

good for little or nothing in winter, but a hen that moults in warm weather will, if not too fat, lay when eggs are scarce and dearest.

If the wool of sheep becomes wet it dries very slowly and only by chilling the animal through. Shelter from rain and snow, especially the former, is therefore more important than protection from cold. If a sheep is chilled so as to give it cold or fever the fibre of the wool is injured, and if this occurs in winter the injury is in the middle of the fleece, where it will do the greatest damage and most hurt the sale.

Horsebreeders of the right kind in Canada will be pleased to hear that prices are likely to rise very greatly during the spring. London Sporting Life says:—Of the laws of political economy operate in the accustomed way, animal-horse-flesh is likely to be a more remuneratively marketable commodity within the three kingdoms than it has been for many years. The exportation of horses has been forbidden in Russia and Germany, and will presently be prevented in Austria-Hungary. With these barriers to free trade—and, of course, no supply of horses from France—England will have to rely substantially on her home and Colonial resources, and prices will go up."

LORD & THOMAS, NEWSPAPER
60 Randolph St., Chicago, keep this paper on file and are authorized to sell it for you.

THIS PAPER may be found in all the cities where advertising contracts are made for it.

NEW YORK.

The Glasgow will receive at very low rates all small and transient advertisements such as House to Let, or for Sale, House Wanted, Situations Vacant or Wanted, For Sale, For Hire, Notices of Meetings, Births, Marriages, Deaths and Funerals, Notices, etc. For these and many others it will prove a medium of general benefit to everyone residing in the city. Mayville, N.Y. 1887.

We have the most complete and reliable means of obtaining the latest information. We have the most complete and reliable means of obtaining the latest information.

THE GLEANER.

Tri-Weekly Edition, one year, \$2.00
Semi-Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.50
Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.00
Advertisements may be made in registered letters at 100 cents per line.

Address: The Gleaner, New York, N.Y.

THE GLEANER.

Tri-Weekly Edition, one year, \$2.00
Semi-Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.50
Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.00
Advertisements may be made in registered letters at 100 cents per line.

Address: The Gleaner, New York, N.Y.

THE GLEANER.

Tri-Weekly Edition, one year, \$2.00
Semi-Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.50
Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.00
Advertisements may be made in registered letters at 100 cents per line.

Address: The Gleaner, New York, N.Y.

THE GLEANER.

Tri-Weekly Edition, one year, \$2.00
Semi-Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.50
Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.00
Advertisements may be made in registered letters at 100 cents per line.

Address: The Gleaner, New York, N.Y.

THE GLEANER.

Tri-Weekly Edition, one year, \$2.00
Semi-Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.50
Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.00
Advertisements may be made in registered letters at 100 cents per line.

Address: The Gleaner, New York, N.Y.

THE GLEANER.

Tri-Weekly Edition, one year, \$2.00
Semi-Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.50
Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.00
Advertisements may be made in registered letters at 100 cents per line.

Address: The Gleaner, New York, N.Y.

THE GLEANER.

Tri-Weekly Edition, one year, \$2.00
Semi-Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.50
Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.00
Advertisements may be made in registered letters at 100 cents per line.

Address: The Gleaner, New York, N.Y.

THE GLEANER.

Tri-Weekly Edition, one year, \$2.00
Semi-Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.50
Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.00
Advertisements may be made in registered letters at 100 cents per line.

Address: The Gleaner, New York, N.Y.

THE GLEANER.

Tri-Weekly Edition, one year, \$2.00
Semi-Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.50
Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.00
Advertisements may be made in registered letters at 100 cents per line.

Address: The Gleaner, New York, N.Y.

THE GLEANER.

Tri-Weekly Edition, one year, \$2.00
Semi-Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.50
Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.00
Advertisements may be made in registered letters at 100 cents per line.

Address: The Gleaner, New York, N.Y.

THE GLEANER.

Tri-Weekly Edition, one year, \$2.00
Semi-Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.50
Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.00
Advertisements may be made in registered letters at 100 cents per line.

Address: The Gleaner, New York, N.Y.

THE GLEANER.

Tri-Weekly Edition, one year, \$2.00
Semi-Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.50
Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.00
Advertisements may be made in registered letters at 100 cents per line.

Address: The Gleaner, New York, N.Y.

THE GLEANER.

Tri-Weekly Edition, one year, \$2.00
Semi-Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.50
Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.00
Advertisements may be made in registered letters at 100 cents per line.

