



SHORT STORY. COTTOLENE is the best Shortening for all cooking purposes.

A TRUE STORY. COTTOLENE is the only healthful Shortening made by physicians' direction.

An OLD STORY. That uncomfortable feeling of "too much richness" from food cooked in lard.

A NEW STORY. Food cooked in COTTOLENE is delicate, delicious, healthful, comforting. Do YOU use COTTOLENE?

SHARP'S BALSAM OF HOREHOUND AND ANISEED. FOR COUGH, WHOOPING COUGH, COUGHS AND COLDS.

ARMSTRONG & CO. PROPRIETORS. ST. JOHN, N. B.

SHERIFF'S SALE. To be held at public auction on Saturday, the 24th day of March next, in front of the Court House...

UNDERWEAR FOR FALL & WINTER. Our present season's stock will be found complete in all respects.

W. S. LOGGIE, Manchester House. Sleighs, New Style, Double and Single.

I WILL SELL CHEAP. All my work is made of the best of stock, and by first class workmen, and guaranteed.

HOUSE TO RENT. A furnished house in a good locality in Chatham. Rent moderate. Possession given at once.

GEO. W. CUTLER. GENERAL INSURANCE AGENT FOR FIRE, LIFE AND ACCIDENT COMPANIES.

FOR SALE. This property situated on the north side of the town of Miramichi, in the County of Gloucester...

CHATHAM WOOD TRADE. On 4th inst. we gave the figures representing the imports and consumption of wood goods at Liverpool for the month of December and also the past year, and the stock on hand.

CHATHAM WOOD TRADE. On 4th inst. we gave the figures representing the imports and consumption of wood goods at Liverpool for the month of December and also the past year, and the stock on hand.

CHATHAM WOOD TRADE. On 4th inst. we gave the figures representing the imports and consumption of wood goods at Liverpool for the month of December and also the past year, and the stock on hand.

CHATHAM WOOD TRADE. On 4th inst. we gave the figures representing the imports and consumption of wood goods at Liverpool for the month of December and also the past year, and the stock on hand.

Miramichi Advance. CHATHAM, N. B., JANUARY 18, 1894.

The Municipal Council.

The Municipal Council of Northumberland, which commenced its annual January session on Tuesday, is the first under the new biennial system.

The Telegraph appeared to experience a feeling of sadness last Friday because it is, to publish the news from Ottawa, in which was a statement by Sir Herbert Tupper, Minister of Marine, that he had caused the question of alleged infractions of the steamboat law by the St. John corporation ferryboats, to be referred to the Minister of Justice.

MAJOR CHAPMAN, of St. Stephen, has announced that he does not intend to seek re-election.

Encouraging Crime. The case of the three young men, Pelland, Demarq and Mercier, who, early in December, attempted to blow up the Nelson monument on Jacques Cartier square, Montreal, with dynamite was before the provincial law examiners of Quebec on 11th, on a resolution that the three young men, who are all law students, should not be allowed to undergo examination for admission to study. The motion was defeated by a vote of three to four.

Business in Gloucester County. Advice from Gloucester County indicate that the severity of this winter's weather will cut into the business of that locality. The frequent snow-falls have rendered the roads almost impassable, and thereby hindered the progress of all outside work.

THE SHATFORD CASE. Judge Tuck gives the custody of the children to Mr. Shatford. Ernest Blair of Chatham, abducts one of the children and is brought at Moncton. Shatford now has all the children.

Liverpool Wood Trade. On 4th inst. we gave the figures representing the imports and consumption of wood goods at Liverpool for the month of December and also the past year, and the stock on hand.

Liverpool Wood Trade. On 4th inst. we gave the figures representing the imports and consumption of wood goods at Liverpool for the month of December and also the past year, and the stock on hand.

against him were true then he was not fit to bring the children.

For the present the children remain with Mr. Shatford. It is probable that in the event of Shatford getting the children today he will be required to give bonds for their production when necessary.

Mr. Charles Campbell was the only representative of the Campbell family present in Judge Tuck's court on Saturday morning when the consideration of Mr. Curry's application for a stay of proceedings was on, pending an appeal to the full Supreme Court came up. The Record says:—

Mr. Shatford, as usual, sat behind his counsel. His Honor asked Mr. Curry what he had to say, and after that gentleman had commenced his argument Judge Tuck had to say to Mr. Curry:—

Mr. Curry pointed out that although the act of 1885 provided for an appeal, it made no provision for a stay of proceedings. He therefore argued from principle that this was one of the cases where a stay should be allowed as a matter of right.

