

THE BREAD QUESTION.

Attention has previously been called to the impossibility of carrying into effect with justice to the public and to the trade certain city by-laws affecting the manufacture and sale of bread. The difficulty evidently arises from no other cause than the general unfitness of such by-laws to prevent unfair dealing, or to protect such bakers as desire to do business on the square. The business of bread making is perhaps fully up to the average in facilities for crooked dealing. While a certain amount of legislation judiciously applied will in some degree prevent dishonest practices, it is impossible, in a business where there is so much variation of weight and bulk in the materials handled, for any body of lawgivers to attempt their total eradication by a fixed code of rules. Evidently it was towards this impossible goal that our older men were striving, when by laws 375 and 1128 referred to above were passed, or rather in the case of the latter rushed through the council. In this it is evident that all bread sold or offered for sale in Toronto, of whatever shape, form or fashion, shall be in loaves of one pound, one pound and a half, two pounds and four pounds respectively, and also that its respective weight shall be stamped on each loaf. The penalty for non-compliance with these and other regulations is twenty dollars fine and also seizure of bread not thus legally manufactured.

That such law-giving as this brought into practice would prove inoperative, if not a positive injury, is clearly evident to whoever takes the trouble to give the matter a serious thought. In the first place, a law compelling dealers to sell their bread in one, one and a half, two, three and four pound loaves under penalty of confiscation, will not hinder a baker whose loaves were seized to-day from making light weight tomorrow. The only serious detriment he will be under consists in a slight deterioration in popularity, which he soon recovers, as is proved by the result of numerous confiscations in the city.

The injustice done to the bakers in having to submit every loaf to the merciless scrutiny of an inspector is considerable. It is easy to conceive how difficult a matter it is to put a certain quantity of flour through the different processes of mixing, raising, baking, etc., to weigh a fixed and unvarying number of ounces, on being set up for sale.

The stamping regulation from the outset was a decided unwise failure. No baker living can stamp his bread on putting it in the oven so as to depend on its coming out recognizable. And supposing it were what guarantee is there in the mere stamping of bread, that the public are getting their proper weight? And yet by neglecting to stamp a single loaf the trade are liable to a heavy fine.

Recognizing the total inefficiency and general stupidity of such a by-law the present city commissioner has wisely declined to put it in force. For over a year it has remained a part of our civil code, a dead letter, yet liable to be put in force any day should Commissioner Costworth be replaced by a man of less good sense. Lately, however, a prominent baker has determined to have the matter settled in court and disposed of once and for ever. An order nisi has been granted and in a few days the case will be argued. It is surely a reflection on our aldermanic government that a private individual is compelled thus to seek in a law court protection from such blundering edicts as those in question. Though they have been inoperative for a whole year, owing to their utter uselessness, not a step has been taken even towards reconsidering them. They still remain and probably would ever remain for anything our aldermen have done towards removing them.

Why not bakers' bake what size loaves they like and let people buy what they wish. The trade will regulate itself; it needs no by-law whatever.

THE LATE HON. GEORGE BROWN AND SIR FRANCIS HINCKES. The Montreal Journal of Commerce of last week contains the first of a series of articles from Sir Francis Hinckes, reviewing "The Life and Speeches of Hon. George Brown," by the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie. There was a disruption of the reform party in Canada about thirty years ago, Mr. Brown taking one side and Sir Francis Hinckes the other. It is of course Sir Francis' object now to show that he was right and Mr. Brown wrong on that occasion; that is, taking the well understood principles of the reform party as the standard of judgment. He begins with a tribute of respect to Mr. Brown personally, and admits that it would be impossible to justify Mr. Brown without condemning himself (Sir Francis) who at a critical time took an antagonistic position on questions of the first importance.

