

Miramichi and the North Shore, etc.

SEVANT WANTED, see advt. GEORGE McLEOD, Esq., has established his office at Newcastle for this season.

THE SCHEER, "DASHER," 52 tons register, of Yarmouth, N. S., has been purchased by Robert Caie, Esq., of Richibucto.

RESIDENCE BOUGHT.—Mr. John Dickinson, now in California, has sold his late residence at Kingston to Capt. James Gordon.

EDGINGS IN RAFTS are afloat in the vicinity of Newcastle wharves. Is this "lawful and right"?

TENDERS FOR BRIDGE.—Tenders are invited for building a new bridge over Little Tracadie River, the work to be completed next November.

FOR THE N. W.—Messrs. Wm. McMinin, Jr., and Hudson Curwin have left Richibucto to join the North West Mounted Police Force.

SCOTT ACT.—A petition was being circulated yesterday, at Bathurst, for the purpose of bringing the Scott Act into operation in Gloucester.

FOR TEXAS.—Messrs. Clifford Aitken and William McPhee, of Kouchibouctou, have started for Texas to seek their fortunes.

NONE OF IT.—We have none of the information referred to by the Advocate, other than that to which the poet refers. We are, therefore, happy.

A GENERAL CARGO for Messrs. J. B. Snowball, R. Bain, Geo. Burchill and others has arrived from Liverpool in the barque Equator, consigned to J. B. Snowball, Esq.

REMOVAL.—Mr. George Staples has removed his tonorial establishment from his late stand, Canada House, to the Ferguson building, Water Street, formerly occupied by Mr. Cyrus Brown.

WOOD ENGRAVING.—Mr. C. H. Flewelling, the well known Wood Engraver, Electrotyper and Stereotyper, of St. John, has removed his place of business to quarters over the Colonial Bookstore, King Street in that City. See advt.

THE MIRAMICHI BOOKSTORE is the headquarters of the Mechanical Orgraphette Agency on the Miramichi. Orders for instruments or music sheets filled at manufacturers' prices. It's a wonder in its way and all the manufacturers claim for it.

SALMON.—Two dollars each, it is said, was the price paid for the first two salmon in the Chatham market this season. They were brought to town by Mr. Luther Lewis last Monday, and Mr. Snowball secured one of them and Senator Muirhead, the other.

BATHURST MILLS AND LUMBER.—Both Messrs. Stewart's & Burns' mills commenced sawing last week. There is a good freshet and logs are coming down freely.

There is a heavy jam at the middle landing on the Nepisiquit, but it is expected to be got out without much difficulty.

PLASTER WORK.—An Italian has established himself in the business of making plaster casts in the house opposite Temperance Hall. His work is being sold about town. He is also preparing to turn out work for the interior decoration of houses—such as centre pieces, cornice ornaments, etc. Here is a chance for our house-building friends.

DANGEROUS.—The roadway of "Stewart's Bridge" lower Newcastle, is reported to be in very bad condition. A Chatham gentleman narrowly escaped meeting with a very serious accident there a few evenings since. As it was, his wagon was broken. This bridge requires raising, as it is a high one and very dangerous to travellers at night who may not be familiar with it.

WAGONS, ETC.—During a visit made yesterday by one of our staff to Mr. Alex. Robinson's Carriage Factory, St. John Street, he was shown some "piano box" and other wagons, besides other kinds of Mr. Robinson's line, that would do credit to any establishment in the Province. We shall refer at greater length to what Mr. Robinson has on hand next week, but in the meantime, a personal inspection will satisfy good judges that they need not go abroad for first class wagons.

THE DREDGE, ST. LAWRENCE, in command of Capt. Thomson, with Mr. A. McMurray as chief engineer, arrived at Chatham, on Saturday afternoon last, from Pictou and is now after completing her coaling at Newcastle—ready to continue her work on the Horseshoe Bar. The reappearance of the Dredge and her genial officers at so early a date in the season, is an evidence that the very necessary work in which she is engaged, and which was commenced through the representations of Mr. Snowball, is to be effectively prosecuted.

DIPHTHERIA.—May, eldest daughter of Roger Flanagan, Esq., died on Thursday morning last of diphtheria. She was about nine years old and her death, following very closely upon that of Mr. and Mrs. Flanagan's only son, who was nine months old, is calculated to enlist general sympathy for them in the community.

A rather unusual case of diphtheria—that of Mrs. Stuart of Lower Napan, a lady 61 years old—terminated fatally on Tuesday last.