His Honor intimated that he thought it was in his discretion to grant or withhold a stay, but that he would not do so unless the stay was allowed Mr. Shatford's appeal would allow nothing even if successful, because in the meanwhile Mr. Shatford would have had the children before the jurisdiction of the court, whence they could not be recovered.

His Honor said the rule works both ways, for suppose a stay is granted and the appeal comes up before the appellate court and it is argued, perhaps the court might have to consider, and if it did it would be some time before judgment, and suppose the judgment was in favor of Shatford, then he would have to come away from Chicago to get his children.

Mr. Curry referred to the Ellis case and stated that if there was anything in point in the appeal in that case it was in his favor. In that case he argued that the court ready to appeal, which was not the case here. The appeal in that case was never argued on its merits, but was quashed on the question of jurisdiction. Therefore there was no similarity between the two cases.

His Honor said that he found in the statute nothing more than was expressed—that is simply that the judge's decision was not to be appealed from. He thought that Mr. Shatford with the little girl Leslie had taken refuge in Mrs. Grace Robinson's house. The warrants for the arrest of Chas. Campbell and Mrs. Shatford have been placed in the hands of several constables and will be immediately executed if such arrangement is not made soon.

against him were true then he was not fit to bring the children.

For the present the children remain with Mr. Shatford. It is probable that in the event of Shatford getting the children today he will be required to give bonds for their production when necessary.

Mr. Charles Campbell was the only representative of the Campbell family present in Judge Tuck's court on Saturday morning when the consideration of Mr. Curry's application for a stay of proceedings was on, pending an appeal to the full Supreme Court came up. The Record says:—

Mr. Shatford, as usual, sat behind his counsel. His Honor asked Mr. Curry what he had to say, and after that gentleman had commenced his argument Judge Tuck had to say to Mr. Curry:—

Mr. Curry pointed out that although the act of 1885 provided for an appeal, it made no provision for a stay of proceedings. He therefore argued from principle that this was one of the cases where a stay should be allowed as a matter of right.

His Honor intimated that he thought it was in his discretion to grant or withhold a stay, but that he would not do so unless the stay was allowed Mr. Shatford's appeal would allow nothing even if successful, because in the meanwhile Mr. Shatford would have had the children before the jurisdiction of the court, whence they could not be recovered.

His Honor said the rule works both ways, for suppose a stay is granted and the appeal comes up before the appellate court and it is argued, perhaps the court might have to consider, and if it did it would be some time before judgment, and suppose the judgment was in favor of Shatford, then he would have to come away from Chicago to get his children.

Mr. Curry referred to the Ellis case and stated that if there was anything in point in the appeal in that case it was in his favor. In that case he argued that the court ready to appeal, which was not the case here. The appeal in that case was never argued on its merits, but was quashed on the question of jurisdiction. Therefore there was no similarity between the two cases.

His Honor said that he found in the statute nothing more than was expressed—that is simply that the judge's decision was not to be appealed from. He thought that Mr. Shatford with the little girl Leslie had taken refuge in Mrs. Grace Robinson's house. The warrants for the arrest of Chas. Campbell and Mrs. Shatford have been placed in the hands of several constables and will be immediately executed if such arrangement is not made soon.

against him were true then he was not fit to bring the children.

For the present the children remain with Mr. Shatford. It is probable that in the event of Shatford getting the children today he will be required to give bonds for their production when necessary.

Mr. Charles Campbell was the only representative of the Campbell family present in Judge Tuck's court on Saturday morning when the consideration of Mr. Curry's application for a stay of proceedings was on, pending an appeal to the full Supreme Court came up. The Record says:—

Mr. Shatford, as usual, sat behind his counsel. His Honor asked Mr. Curry what he had to say, and after that gentleman had commenced his argument Judge Tuck had to say to Mr. Curry:—

Mr. Curry pointed out that although the act of 1885 provided for an appeal, it made no provision for a stay of proceedings. He therefore argued from principle that this was one of the cases where a stay should be allowed as a matter of right.

His Honor intimated that he thought it was in his discretion to grant or withhold a stay, but that he would not do so unless the stay was allowed Mr. Shatford's appeal would allow nothing even if successful, because in the meanwhile Mr. Shatford would have had the children before the jurisdiction of the court, whence they could not be recovered.