Coming to the subject proper of his criticism, Sir Francis holds that in the introduction to the "Life" injustice is done to those who were "the leaders of the popular party" prior to Mr. Brown's taking up his residence in Canada. Against them the allegation is made that they "gave comparatively little attention to the advocacy of fundamental principles of government;" to which Sir Francis replies that such "fundamental principles" were advocated by Canadian reform leaders from as far back as 1829. It is even maintained (in Mr. Mackenzie's introduction) that "the principles of responsible government were not well understood by the people, nor much insisted on by their leaders," at the period of Lord Metcalfe's government, and this, says Sir Francis, after Mr. Baldwin had three times resigned office on that principle. The statement that Lord Elgin materially influenced the policy of his ministers he vigorously denies, and maintains that the principle of responsible government through ministers was then fully carried out. Next

comes a paragraph which we quote as it stands: "Fully conversant with his biography, that Mr. Brown's advent to Canada was a great accession to the liberal ranks, I emphatically deny that 'some very prominent liberals in political life were more conversant with the liberal ranks,' if, as the passage is likely to be understood, the reference is to Upper Canadian Liberals. With regard to the Lower Canadian Liberals, I shall notice the case of the latter in a moment. The publication of the Toronto Examiner in 1838 with the motto, 'Responsible government and the voluntary principle,' my warmest supporters were Dr. and Mr. Robert Baldwin. During the protracted discussion of the clergy reform bill in the session of 1839-40, when no effort was spared to obtain the consent of reformers to the division of the reserves, the Examiner fought the battle with the Christian Guardian and Colonist for complete secularization, and Mr. Baldwin and all the other leading reformers approved of its course. Then followed the disallowance of the Colonial act in consequence of the opinion of the twelve judges of England, that the Imperial act was already sold had been legally appropriated by the statute of 1791 to the churches of England and Scotland. The Imperial act passed in 1840 was very generally believed to be a final settlement of the question, and the restoration of Canada to the government had been declared that the clergy reserve question should be settled prior to the union. I have no doubt that Mr. Baldwin believed that it would be impracticable to obtain the repeal of the Imperial act, and no better proof can be adduced of the prevalence of such an opinion than the fact that there was no agitation on the subject in Upper Canada, England, an attempt was made by the Church of England to obtain such an amendment of the Imperial act as would vest the reserved lands in the Churches of England and Scotland as corporations. It is admitted by Mr. Brown's biographer, after citing a remark of Mr. Pilon, that 'vesting these lands in colonial bodies was an infelicitous idea, which the country could not and would not bear,' that the infelicitous idea was given to be imminent, and reasons are given for that opinion in which I entirely concur. Justice, however, is not done to Mr. Baldwin and his Upper Canada colleagues who led the movement to obtain the repeal of the Imperial act and the restoration of Canada to the right to deal with the whole question of religious endowments."

Sir Francis denies that at the time of the Metcalfe crisis there was any want of concord among the reform leaders of the day. He says that there was nothing approaching to a rupture between himself and Mr. Brown until after he (Sir Francis) had ceased his connection with the press. On accepting office in 1842 he dropped connection with the Examiner, and he took the same course again in 1848. He reproaches from the Globe of May 8, 1847, some remarks highly flattering to himself as a study and consistent reformer, who took up the cause when it was at zero, and never flinched. It must be said that the Globe's account of Sir Francis in 1847 reads strangely enough. And this brings us to the sixth and seventh paragraphs of the article, his main point so far is that there was a material change afterwards, not in his own views, but in those of Mr. Brown. We quote the last paragraph of the present article: "I have expressed an opinion that Mr. Brown had in later years materially modified those views which caused the antagonism between him and myself during the period from 1851 to 1854. I will briefly state the grounds of that opinion. I believe that the Globe of the present day expresses political views substantially in accordance with those which Mr. Brown held at the period of his death. It is my conviction that thirty years ago no catholic archbishop would have expressed the confidence in an administration, enjoying the support of the Globe, that was only a few days ago declared by Archbishop Lynch. I am equally confident that no Roman Catholic would have consented at that period to be a member of an administration supported by Mr. Brown. Had the Marmion controversy taken place thirty years ago the Globe would most assuredly have taken a course diametrically opposite to that which it has but recently followed, one that I should think substantially the same as that of the present day. The Globe of the present day has published such an article as that in its issue of the 11th inst., headed 'Protestant aid to Roman Catholicism.' I believe that the Globe to decidedly more liberal to-day than it was in 1852, and I am moreover firmly convinced that at that time my own political principles were more liberal than those of Mr. Brown."