Address: The Gleaner, New York, N.Y.

THE GLEANER.

Tri-Weekly Edition, one year, \$2.00
Semi-Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.50
Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.00
Advertisements may be made in registered letters at 100 cents per line.

Address: The Gleaner, New York, N.Y.

THE GLEANER.

Tri-Weekly Edition, one year, \$2.00
Semi-Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.50
Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.00
Advertisements may be made in registered letters at 100 cents per line.

Address: The Gleaner, New York, N.Y.

THE GLEANER.

Tri-Weekly Edition, one year, \$2.00
Semi-Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.50
Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.00
Advertisements may be made in registered letters at 100 cents per line.

Address: The Gleaner, New York, N.Y.

THE GLEANER.

Tri-Weekly Edition, one year, \$2.00
Semi-Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.50
Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.00
Advertisements may be made in registered letters at 100 cents per line.

Address: The Gleaner, New York, N.Y.

THE GLEANER.

Tri-Weekly Edition, one year, \$2.00
Semi-Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.50
Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.00
Advertisements may be made in registered letters at 100 cents per line.

Address: The Gleaner, New York, N.Y.

THE GLEANER.

Tri-Weekly Edition, one year, \$2.00
Semi-Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.50
Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.00
Advertisements may be made in registered letters at 100 cents per line.

Address: The Gleaner, New York, N.Y.

THE GLEANER.

Tri-Weekly Edition, one year, \$2.00
Semi-Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.50
Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.00
Advertisements may be made in registered letters at 100 cents per line.

Address: The Gleaner, New York, N.Y.

THE GLEANER.

Tri-Weekly Edition, one year, \$2.00
Semi-Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.50
Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.00
Advertisements may be made in registered letters at 100 cents per line.

Address: The Gleaner, New York, N.Y.

THE GLEANER.

Tri-Weekly Edition, one year, \$2.00
Semi-Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.50
Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.00
Advertisements may be made in registered letters at 100 cents per line.

Address: The Gleaner, New York, N.Y.

THE GLEANER.

Tri-Weekly Edition, one year, \$2.00
Semi-Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.50
Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.00
Advertisements may be made in registered letters at 100 cents per line.

Address: The Gleaner, New York, N.Y.

THE GLEANER.

Tri-Weekly Edition, one year, \$2.00
Semi-Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.50
Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.00
Advertisements may be made in registered letters at 100 cents per line.

Address: The Gleaner, New York, N.Y.

THE GLEANER.

Tri-Weekly Edition, one year, \$2.00
Semi-Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.50
Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.00
Advertisements may be made in registered letters at 100 cents per line.

Address: The Gleaner, New York, N.Y.

THE GLEANER.

Tri-Weekly Edition, one year, \$2.00
Semi-Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.50
Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.00
Advertisements may be made in registered letters at 100 cents per line.

Address: The Gleaner, New York, N.Y.

THE GLEANER.

Tri-Weekly Edition, one year, \$2.00
Semi-Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.50
Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.00
Advertisements may be made in registered letters at 100 cents per line.

Address: The Gleaner, New York, N.Y.

THE GLEANER.

Tri-Weekly Edition, one year, \$2.00
Semi-Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.50
Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.00
Advertisements may be made in registered letters at 100 cents per line.

Address: The Gleaner, New York, N.Y.

THE GLEANER.

Tri-Weekly Edition, one year, \$2.00
Semi-Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.50
Weekly Edition, one year, \$1.00
Advertisements may be made in registered letters at 100 cents per line.

Address: The Gleaner, New York, N.Y.

shown himself to be, what we all anticipated he would be, an ornament to the house. Mr. Temple, who was the respondent and Mr. Stockton and the attorney general, who supported it, spoke very well, and the discussion, though short, was well sustained and interesting.

THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Some of the gentlemen of the legislative council, who voted for the amendment to the government's resolution for a conference between the two houses in regard to the abolition of the legislative council, say that they do not wish to be understood as thereby placing themselves on record against such a measure. It is not right to question their sincerity in this regard, but we may be allowed to most respectfully say that if any of them are desirous of putting themselves in accord with popular opinion they have taken a very extraordinary way of showing it. One can hardly imagine that any gentleman of the legislative council is so ignorant of constitutional usage as to suppose that the policy of the government can be forwarded by the passage of an amendment to a government resolution, especially when such an amendment is moved by persons known to be hostile to the administration. The legislative council cannot be allowed to dictate to the government and the popular branch, and the fact that they have refused to concur in the unanimous resolution of the house will be understood and can only be understood in a constitutional sense as a proof of their hostility to the measure contemplated by the resolution, even although some of the council may claim that they do not wish to be understood as taking any such position. We do not pretend to know what course the government will take, but we fancy they will scarcely invite the house to act upon the expressed wish of the council.