Other cases of this dreadful disease exist and it is feared that they will multiply.

INQUEST ON BOARD THE SHIP "HELENA."—On Monday last an inquest was held on board the ship "Helga," Capt. Schulstok, from Norway, by Coroner McCurdy, on the body of a seaman named Jens Emil Aule. The deceased was a Norwegian aged 16. It appeared from the evidence that on the 9th inst, while loosening a coil, he fell from the main yard to the deck, thereby fracturing the base of the skull, causing instantaneous death. The jury brought in a verdict of accidental death, and accompanied it with remarks of approval of the care with which the remains of the deceased had been prepared for burial. The jury sworn in this case were James Carter, Foreman; Peter Dickson, Capt. J. J. Brown, John A. Lynch, Philip Leonard, John Smith, Jas. Flood.

PERSONAL.—His Lordship, Bishop Rogers, of Chatham, came down by train to Point du Chene, Wednesday night, on diocesan business. He thence took steamer for Charlottetown.—Times.

Thos. H. Fleiger, Esq., was in town yesterday.

Hon. Provincial Secretary Wedderburn and Surveyor-General Adams visited their Chatham friends on Monday last.

Mr. Jas. J. Mulhall, formerly of Newcastle, has secured a first rate appointment under the Canada Pacific Syndicate—his salary being, it is said, \$2,000 a year.

H. D. McLEOD, Esq., Superintendent of the E. & N. A. Railway (westward), and Capt. Spear, representing American roads connecting therewith, were in town on

Thursday last looking after business affairs.

Piers Locke, Esq., of the Montreal firm, Black & Locke, Leather Merchants, visited Newcastle Monday. Mr. Locke is a large buyer of leather. He said he had visited Chatham, but was told that Newcastle had there was only a very small tannery here and that the place was also comparatively unimportant. The gentleman who gave him this kindly information is a Dominion official and, no doubt, imagines he was perpetrating a good joke.

THE "ST. GEORGE"—Mr. Snowball's new side wheel steamer, St. George, having been made ready for the season's work and the main difficulties incidental to new machinery having been overcome, a trial trip to Newcastle and back was made on Monday. A good many of our leading citizens were on board, and although a stiff easterly wind, the run was a very enjoyable one. A stop of half an hour was made at Newcastle, where the Gladiators—the St. George's only rival in speed—lay, taking in coal, and there was a good deal of speculation as to which of the two boats would prove the faster. The Gladiator was not ready to leave when the St. George did, so there was no "race"—to the satisfaction of those who knew that the latter boat was not at her best. She made the run to Chatham against a strong wind and a slight up-tide—a distance of a little over five miles—in twenty six minutes, equal to say, twelve miles an hour—not bad going for new machinery. The trial was especially satisfactory in showing that the new compound engine is capable of developing great power, and that the boilers, with their improvements, are all that can be desired as steam generators. The engines worked smoothly and were much admired by all on board, while the handsome appearance of the boat as she passed up and down the river was the subject of general remark.

Local "Strikes."

On Saturday morning last some of the hands in Fish's mill, Newcastle, struck for higher wages than they were receiving.

Mr. Fish at once stopped work and next day had obtained men in place of the strikers.

At Mr. Snowball's mill, Chatham, on Monday morning, some twenty men—the deal-carriers—failed to go to work, being dissatisfied with the rate of wages received by them the previous Saturday. It seems that, although more carriers per gang had been employed last season at this mill than at any other on the Miramichi, the men said they required more help. So there were eight of them to a gang, while other mills have only four or five. Mr. Snowball claimed that, to do the work he would give them \$1.35 per day, instead of \$1.40 which he paid last year.

As they did not go to work on Monday morning in consequence of this, Mr. Snowball consented to allow them the same rate as last year, rather than have the whole crew idle. So the deal-carriers went to work about 9 o'clock and worked until noon, when they again knocked off, declaring they were now on a strike for \$1.50 per day, or ten cents per day more than any other mill-owner paying for this class of labor.

Mr. Snowball has, therefore, shut down the mill, until he can have his work done on fairer terms. We understand that Mr. Snowball declares his willingness to pay the \$1.50 per day asked if two men per gang more than the other mills employ, or he will give \$2 per day, provided his men will do the same work, man for man, as is done by the carriers of other mills.