His Honor said the rule works both ways, for suppose a stay is granted and the appeal comes up before the appellate court and it is argued, perhaps the court might have to consider, and if it did it would be some time before judgment, and suppose the judgment was in favor of Shatford, then he would have to come away from Chicago to get his children.

Mr. Curry referred to the Ellis case and stated that if there was anything in point in the appeal in that case it was in his favor. In that case he argued that the court ready to appeal, which was not the case here. The appeal in that case was never argued on its merits, but was quashed on the question of jurisdiction. Therefore there was no similarity between the two cases.

His Honor said that he found in the statute nothing more than was expressed—that is simply that the judge's decision was not to be appealed from. He thought that Mr. Shatford with the little girl Leslie had taken refuge in Mrs. Grace Robinson's house. The warrants for the arrest of Chas. Campbell and Mrs. Shatford have been placed in the hands of several constables and will be immediately executed if such arrangement is not made soon.

against him were true then he was not fit to bring the children.

For the present the children remain with Mr. Shatford. It is probable that in the event of Shatford getting the children today he will be required to give bonds for their production when necessary.

Mr. Charles Campbell was the only representative of the Campbell family present in Judge Tuck's court on Saturday morning when the consideration of Mr. Curry's application for a stay of proceedings was on, pending an appeal to the full Supreme Court came up. The Record says:—

Mr. Shatford, as usual, sat behind his counsel. His Honor asked Mr. Curry what he had to say, and after that gentleman had commenced his argument Judge Tuck had to say to Mr. Curry:—

Mr. Curry pointed out that although the act of 1885 provided for an appeal, it made no provision for a stay of proceedings. He therefore argued from principle that this was one of the cases where a stay should be allowed as a matter of right.

His Honor intimated that he thought it was in his discretion to grant or withhold a stay, but that he would not do so unless the stay was allowed Mr. Shatford's appeal would allow nothing even if successful, because in the meanwhile Mr. Shatford would have had the children before the jurisdiction of the court, whence they could not be recovered.

His Honor said the rule works both ways, for suppose a stay is granted and the appeal comes up before the appellate court and it is argued, perhaps the court might have to consider, and if it did it would be some time before judgment, and suppose the judgment was in favor of Shatford, then he would have to come away from Chicago to get his children.

Mr. Curry referred to the Ellis case and stated that if there was anything in point in the appeal in that case it was in his favor. In that case he argued that the court ready to appeal, which was not the case here. The appeal in that case was never argued on its merits, but was quashed on the question of jurisdiction. Therefore there was no similarity between the two cases.

His Honor said that he found in the statute nothing more than was expressed—that is simply that the judge's decision was not to be appealed from. He thought that Mr. Shatford with the little girl Leslie had taken refuge in Mrs. Grace Robinson's house. The warrants for the arrest of Chas. Campbell and Mrs. Shatford have been placed in the hands of several constables and will be immediately executed if such arrangement is not made soon.

against him were true then he was not fit to bring the children.

For the present the children remain with Mr. Shatford. It is probable that in the event of Shatford getting the children today he will be required to give bonds for their production when necessary.

Mr. Charles Campbell was the only representative of the Campbell family present in Judge Tuck's court on Saturday morning when the consideration of Mr. Curry's application for a stay of proceedings was on, pending an appeal to the full Supreme Court came up. The Record says:—

Mr. Shatford, as usual, sat behind his counsel. His Honor asked Mr. Curry what he had to say, and after that gentleman had commenced his argument Judge Tuck had to say to Mr. Curry:—

Mr. Curry pointed out that although the act of 1885 provided for an appeal, it made no provision for a stay of proceedings. He therefore argued from principle that this was one of the cases where a stay should be allowed as a matter of right.

His Honor intimated that he thought it was in his discretion to grant or withhold a stay, but that he would not do so unless the stay was allowed Mr. Shatford's appeal would allow nothing even if successful, because in the meanwhile Mr. Shatford would have had the children before the jurisdiction of the court, whence they could not be recovered.

His Honor said the rule works both ways, for suppose a stay is granted and the appeal comes up before the appellate court and it is argued, perhaps the court might have to consider, and if it did it would be some time before judgment, and suppose the judgment was in favor of Shatford, then he would have to come away from Chicago to get his children.

Mr. Curry referred to the Ellis case and stated that if there was anything in point in the appeal in that case it was in his favor. In that case he argued that the court ready to appeal, which was not the case here. The appeal in that case was never argued on its merits, but was quashed on the question of jurisdiction. Therefore there was no similarity between the two cases.