In this connection we wish to direct attention to the fact that the Hon. Messrs. Flaveling and Thompson were true to their professions made in the assembly, and on the first opportunity placed themselves squarely on record as ready to vote the council out of existence, and that the Hon. Messrs. Harrison and Holly also showed themselves prepared to give effect to the popular will. These four gentlemen stand out conspicuously for their unequivocal position, and they are to be congratulated thereon.

THE SALE OF LIQUOR IN FREDERICTON.

We take the following extract from the Religious Intelligencer:—

There are some places in the city, it is reported, where we feel they are in need to be looked after. The Queen Hotel and the house are said to be selling rum, perhaps not openly as formerly, but selling it. Other places have been shut up, and these ought to be—must be. They have been fringed several times into great numbers, and the rum is sold in the most dangerous places than the seven by nine. Their proprietors should be careful of the same treatment as other rum sellers. A term in jail would make them careful of the same treatment as other rum sellers. We direct the attention of the authorities to the matter.

It was alleged during the late election campaign that, for certain political considerations, some persons having influence in regard to Scott's act prosecutions pronounced to the above mentioned hotel that they should not be prosecuted for selling liquor. Whether there is any truth or not in this can only be judged from the facts which are developed from day to day, and if the intelligence is correct as to its statement of fact, the report would seem to have the semblance at least of truth. We understand that the police authorities intend taking action immediately. They should understand that the hotel, rightly or wrongly, gives them very little credit for sincerity in regard to the public. As every one knows reports as to the sale of liquor are apt to be tremendously exaggerated, and the difficulties in the way of successfully prosecuting are never thought of by those who talk the most about such matters; but the success which attended the work of the police in other quarters itself gives point to the public criticism of their inaction in regard to the hotel. We trust that they will endeavor to meet the demands of public opinion in this matter, and suppress entirely the sale of liquor at bars. So long as liquor may be brought into a place, no one need hope to see its sale absolutely prevented. Not even the most ardent Scott act men expects this. But it is not unreasonable to insist that nothing bearing any resemblance to a public bar ought to be permitted to exist in the city, and until everything of that nature is suppressed the demands of public opinion in this matter of the citizens, have discharged their duty in the premises.

MR. TEMPLE'S CASE.

The failure of the grand inquest to find a bill against Mr. Temple for bribery created a decided sensation, although it is admitted that they had no course open to them under the judge's charge. With the utmost respect for Judge Steadman we think that his charge was erroneous. In preparing the bill of indictment the crown officer was governed not only by the principles of common law, which do not recognize any gradation in responsibility on the part of persons implicated in a misdemeanor, there being in point of law no difference whatever between principals and accessories, but also by the clear provisions of the Criminal Law of Canada. The act of parliament, 21 Vic. Chap. 72, section 9, declares:—

Whoever aids, abets, counsels or procures the commission of an offence, whether the same be a misdemeanor at common law or by virtue of any act passed or to be passed shall be liable to be cited and punished as a principal offender.

Applying this section to Mr. Temple's case it seems difficult to understand how the judge could have directed the jury as he did. The offences for which Messrs. Haen and Hilgard were indicted are misdemeanors by virtue of the election law, and if Mr. Temple aided, abetted, counselled or procured the commission of those offences, he was properly indicted as a principal offender. The evidence certainly directly connected Mr. Temple with these offences as procuring their commission. This seems so very clear that we can only suppose Judge Steadman to have overlooked the section quoted. We know that it was in pursuance of its provisions that the indictment against Mr. Temple was drawn. This section is not new. It is only declaratory of what the criminal law has been for a long time. It is not a distinction between principals and accessories. In misdemeanors no such distinction obtains, and the accessory and the principal stand upon the same footing. Both are principals. Even without the election law, above quoted, Mr. Temple might properly have been indicted as a principal offender. An argument might, perhaps, have been made on the trial that as he did not personally do the bribing he committed no offence under the election law, although the claim could not be sustained before a court. But the act quoted declares that to procure the commission of a misdemeanor is equivalent to the actual commission of it, and shall be dealt with in precisely the same way. Therefore under the evidence Mr. Temple was equally guilty with his agents. As we view the case, and we think there can be no doubt as to the correctness of our view, there has been a miscarriage of justice due to Judge Steadman's misconception of the law. We are satisfied that Judge Steadman, on consideration, will agree with us. The result will be regretted, because it is desirable that the prosecution be effected in preventing bribery should have been carried to a successful conclusion. The result does not in any way affect Mr. Temple's position before the election court. He has simply been relieved of the necessity of answering criminally for his alleged violation of the law.