It is well known to many that a great effort has been made for several weeks past to create dissatisfaction among the laboring men, who are so largely employed by Mr. Snowball, in order that political capital may be made out of it. These strikers represent the total number of those who are susceptible of being induced to follow the bad advice that has been so industriously pressed upon the laboring men generally, and who have taken the responsibility of stopping work at the largest steam saw mill in the province. Of course the "strikers" and other men (who but for them would be earning pay and making the best of a not very encouraging season) are, themselves, the greatest sufferers, and it is a matter of regret that they have been so short-sighted and unreasonable in their demands.

Death of Walter M. Buck, Esq., C. E.

Among the deaths of the past week was that of Walter M. Buck, Esq., C. E., a former resident of Newcastle and Chatham, whose citizens will remember him in kindly remembrance. He was engaged in connection with the Intercolonial Railway—both on location and construction, surveyed the trial route of the proposed Miramichi Valley Railway and was inspecting engineer for the government of the Albert Railway and also of the Kent Northern Railway now under construction.

Referring to Mr. Buck's death the Telegraph's Fredericton Correspondent, writing Monday says:—

Walter M. Buck, Esq., Engineer of Government Railways, died at his boarding house a little after eleven o'clock last night. Very few people knew that he was in ill health and the news of his death, when made known this morning, created much surprise. Some months ago Mr. Buck went to Quebec on business, and had not been well since his return, but suffered constantly from hemorrhage of the lungs. During the past three weeks he complained of not feeling well, but neither he nor his most intimate friends thought that his illness would be attended with serious results. On Thursday morning last, he took his post at the Board of Works Office as usual, but was unable to proceed with the work on which he was engaged, and told Mr. Beckwith that he would return and finish it the next morning. When he went back to his boarding house, Dr. Condit was called in to attend him and continued to do so up to the time of his death, and informed him on Friday that he was in a very dangerous condition. At eleven o'clock last night, his landlady, Mrs. Hawthorne, gave him some medicine that had been prescribed, and when she entered his room less than a quarter of an hour afterwards, she was horrified at finding him dead. It was evident, however, that he had suffered no pain in his last moments, and that his life had passed away quietly and peacefully. Mr. Buck was a native of Dublin, and at the time of his death had reached the age of fifty-five years. He came to the Province as engineer to the contractors of the St. Andrews Railway, and was subsequently appointed engineer in chief for the road. In 1869 he published a pamphlet entitled "An account of the St. Andrews and Quebec Railway, being the original Intercolonial Railway, from its first inception in 1835 to the present time." He occupied other positions in connection with railways in the Province, and was at one time engineer in the Board of Works Department, a position which he filled to the entire satisfaction of the Government of the day, of which Hon. Charles McPherson was Chief Commissioner. The deceased was a most amiable and courteous gentleman, and was never known to utter a harsh word against any one.

The remains of the late Mr. Buck were taken by train this afternoon to St. John, where they will be met by his relatives

and taken to Moncton for burial. Quite a large procession followed the remains to the train, and Mr. Winklow, of the Board of Works Department, accompanied them to St. John.

The flag on Messrs. McEwan & Buck's store, Newcastle, was displayed at half-mast as soon as the sad news reached the town of deceased—Mr. Walter Buck of that firm—and general regret over the sad event and sympathy with the bereaved family, was expressed both in Chatham and Newcastle.

Our young men abroad.

Among the young men belonging to Miramichi who have made up their minds to live in the United States is Mr. Alex. Rainsboro, who is now visiting his relatives here. He is a son of Mr. Robert Rainsboro, of the Richibucto Road. He had the misfortune to cut his foot some eight months ago, while working in the woods on the Susquehanna River, and it still a little lame from the effects of the wound. He and a young Hackett, of Chatham, he arrived here on Sunday evening last. He says that about ten or eleven hundred men working in the Susquehanna woods are New Brunswickers, and most of them from Miramichi. Among those who were known to him there last winter were four of the Hacketts of Chatham, John Arbo of Blissfield, Donald Ross, Jas. Holland, Lawrence Rainsboro, and Pat Fitzgerald of Black River, Peter Connors of "Backwoods," Michael Lynch, Barnaby's River, Lawrence Hudson, Napan, Peter Rainsboro, Black River, Jas. McDonald, Bay des Veaux. The last five are still on the Susquehanna and the others visiting home. So far as he knows nearly the whole of them will return to the States. Mr. Rainsboro is a good-looking and intelligent young man, who talks very sensibly of his experiences in the country of his adoption. He says he would like to live here better than in the States, but there are not so good inducements here for a young man. He is one of a family in which there are six boys and three of them reside permanently in the States. This goes to show that there is an exodus.

Fire at Tracadie.