The question as to what material change, if any, took place in Mr. Brown's views on great public questions, to what extent and in what direction—is really an important question in Canadian history. And while such reminiscences must have a special interest for the veterans of a former time of political trial and struggle who yet remain with us, they may have an interest as well for the younger generation, and who look upon Canada as their country, and a country not without a history either.

A METHODIST HERETIC. Texas, like Toronto, has been having its trial for heresy. Rev. Mr. Shaw, one of the most popular of the clergy of the Methodist church, has been bold enough to think for himself, and while retaining his Christian faith and reverence for the bible, has examined into and has at last rejected the belief in all that is claimed to be supernatural in what are called miracles. He does not believe that the whole really swallowed Jonah, or that the ass held dialogue with the prophetic son of Troas. Hence, very justly, the Methodist church has expelled him. Churches to exist must have creeds, and if churches do not believe them they have their alternative, to quit the church. Nobody compelled Mr. Shaw to reason about miracles, which, like pills, are best taken at a swallow. Mr. Shaw chose to think and reason; to chew his pill, and the process has not agreed with him.

ARAB'S VENICTION. No more awkward revelation could have come upon the Turkish government than the publication at his trial of the papers of Arabi Pasha, which the khedive and the porte have in vain tried to suppress. Arabi, however, is England's prisoner and his trial must be conducted in accordance with English justice. If proof can be given that Arabi is in any way responsible for the Alexandria massacre no doubts he will be punished. But as far as the evidence as yet made public goes, there is nothing to show that Arabi had anything to do with the massacre or the subsequent outrages on Europeans. On the other hand there is reason to believe that to the utmost of his power Arabi protected the lives of all Europeans, and secured the success of the British fleet. We remember Mr. Dechair's account when he visited our office last summer of Arabi's kind treatment of his son, Midshipman Dechair, then a prisoner within the Egyptian lines. Arabi was minister of war to the khedive, and his papers, now being published, show that he obeyed Tewfik's orders in resisting Admiral Seymour's bombardment and in subsequently fighting against the British invasion. All which makes it very likely that he will be made away with by some of those subtle modes of poisoning which Mr. Senior's paper on Egypt in the Fort-nightly Review for 1877 shows to be so common in the country. With us it is comparatively difficult to poison a man, the natural question in case of a sudden death being, "with whom did he dine?" But in Egypt, where a man drinks half a dozen cups of coffee in a half a dozen houses, the poisoning business is more practicable. The poison used is of the kind called cumulative, it acts slowly, its effects are for a long time imperceptible, and when most serious simulate liver disease, for which they may easily be mistaken.

THE MISSOURI OUT-THREAT KING. Next Monday will witness what will probably prove the crowning force of the apotheosis of villainy which has for the last month disgraced Missouri in the trial, if it can be called by a name connoting any reference to justice, of the self-confessed murderer, bandit and desperado, Frank James. His jail life has been the oration given by Missouri to her representative man. His cell is lavishly rich, delicacies and flowers are carried on the prisoner; he is visited by crowds of the most high-toned people, including Governor Crittenden and his wife. The Missouri people have themselves to blame if law-abiding and respectable citizens show their state as an exceedingly undesirable field for settlement.

MR. WITHROW AND THE WORKING-MAN. (To the Editor of The World.) Sir: The World deserves all praise for the impartiality it displays in the Withrow question. It opens its columns to both parties and publishes the result of its interview with Mr. Withrow. I presume that Mr. Withrow in that interview made the best of his case and painted the best of himself that he could; and he has done so. It is an air of mystery has been thrown around his record as an employer. He solves that mystery himself in his subsequent statement that he supposed he was regarded as a "representative employer." That is exactly the fact; and it is in that statement that the trade union is strengthened in its action and justified in its opposition. When Mr. Withrow is simply an alderman he is the representative of a ward of a section; but when Mr. Withrow aspires to the office of mayor he seeks to become the representative of all the city. Then every working man who votes for him endorses his record as an employer, and the other employers in opposing the strikers to the strikers the most prominent and important, and every working man who votes against him endorses the record of the other employers in opposing the strikers to the strikers. His record as a city alderman is unsatisfactory, but because on his own statement he has been the representative of the opposition party, the employers, and his resistance to the claims of the strikers.