The story of Henderson—in a recent letter received from Mrs. Sarah A. Mills, of Wheatley, Ont., says, "I was a sufferer for six years with dyspepsia, and I grew weaker every day. I lost appetite and had little hope of recovery. I tried many remedies, but all in vain, till I took Burdock and Blood Purifier. One bottle cured me, after taking seven bottles. I am thankful that I now enjoy good health."

Professor Thomson claim that where quick heating is required electricity may be relied upon, and results are cited where, in welding, broken iron bars may be securely joined with great rapidity and strength. In forging, electric current according to the reports given, will prove of interest, and when better understood will place this new principle in every workshop. Metal-workers and iron-mongers will prefer electric force to flame, for it is said the chief essentials of the apparatus are the direct means of getting heavy currents through metal without loss.

A GOOD MOTIVATOR.—Harry Ricardo, of Toronto, says for first aid for all troubles that he was so troubled with dyspepsia for eight years that he could scarcely attend to business, until he tried Yellow Oil. He desires to make this cure known, for the benefit of those who talk the most about such matters; but the success which attended the work of the police in other quarters itself gives point to the public criticism of their inaction in regard to the hotel. We trust that they will endeavor to meet the demands of public opinion in this matter, and suppress entirely the sale of liquor at bars. So long as liquor may be brought into a place, no one need hope to see its sale absolutely prevented. Not even the most ardent Scott act men expects this. But it is not unreasonable to insist that nothing bearing any resemblance to a public bar ought to be permitted to exist in the city, and until everything of that nature is suppressed the demands of public opinion in this matter of the citizens, have discharged their duty in the premises.

MR. TEMPLE'S CASE.

The failure of the grand inquest to find a bill against Mr. Temple for bribery created a decided sensation, although it is admitted that they had no course open to them under the judge's charge. With the utmost respect for Judge Steadman we think that his charge was erroneous. In preparing the bill of indictment the crown officer was governed not only by the principles of common law, which do not recognize any gradation in responsibility on the part of persons implicated in a misdemeanor, there being in point of law no difference whatever between principals and accessories, but also by the clear provisions of the Criminal Law of Canada. The act of parliament, 21 Vic. Chap. 72, section 9, declares:—

Whoever aids, abets, counsels or procures the commission of an offence, whether the same be a misdemeanor at common law or by virtue of any act passed or to be passed shall be liable to be cited and punished as a principal offender.

Applying this section to Mr. Temple's case it seems difficult to understand how the judge could have directed the jury as he did. The offences for which Messrs. Haen and Hilgard were indicted are misdemeanors by virtue of the election law, and if Mr. Temple aided, abetted, counselled or procured the commission of those offences, he was properly indicted as a principal offender. The evidence certainly directly connected Mr. Temple with these offences as procuring their commission. This seems so very clear that we can only suppose Judge Steadman to have overlooked the section quoted. We know that it was in pursuance of its provisions that the indictment against Mr. Temple was drawn. This section is not new. It is only declaratory of what the criminal law has been for a long time. It is not a distinction between principals and accessories. In misdemeanors no such distinction obtains, and the accessory and the principal stand upon the same footing. Both are principals. Even without the election law, above quoted, Mr. Temple might properly have been indicted as a principal offender. An argument might, perhaps, have been made on the trial that as he did not personally do the bribing he committed no offence under the election law, although the claim could not be sustained before a court. But the act quoted declares that to procure the commission of a misdemeanor is equivalent to the actual commission of it, and shall be dealt with in precisely the same way. Therefore under the evidence Mr. Temple was equally guilty with his agents. As we view the case, and we think there can be no doubt as to the correctness of our view, there has been a miscarriage of justice due to Judge Steadman's misconception of the law. We are satisfied that Judge Steadman, on consideration, will agree with us. The result will be regretted, because it is desirable that the prosecution be effected in preventing bribery should have been carried to a successful conclusion. The result does not in any way affect Mr. Temple's position before the election court. He has simply been relieved of the necessity of answering criminally for his alleged violation of the law.

