

NEW CITY COUNCIL IN LADYSMITH Two Aldermanic Vacancies to Be Filled—Depression in Coal Trade.

(Special Correspondence.) Ladysmith, Jan. 21.—The newly elected council met for the first time in the city hall yesterday evening. Ald. Nicholson presided and there were present Alds. Brown, Haworth, Campbell and Matteson. So far there is only one representative from the East ward, and as the citizens in that section are taking no action in the matter, the council will probably have to appoint an alderman for that ward. Mayor Nicholson also stated that Mr. Gast Kleim, one of the aldermen-elect for the Middle ward, was not going to sit, so that there will also be a representative to find for this ward.

Under these circumstances Mayor Nicholson contented himself with appointing only the finance committee, his choice falling on Alds. Matteson, Brown and McKinnell. Meantime the whole council will act as a street committee, and the rest of the committees will be appointed at the next meeting of the council. It was decided to finish the work which was ordered to be done on High street by the last council, and also to do some temporary fixing to the foot of Baden Powell street, which was described by one of the aldermen as a "proper mud-hole." A big rock on White street — "a monument of disgrace" in the phrase of Ald. Howarth — was ordered to be taken over by the council adjourned after sitting only a half hour.

Depression in Coal Trade. The depression which has so suddenly and so unexpectedly overtaken the coal trade, is engaging a lot of attention locally. The cloud on the industrial horizon has fallen from a clear sky without the slightest warning and taken everybody by surprise. The laying off of so many men in Nanaimo, and the question of government employment raised in the provincial House have both served to focus attention upon the slump. Naturally there is a great deal of speculation as to how it has all come about, and many of the miners hereabouts are inclined to scout the explanation put forth that it is the result of a contract made by the Western Fuel Company for a large supply of Australian coal. Here men are just as skeptical of the unexpected depression being the consequence of an overstocked market. Rather, they suspect the slump is the result of some secret jockeying with the market by some of the big corporations. However all this may be, there is no getting away from the fact that the situation at present looks black and gloomy enough in Nanaimo. It is not so bad here. Very little of Extension coal is shipped to foreign ports. Most of it is consumed in the local trade, and it is hoped that the slackness will, at the most, not affect the mines more than three or four days a month.

Association Football. Two league football matches were played here on Saturday. The weather was wretched, the rain coming down in torrents all the afternoon, and the field naturally was all against good play. The locals won one and lost one. The Juniors were defeated by the North ward boys from Victoria, and on the day's play, the champions should not have much difficulty in retaining their title. They are a clever, speedy lot of players, sound in every division, and having a thorough knowledge of the game and of each other's methods. The local boys gave them a hard run for their money, and certainly did not deserve to be beaten by three goals to one. A draw would better have represented the merits of the two teams, although the Victorians had perhaps the pull, taking it right through. The intermediate game, in which the locals played the Y. M. C. A. eleven, was too one-sided to be interesting. Three of the North Ward boys had to take the field again to complete the eleven, and, as might be expected, the team made a poor showing. However, the victors held the local boys for first half, but went all to pieces in the second moiety, during which they had six goals scored against them. Under the circumstances it would be useless to institute a comparison between the two teams. On Saturday the senior Y. M. C. A.

eleven are expected. The champions, unluckily will be deprived of the services of their best half-back, J. McKinley, who is on the sick list. The team will probably be composed as follows: Goal, D. Morrison; backs, T. O'Connor and C. Hewlett; halves, R. Simpson, A. Morrison and A. Hallstones; forwards, J. Gray, J. Adams, J. Strong, Jas. Adam, J. Graham and Jos. Sanderson.

A MODEL CITY. Landscape Gardeners Employed by G. T. P. for Prince Rupert.

A dispatch from Montreal says it is the intention of the Grand Trunk Pacific to make a model city of Prince Rupert. With this end in view two Toronto landscape architects, Franklin Brett and George D. Hill are now on the way to that place. They will go over the site and make suggestions as to the best means to be employed and will probably be later empowered to make plans for the same. The undertaking is one of the biggest contracts of the kind ever contemplated. The architects expect to arrive in Prince Rupert about February 25th.

STARVED BY ANAEMIA

HEALTH RESTORED BY THE RICH BLOOD DR. WILLIAMS' PINK PILLS ACTUALLY MADE.

Thousands and thousands of young girls throughout Canada are literally passing into hopeless decline for the want of the new rich red blood, so abundantly supplied by Dr. Williams' Pink Pills. They are distressingly weak, pale or sallow, appetite feeble, subject to headaches, dizziness, are breathless and the heart palpitates violently at the least exertion. The doctors call this anaemia—which is the medical name for bloodlessness. Dr. Williams' Pink Pills actually make new blood—they cure anaemia just as surely as food cures hunger. Here is a bit of the strongest kind of evidence: "Dr. Williams' Pink Pills and nothing else saved my two daughters when their doctors had failed to help them." This statement is made by Mrs. Joseph Martel, St. Oliver street, Quebec. She adds: "My daughters were under the age of twenty-two and twenty-three years. For two years they suffered from the weakness and distress of anaemia, and had I learned of Dr. Williams' Pink Pills earlier, it would not only have saved me money, but much worry and anxiety as well. Both girls were as pale as a sheet. They suffered from headaches, poor appetite and grew so feeble that they could hardly go about. They were under a doctor's care, but did not improve a bit. I despair of ever seeing them in good health again, when a friend called my attention to Dr. Williams' Pink Pills. Soon after they began the pills there was an improvement in their condition and in less than a couple of months they were again enjoying good health, active robust girls. I am so grateful for what Dr. Williams' Pink Pills have done for my children that I strongly recommend them to every mother who has a weak, pale faced boy or girl."