Mr. Withrow states that he never had any special trouble with his "own men," but that he had a direct conflict with the employer's union, never knowingly injured any employee in any way; and as a climax to these claims to their votes, he adds that his firm has paid the highest wages in the city to the strikers in their service. This is perfectly clear, and it leaves the public to understand that there is no personal antagonism, but that the opposing party is the employer's ground of principle and makes all other motives subordinate. If his firm paid the highest current wages, that was no mark of his superior liberality. It made no sacrifice; it simply studied its own interests; it secured by that means the best mechanical skill at the lowest price that would be accepted, and at the highest demand by the union; and if the union would have sanctioned half the rate of wages there is no reason for believing that the firm of Withrow & Hillock would have paid a cent more than the standard wage.

Mr. Withrow has not distinguished himself especially as an alderman above many of his conferees, and amongst them, there is no doubt, there are men in many respects better entitled to the honor which he seeks. Mr. Withrow's chief claim lies in the active part he has taken as a member of the exhibition committee. No doubt the exhibition by the influx of visitors to the city brought a temporary influx of money; that influx of money benefited the hotel keepers, the brewers, the best distillers and the stores; but it is very doubtful if it benefited the workmen; and the best that can be said of such exhibitions is that they give an impulse to mechanical and agricultural skill. But there is no doubt that Mr. Withrow has been fully recompensed in the prominence which his efforts secured, and in the popularity it won for him amongst the moneyed classes and those directly benefited.

But in that very prominence Mr. Withrow becomes more dangerous in his antagonism with labor. Wealth always sympathizes with wealth; and as Mr. Withrow advances a higher amount the wealth owners and classes he is stronger and better able in future contests to crush the antagonisms of labor.

I repeat, Mr. Editor, what I advanced in my first letter this is not a political question with the workmen. Mr. Withrow himself declares the introduction of politics in municipal matters. Let the workmen then unite and show at once that they sympathize with Mr. Withrow in this last sentiment, and are determined to exalt principle above party politics in civic affairs by voting against the man who resisted their just claims, and who, in their trial, when they exhibited the highest moral qualities, implied by invoking the protection of the police, that they were capable of crime, of arson, of robbery and of murder.

LAW AND GOSPEL. (To the Editor of The World.) Sir: The deceased Thomas Carlyle was a champion of force, a believer in the god of battles. How he would have enjoyed life in Toronto amid a Christian (?) community which trusts by force to work moral, social, trade and financial reforms. How he would have admired the strength of pig-headedness which animates our utter distrust of all such trivalties as reason, moral aversion, experience, truth, righteousness of life, lived and taught by the man Christ Jesus.

Is it the temperance question which is under consideration?—then straightway we agitate for a law to prohibit the sale of liquor, leaving its manufacture free, in hope that by force we can prevent its sale after it is made; or at least compel its export to other countries.

Do we seek to inculcate morality and sound moral principles?—The way we find to do it is to clamor for legal enforcement of bible truths for the use of our schools. Yet well we know, or might know, that a man may read the bible regularly all his life, and only use its divine truths to cloak his sins and to make himself more accomplished and successful hypocrite.

Do we desire to stop intemperance in trade? We take the simple, easy and eminently rational method of restricting the law of supply, or of instituting such a law as will prevent the sale of liquor. Of course it does it, if we shall dare to say we are pillars up of business which must reveal itself sooner or later?