MR. TEMPLE'S CASE.

The failure of the grand inquest to find a bill against Mr. Temple for bribery created a decided sensation, although it is admitted that they had no course open to them under the judge's charge. With the utmost respect for Judge Steadman we think that his charge was erroneous. In preparing the bill of indictment the crown officer was governed not only by the principles of common law, which do not recognize any gradation in responsibility on the part of persons implicated in a misdemeanor, there being in point of law no difference whatever between principals and accessories, but also by the clear provisions of the Criminal Law of Canada. The act of parliament, 21 Vic. Chap. 72, section 9, declares:—

Whoever aids, abets, counsels or procures the commission of an offence, whether the same be a misdemeanor at common law or by virtue of any act passed or to be passed shall be liable to be cited and punished as a principal offender.

Applying this section to Mr. Temple's case it seems difficult to understand how the judge could have directed the jury as he did. The offences for which Messrs. Haen and Hilgard were indicted are misdemeanors by virtue of the election law, and if Mr. Temple aided, abetted, counselled or procured the commission of those offences, he was properly indicted as a principal offender. The evidence certainly directly connected Mr. Temple with these offences as procuring their commission. This seems so very clear that we can only suppose Judge Steadman to have overlooked the section quoted. We know that it was in pursuance of its provisions that the indictment against Mr. Temple was drawn. This section is not new. It is only declaratory of what the criminal law has been for a long time. It is not a distinction between principals and accessories. In misdemeanors no such distinction obtains, and the accessory and the principal stand upon the same footing. Both are principals. Even without the election law, above quoted, Mr. Temple might properly have been indicted as a principal offender. An argument might, perhaps, have been made on the trial that as he did not personally do the bribing he committed no offence under the election law, although the claim could not be sustained before a court. But the act quoted declares that to procure the commission of a misdemeanor is equivalent to the actual commission of it, and shall be dealt with in precisely the same way. Therefore under the evidence Mr. Temple was equally guilty with his agents. As we view the case, and we think there can be no doubt as to the correctness of our view, there has been a miscarriage of justice due to Judge Steadman's misconception of the law. We are satisfied that Judge Steadman, on consideration, will agree with us. The result will be regretted, because it is desirable that the prosecution be effected in preventing bribery should have been carried to a successful conclusion. The result does not in any way affect Mr. Temple's position before the election court. He has simply been relieved of the necessity of answering criminally for his alleged violation of the law.

MR. TEMPLE'S CASE.

The failure of the grand inquest to find a bill against Mr. Temple for bribery created a decided sensation, although it is admitted that they had no course open to them under the judge's charge. With the utmost respect for Judge Steadman we think that his charge was erroneous. In preparing the bill of indictment the crown officer was governed not only by the principles of common law, which do not recognize any gradation in responsibility on the part of persons implicated in a misdemeanor, there being in point of law no difference whatever between principals and accessories, but also by the clear provisions of the Criminal Law of Canada. The act of parliament, 21 Vic. Chap. 72, section 9, declares:—

Whoever aids, abets, counsels or procures the commission of an offence, whether the same be a misdemeanor at common law or by virtue of any act passed or to be passed shall be liable to be cited and punished as a principal offender.

Applying this section to Mr. Temple's case it seems difficult to understand how the judge could have directed the jury as he did. The offences for which Messrs. Haen and Hilgard were indicted are misdemeanors by virtue of the election law, and if Mr. Temple aided, abetted, counselled or procured the commission of those offences, he was properly indicted as a principal offender. The evidence certainly directly connected Mr. Temple with these offences as procuring their commission. This seems so very clear that we can only suppose Judge Steadman to have overlooked the section quoted. We know that it was in pursuance of its provisions that the indictment against Mr. Temple was drawn. This section is not new. It is only declaratory of what the criminal law has been for a long time. It is not a distinction between principals and accessories. In misdemeanors no such distinction obtains, and the accessory and the principal stand upon the same footing. Both are principals. Even without the election law, above quoted, Mr. Temple might properly have been indicted as a principal offender. An argument might, perhaps, have been made on the trial that as he did not personally do the bribing he committed no offence under the election law, although the claim could not be sustained before a court. But the act quoted declares that to procure the commission of a misdemeanor is equivalent to the actual commission of it, and shall be dealt with in precisely the same way. Therefore under the evidence Mr. Temple was equally guilty with his agents. As we view the case, and we think there can be no doubt as to the correctness of our view, there has been a miscarriage of justice due to Judge Steadman's misconception of the law. We are satisfied that Judge Steadman, on consideration, will agree with us. The result will be regretted, because it is desirable that the prosecution be effected in preventing bribery should have been carried to a successful conclusion. The result does not in any way affect Mr. Temple's position before the election court. He has simply been relieved of the necessity of answering criminally for his alleged violation of the law.