His Honor said that he found in the statute nothing more than was expressed—that is simply that the judge's decision was not to be appealed from. He thought that Mr. Shatford with the little girl Leslie had taken refuge in Mrs. Grace Robinson's house. The warrants for the arrest of Chas. Campbell and Mrs. Shatford have been placed in the hands of several constables and will be immediately executed if such arrangement is not made soon.

against him were true then he was not fit to bring the children.

For the present the children remain with Mr. Shatford. It is probable that in the event of Shatford getting the children today he will be required to give bonds for their production when necessary.

Mr. Charles Campbell was the only representative of the Campbell family present in Judge Tuck's court on Saturday morning when the consideration of Mr. Curry's application for a stay of proceedings was on, pending an appeal to the full Supreme Court came up. The Record says:—

Mr. Shatford, as usual, sat behind his counsel. His Honor asked Mr. Curry what he had to say, and after that gentleman had commenced his argument Judge Tuck had to say to Mr. Curry:—

Mr. Curry pointed out that although the act of 1885 provided for an appeal, it made no provision for a stay of proceedings. He therefore argued from principle that this was one of the cases where a stay should be allowed as a matter of right.

His Honor intimated that he thought it was in his discretion to grant or withhold a stay, but that he would not do so unless the stay was allowed Mr. Shatford's appeal would allow nothing even if successful, because in the meanwhile Mr. Shatford would have had the children before the jurisdiction of the court, whence they could not be recovered.

His Honor said the rule works both ways, for suppose a stay is granted and the appeal comes up before the appellate court and it is argued, perhaps the court might have to consider, and if it did it would be some time before judgment, and suppose the judgment was in favor of Shatford, then he would have to come away from Chicago to get his children.

Mr. Curry referred to the Ellis case and stated that if there was anything in point in the appeal in that case it was in his favor. In that case he argued that the court ready to appeal, which was not the case here. The appeal in that case was never argued on its merits, but was quashed on the question of jurisdiction. Therefore there was no similarity between the two cases.

His Honor said that he found in the statute nothing more than was expressed—that is simply that the judge's decision was not to be appealed from. He thought that Mr. Shatford with the little girl Leslie had taken refuge in Mrs. Grace Robinson's house. The warrants for the arrest of Chas. Campbell and Mrs. Shatford have been placed in the hands of several constables and will be immediately executed if such arrangement is not made soon.

against him were true then he was not fit to bring the children.

For the present the children remain with Mr. Shatford. It is probable that in the event of Shatford getting the children today he will be required to give bonds for their production when necessary.

Mr. Charles Campbell was the only representative of the Campbell family present in Judge Tuck's court on Saturday morning when the consideration of Mr. Curry's application for a stay of proceedings was on, pending an appeal to the full Supreme Court came up. The Record says:—

Mr. Shatford, as usual, sat behind his counsel. His Honor asked Mr. Curry what he had to say, and after that gentleman had commenced his argument Judge Tuck had to say to Mr. Curry:—

Mr. Curry pointed out that although the act of 1885 provided for an appeal, it made no provision for a stay of proceedings. He therefore argued from principle that this was one of the cases where a stay should be allowed as a matter of right.

His Honor intimated that he thought it was in his discretion to grant or withhold a stay, but that he would not do so unless the stay was allowed Mr. Shatford's appeal would allow nothing even if successful, because in the meanwhile Mr. Shatford would have had the children before the jurisdiction of the court, whence they could not be recovered.

His Honor said the rule works both ways, for suppose a stay is granted and the appeal comes up before the appellate court and it is argued, perhaps the court might have to consider, and if it did it would be some time before judgment, and suppose the judgment was in favor of Shatford, then he would have to come away from Chicago to get his children.

Mr. Curry referred to the Ellis case and stated that if there was anything in point in the appeal in that case it was in his favor. In that case he argued that the court ready to appeal, which was not the case here. The appeal in that case was never argued on its merits, but was quashed on the question of jurisdiction. Therefore there was no similarity between the two cases.

His Honor said that he found in the statute nothing more than was expressed—that is simply that the judge's decision was not to be appealed from. He thought that Mr. Shatford with the little girl Leslie had taken refuge in Mrs. Grace Robinson's house. The warrants for the arrest of Chas. Campbell and Mrs. Shatford have been placed in the hands of several constables and will be immediately executed if such arrangement is not made soon.