A despatch of yesterday to the ADVANCE says:—

Wm. Ferguson's new store and also his old one, were destroyed by fire last night. Most of the goods were saved.

Mr. Ferguson does large business and the loss involved in the above fire must have been considerable. It is to be hoped that the property destroyed was insured. The fire is all the more unfortunate because the fishing season is about to open, and it cannot but interfere, to some extent, with Mr. Ferguson's business of furnishing supplies for that industry.

Wreck of the Bark "Ganaanooque."

The Bark Ganaanooque, Capt. Jas. McMoran, sailed from Belfast in bal, April 9th, bound for Miramichi, consigned to J. B. Snowball. She had a fine passage until the 10th, when she encountered fog and field ice. On that morning they had sighted the Bird Rock Light. About midnight the weather thickened and the Captain was about wearing the ship to leave her to when, the lookout sighted some field ice, right ahead. The Ganaanooque shortly afterwards struck the ice, apparently only slightly, but it was found that water was leaking in the hold rapidly and all hands were to the pumps. They found the water gaining them, however, and on examination the carpenter discovered that the starboard bulkhead was broken in. The water had now risen over the ballast, and was making 6 ft. an hour, and the vessel was setting fast. The boats were got out, and the Captain and crew—15 in number took to them, remaining alongside until 6.30 a. m. on 11th. They then left on account of the ice coming down on them, and endeavored to reach Bryan Island, which they could not do owing to the ice keeping them off. They finally landed on Bird Rock at 10.30 a. m., on 11th being guided thereto by the light of the signal gun. Here they were cared for by the Light House keeper, and the 12th they saw a vessel pass in the evening and taking their own boats, boarded her. This was the Norwegian ship Helga, Capt. Schulstok, bound for Miramichi and consigned to Messrs. R. A. & J. Stewart. Capt. Schulstok received them kindly and brought them to Chatham, arriving on Monday last. The Captain of the Ganaanooque saved only the ship's papers—the crew and himself losing even their spare clothing.

The Ganaanooque was built in Quebec in 1857, and was owned by James Cochran, Belfast.

The Captain desires to return the thanks of himself and crew to Captain Schulstok of the Helga, by whom they were treated with great kindness in their misfortune.

A New Brunswick Boy at McGill University.

We have several times observed with pleasure the distinguished career of Mr. William A. Ferguson, Esq., of Richibucto, at the McGill University, Montreal. During the whole of his undergraduate course he has stood in the foremost ranks of her students, and been the recipient of many and valuable marks of distinction. The following extracted from a Report of the annual convocation of McGill University, held on the twenty-ninth ult., for the purpose of conferring degrees in Arts and applied sciences, will be read with renewed interest:—

Faculty of Arts, Graduating class B.A. Promoters in Mathematics and Natural Philosophy. Wm. A. Ferguson, Esq., First Rank Honors and Anne Molson Gold Medal.

Mr. Ferguson pursued his studies for a considerable time in the Harkins Academy, Newcastle, under Principal Hutchinson, who, we have no doubt, is pleased to hear of his young friend's success.

Correspondence.

"The Only Photographer"

MR. EDITOR.—I perceive that my letter to you on the above subject has called forth a characteristic reply from Mr. Colpitts, in which he pursues the other photographers of the town with a malevolence reflecting his nature, and an unalleviated true to his character. If he had been accused of and desired to advertise "another scandal" he could not display a greater zeal in rendering himself unsavory than he has done by his attempt to injure his business rivals. I regret that I have called down upon them the abuse of so unscrupulous a person, for, as you know, it was not their solicitation nor with their knowledge that I wrote my letter to the ADVANCE. I thought my attack upon Messrs. Merseaux and Thompson unfair and unworthy. His second one is worse than the first. Even if he were simply engaged in attempting to crush others, because they were in the same business as himself, ought he not, at least, to be free from attack himself? Ought not his own business and private reputation to be fair-

ly free from attack? Why is it that he was obliged, a short time ago to threaten people as to what he would do if they did not stop slandering him in connection with a matter over which everybody was laughing at his expense? Again, how was it that he was obliged to bring back from "across the river, not far from the water mill" to one of his patrons, a photograph printed, but not mounted which had clearly its way into disreputable hands—clearly from his studio direct, because it had not been mounted on card? Again, has Mr. Colpitts not put photographs of his patrons about in different public places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim or receive public notice or to attack rivals in business? No! I confess that "the only photographer" is not warranted in his reflections on Mr. Thomson, for I understand that he had in different places without the consent of the originals? Is this the kind of person to claim