MR. TEMPLE'S CASE.

The failure of the grand inquest to find a bill against Mr. Temple for bribery created a decided sensation, although it is admitted that they had no course open to them under the judge's charge. With the utmost respect for Judge Steadman we think that his charge was erroneous. In preparing the bill of indictment the crown officer was governed not only by the principles of common law, which do not recognize any gradation in responsibility on the part of persons implicated in a misdemeanor, there being in point of law no difference whatever between principals and accessories, but also by the clear provisions of the Criminal Law of Canada. The act of parliament, 21 Vic. Chap. 72, section 9, declares:—

case it seems difficult to understand how the judge could have directed the jury as he did. The offences for which Messrs. Haen and Hilgard were indicted are misdemeanors by virtue of the election law, and if Mr. Temple aided, abetted, counselled or procured the commission of those offences, he was properly indicted as a principal offender. The evidence certainly directly connected Mr. Temple with these offences as procuring their commission. This seems so very clear that we can only suppose Judge Steadman to have overlooked the section quoted. We know that it was in pursuance of its provisions that the indictment against Mr. Temple was drawn. This section is not new. It is only declaratory of what the criminal law has been for a long time. It is not a distinction between principals and accessories. In misdemeanors no such distinction obtains, and the accessory and the principal stand upon the same footing. Both are principals. Even without the election law, above quoted, Mr. Temple might properly have been indicted as a principal offender. An argument might, perhaps, have been made on the trial that as he did not personally do the bribing he committed no offence under the election law, although the claim could not be sustained before a court. But the act quoted declares that to procure the commission of a misdemeanor is equivalent to the actual commission of it, and shall be dealt with in precisely the same way. Therefore under the evidence Mr. Temple was equally guilty with his agents. As we view the case, and we think there can be no doubt as to the correctness of our view, there has been a miscarriage of justice due to Judge Steadman's misconception of the law. We are satisfied that Judge Steadman, on consideration, will agree with us. The result will be regretted, because it is desirable that the prosecution be effected in preventing bribery should have been carried to a successful conclusion. The result does not in any way affect Mr. Temple's position before the election court. He has simply been relieved of the necessity of answering criminally for his alleged violation of the law.

THE APPETITE

May be increased, the Digestive organs strengthened, and the Bowels regulated, by taking Ayer's Pills. These Pills are purely vegetable in their composition. They contain neither calomel nor any other dangerous drug, and may be taken with perfect safety by persons of all ages.

I was a great sufferer from Dyspepsia and Constipation. I had no appetite, became greatly debilitated, and was constantly afflicted with Headache and Dizziness. I consulted our family doctor, who prescribed for me, at various times, with out effecting more than temporary relief. I finally commenced taking Ayer's Pills. In a short time my digestion and appetite were improved.

IMPROVED.

My bowels were regulated, and, by the time I finished two boxes of these Pills my tendency to headachiness had disappeared, and I became strong and well.—Darius M. Logan, Washington, D.C.

I was troubled, for over a year, with Loss of Appetite, and General Debility, and commenced taking Ayer's Pills, and before finishing half a box of this medicine, my appetite and strength were restored.—C. O. Clark, Danbury, Conn.

Ayer's Pills are the best medicine known to us for regulating the bowels, and for all diseases caused by a disordered Stomach and Liver. I suffered for over three years with Headache, Indigestion, and Constipation. I had no appetite, and was weak and nervous most of the time.

BY USING

three boxes of Ayer's Pills, and at the same time they not only cured me of the painful disorder, but gave me increased strength and vigor. My health is now perfect.—Philip Lockwood, Topeka, Kan.

Ayer's Pills have benefited me wonderfully. For months I suffered from Indigestion and Headache, was restless at night, and had a bad taste in my mouth every morning. After taking one box of Ayer's Pills all these troubles were cured, my food digested well, and my health improved.—Henry C. Hamner, Rockport, Mass.