Suddenly become virtuous, do we cry out against financial speculation? Then at once we clamor for legal force to rid us of the supply of men, blinded by dishonest selfishness, whose folly makes speculation possible. Making the thing illegal, we say, and it will cease out of the land. What nonsense! Do theft, fraud, forgery, etc., although illegal, cease to exist among the people? The thing which speculation has will save many a man from entering on such paths. Any new enactment prohibiting it would only be evaded by new methods, morality remains as unshaken as to deem it right to make money by causing others to lose, wasting time and energy in producing nothing of use to the community. Speculation is gaining, and men should be left free to do it and take the consequences. It is the quickest method of teaching them. All sensible men are slow to credit a supporter, or an institution which lives by supporting gamblers. Threw light on these things. It is all that is needed to check them. Expose three-fourths of the victims—then the rest will be caught up. Do we seek to suppress the social evil? Legal force again becomes our panacea for moral reform. We have but to find out these places so that he may give evidence, and then surprise them by a raid. It is a small matter to do evil, if only good be our aim. That such a course is neither better nor more just than the smaller matter. Our laws are so constructed and must be carried out. It would be alike ridiculous and impossible to amend our laws so that they should be generally paid. What the public ought to know is whether the informer is rewarded with any portion of them. This whole question over "the man who took money" is probably betrayed, is out of his society and social usages from almost any other means of livelihood, and such circumstances would require a double standard of justice for all diseases of the body, and for all diseases of the mind. PHYSICIANS USE IT AND PRESCRIBE IT FREELY. FOR ALL WEAKNESSES OF THE GENERATIVE ORGANS OF EITHER SEX. IT IS ACCORDING TO NO REMEDY THAT HAS EVER BEEN USED IN THE TREATMENT OF THESE AFFECTIONS. IT IS THE GREATEST REMEDY IN THE WORLD. BY THE GENTLEST AND MOST EFFECTIVE OF ALL MEANS. LYDIA E. PINKHAM'S VEGETABLE COMPOUND. A SURE CURE FOR ALL FEMALE WEAKNESSES, INCLUDING LEUCORRHOEA, IRREGULAR AND PAINFUL MENSTRUATION, INFLAMMATION AND ILL-CURABLE OF THE UTERUS, HEADACHE, BRONCHITIS, LARVAE UTERI, &c. &c. PROMPT TO THE TALK, EFFICACIOUS AND IMMEDIATE IN ITS EFFECT. IT IS GREATLY HELPFUL IN PREGNANCY, AND RELIEVES PAIN DURING LABOR AND AT REGULAR PERIODS. PHYSICIANS USE IT AND PRESCRIBE IT FREELY. FOR ALL WEAKNESSES OF THE GENERATIVE ORGANS OF EITHER SEX. IT IS ACCORDING TO NO REMEDY THAT HAS EVER BEEN USED IN THE TREATMENT OF THESE AFFECTIONS. IT IS THE GREATEST REMEDY IN THE WORLD. BY THE GENTLEST AND MOST EFFECTIVE OF ALL MEANS. LYDIA E. PINKHAM'S VEGETABLE COMPOUND. A SURE CURE FOR ALL FEMALE WEAKNESSES, INCLUDING LEUCORRHOEA, IRREGULAR AND PAINFUL MENSTRUATION, INFLAMMATION AND ILL-CURABLE OF THE UTERUS, HEADACHE, BRONCHITIS, LARVAE UTERI, &c. &c. PROMPT TO THE TALK, EFFICACIOUS AND IMMEDIATE IN ITS EFFECT. IT IS GREATLY HELPFUL IN PREGNANCY, AND RELIEVES PAIN DURING LABOR AND AT REGULAR PERIODS. PHYSICIANS USE IT AND PRESCRIBE IT FREELY. FOR ALL WEAKNESSES OF THE GENERATIVE ORGANS OF EITHER SEX. IT IS ACCORDING TO NO REMEDY THAT HAS EVER BEEN USED IN THE TREATMENT OF THESE AFFECTIONS. IT IS THE GREATEST REMEDY IN THE WORLD. BY THE GENTLEST AND MOST EFFECTIVE OF ALL MEANS.

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of claysmen; and one of them said to the other, "Why, there are all the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen." The other, who was a visitor, said, "The other, no wiser than before, said, 'What a visitation!' And the answer he received was, 'Why, it's the people coming from the north, and they are all claysmen.'"

Two farmers, while riding along together, encountered a large number of