Dr. Williams' Pink Pills do only one thing, but they do it well—they actually make new, rich blood. They don't tinker with symptoms. They act on the bowels. They simply change bad blood into good blood, and this strike straight at the root of such common ailments as headaches, dizziness, nervous exhaustion, neuralgia, St. Vitus' dance, partial paralysis, and the special, painful secret ailments of growing girls and women. Sold by all medicine dealers or by mail at 50 cents a box or six boxes for \$2.50 from the Dr. Williams' Medicine Co., Brockville, Ont.

RUTHVEN PASSED IN. Alley Liner Has Gone to Vancouver With Shipment of Flax.

The Alley liner Den of Ruthven, carrying mail from New Zealand, passed inbound for Vancouver this morning. The Ruthven did not call at Victoria as she did not wish to load inbound. The vessel however will make her first call here before the 10th of next month when she will load a large shipment of salmon and take on mail for the Fiji Islands and New Zealand. Her entire cargo will be put off at Vancouver and consists mainly of flax. The Den of Ruthven has a displacement of over five hundred tons and a capacity of 8,000 tons. The Indravelli which is the other Alley liner carrying out the substantial service every two months to New Zealand will not leave the drydock until April 10th when she will carry cargo from Victoria to New Zealand.

MOTION DEALS WITH MAIL DELIVERY Extension Sought to Continuous Districts—Matters Before Commons.

Ottawa, Ont., Jan. 23.—F. D. Monk has given notice of the following motion in the House of Commons: "That in case of cities where free mail delivery is established, such free delivery should be extended to all continuous districts, which, though situated outside the municipal limits proper, are immediately adjacent thereto, so as to render such delivery easy of execution."

E. N. Lewis, of East Huron, has introduced a bill to amend the provision of the criminal code respecting offensive weapons. He has also introduced a bill to amend the criminal code respecting assaults on women and children.

PROSPEROUS STATE OF ALBERNI CHURCH Income of St. Andrew's for Year Shows Substantial Increase.

(Special Correspondence.) Alberni, Jan. 21.—The annual congregational meeting of the St. Andrew's Presbyterian church was held in the church on the evening of the 18th inst. The reports from the chairman of the various committees showed the finances of the church to be in a prosperous condition. The church income for the year exclusive of the Sunday school, Ladies' Aid, or Manse funds, was shown to be \$610.60, being a substantial increase over last year.

HAND AND ARM ENDANGERED ZAM-BUK ARRESTS BLOOD POISON.

Neglect a cut or a scratch and it may turn to blood poisoning. Mr. Joseph Laliberte, of 34 Artillerie street, Quebec, might have lost his hand and arm but for the timely use of Zam-Buk. He says: "I cut one of my fingers on a rusty piece of tin and had no idea it would become so serious, but in two days blood poison had set in and my fingers became swollen. I was alarmed and began using one ointment after another, but none relieved me. I was about to consult a doctor when a friend advised me to try Zam-Buk. This I did. Zam-Buk began by drawing out the inflammation, and in one week the wound was nicely healed. Since then I have had no healing balm in the house but apply for a special timber license over my speedy cure that I unhesitatingly give my testimonial to the merits of Zam-Buk."

"LAND REGISTRY ACT." Duplicate Certificate of Indefeasible Title to the Northwest 1/4, N. E. 1/4 and Adjoining Fraction on the East 1/2 of Section 23, Township 1 (Map 88), Comox District.

Notice is hereby given that it is my intention, at the expiration of one month from the first publication hereof, to issue a Duplicate Certificate of Indefeasible Title to said lands, issued to The British Columbia Land Company, Limited Liability, on the 28th day of July, 1906, and numbered 188.

ONLY TWO MONTHS MARRIED. Man Quarrelled With His Bride and Committed Suicide.

New York, Jan. 21.—Nathan Elsworth Higbee, who came to New York from Pine Bush, Orange county, committed suicide by shooting to-day after a violent quarrel with his bride of less than two months.

ARGUMENTS COMPLETED IN THE FULL COURT Cases Disposed of Yesterday Afternoon—Judgment Reserved in Each.

On Tuesday afternoon the case of Bridgeman vs. Hepburn was continued before the Full court, the Chief Justice, Mr. Justice Morrison and Mr. Justice Clement sitting as the Court of Appeal. As stated Tuesday the case was one arising out of a claim for commission in connection with a real estate deal. The claim was disallowed by Mr. Justice Irving on trial, and an appeal was taken from that decision. During the morning B. V. Bodwell, K. C., presented the case for the appellant, A. P. Luxton, K. C., on behalf of the respondent, argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff would succeed. It was argued that Bridgeman was agent only for the loan which he failed to negotiate. He was also authorized to negotiate a sale at a given price within a given time, which he failed to do. When Mr. Luxton proceeded to review the evidence he was stopped by the Chief Justice, who remarked that if there was a special contract the case would go to the defendant, but if general the plaintiff