Ayer's Pills.

Prepared by Dr. J. C. Ayer & Co., Lowell, Mass. Sold by all Druggists and Dealers in Medicine.

Owen Sharkey

Thankful for past favors, wishing his patrons MERRY CHRISTMAS & HAPPY NEW YEAR.

Desires to state that he has now on hand a Large Stock of Goods and Fancy

DRY GOODS, CLOTHING, & Reduced Prices

Many lines of which will be sold at a special price, as a change in the business or a final winding up as early as possible.

Ladies DRESS GOODS

Cashmere, Silk Goods, Satin, Tweeds, &c. desirable Shades and Colors, Vests, Flannels, Square Scarfs, Mantles, Wool Jerseys, Caps and Fur Trimmings, Capes and Kimonos, Kid Gloves, etc. Also, Dressing Gowns, and many other goods, all at reduced prices.

MEN'S YOUTHS' and BOYS'

Suits, Overalls, Hosiery, Caps, Pants and Vests, Shirts, Drawers, Socks, Collars, Ties, Fur and Rubber Goods, and many other goods, all at reduced prices.

TRUNKS, VALISES, and TRAVELLING BAGS.

JOSEPH BLANKETS, REMNANTS of all kinds and colors, at low prices.

OWEN SHARKEY.

OUR STOCK IS COMPLETE.

"Cheap Drugs"

"dearest things" "on Earth."

MALTOPEPSIN

Dyspepsia, Indigestion, and kindred diseases are unquestionably cured by Maltopepsin.

THE BEST REMEDY

Maltopepsin is endorsed by all the leading physicians and prominent druggists throughout the Dominion of Canada, and we understand it has a large sale in England and the United States.

This is not a quick cure, but a reliable remedy for the cure of dyspepsia, indigestion, and kindred diseases. It is a natural food, and its use is recommended by all the leading physicians and prominent druggists throughout the Dominion of Canada, and we understand it has a large sale in England and the United States.

We recommend Maltopepsin to every sufferer from Dyspepsia or Indigestion, and know that a trial will demonstrate its value.

DAVIS, STAPLES & CO.

We have on hand constantly a fresh and complete stock of

DRUGS, FANCY GOODS, PERFUMERY, PATENT MEDICINES,

And a full stock of

PAINTS, OILS, etc. PRESCRIPTIONS CAREFULLY DISPENSED.

Good value guaranteed. Favor us with a call.

DAVIS, STAPLES & CO., Druggists, Fredericton

Intending Advertisers should address

GEORGE P. ROWELL & CO.,

100 SPENCER STREET, NEW YORK CITY.

Select List of 1000 Newspapers

Will be sent FREE on application.

"What are the wild waves saying?"

SCOOT FRIENDS SCOOT, TO THE YORK STREET RESTAURANT.

Christmas has come and gone, and it is a day of regret. Some parties have been informed, have made the remark that the entertainment was not so good as they expected. I think it is a pity that I cannot say on Christmas and New Year's Eve, and I am sure that the party in New Year's Eve will be a success.

Orders and assist in spending the evening year. Please give the York Street Restaurant a bumper glass of wine and I will be glad to call my wardrobe is getting down and I've got to say the latter a visit.

To my superstitious guests I take this opportunity of wishing a Happy and prosperous New Year.

D. HARRIS, ENGLISH OPTICIAN.

OFFICE: 53 GERMAIN STREET.

Mr. Harris is enabled to suit perfectly even most difficult cases, and his stock being made up to be passed shall be liable to be cited and punished as a principal offender.

D. HARRIS, ENGLISH OPTICIAN.

OFFICE: 53 GERMAIN STREET.

Mr. Harris is enabled to suit perfectly even most difficult cases, and his stock being made up to be passed shall be liable to be cited and punished as a principal offender.

ASTANDARD MEDICAL WORK

For Young and Middle-Aged Men.

ONLY \$1 BY MAIL POSTPAID.

Illustrative Sample Free to All

THE SCIENCE OF LIFE

Know Thyself.

A Great Medical Work on Manhood.

Exhausted Vitality, Nervous and Physical Debility, Premature Decline in Man, Etc., of Youth, and the usual infirmities resulting from indigestion or excesses. A book for every man, young, middle-aged and old. It contains 15 prescriptions for all acute and chronic diseases, each one of which is