in a condition, according to Mr. McAvity, to relate events as they occurred. Should this statement be published, it would be a testimony of witnesses like McAvity, Pearson and Brown, who were actors in the scene, and whose sworn testimony and counter statements contradicted his in many respects so severely. The man who could have cleared up the true cause of the disaster, and who could have been assured of the fact, alone gathered particulars