

Miramichi and the North Shore, etc.

Rev. Mr. HICKS, who has had charge of the Church of England at Gagetown, has become rector of Richibucto.

A WILD STRAWBERRY plant, with the ripened fruit upon it, which was found growing in Mr. Russell's garden, Rosebank, last Sunday, is amongst our office attractions.

PIRE.—The tug Mascot took fire at the Miramichi wharf on Tuesday night between one and two o'clock. She was damaged to the extent of nearly \$1000. Insured in the Queen for \$5,000.

TO RETIRE.—It is stated that at the end of this year Mr. Manchester, of the well-known firm of Manchester, Robertson and Allison, St. John, will retire from the business with which his name has been so long and honorably connected.

A GOOD CARRIER.—Barque "Alert," Capt. Pitman, which recently loaded deals at Alma for United Kingdom, took away a cargo of 360 standards, or 68 standards to the 10 tons. The "Alert" is 330 tons register, and the above cargo is said to be one of the largest according to tonnage carried away from Canada.—Globe.

BOY AND MATCHES.—The barn of Mr. Doxy Robichaux, a short distance from the Big Traadie bridge, Gloucester county, was, by its contents, destroyed by fire the other day. It was crammed full of the crops of the season, hay, grain, implements, two pigs, all a total loss, no insurance. Loss is not far short of \$1000. A youngster of five years old, a son of Mr. Robichaux, and some matches was the cause.

CENTENARY CELEBRATION.—St. Michael's C. T. A. Society held a meeting in St. John's Hall, on Friday evening last, for the purpose of celebrating the Father-Mother centennial. A fair attendance of members and ex-members was present. Rev. Fathers Bannan and Joiner delivered addresses on the life and good works of temperance accomplished by Father Matthew. The Society band played some excellent selections before and after the address.

BOSTON COMEDY COMPANY.—Mr. H. Price Webber, manager of the Boston Comedy Company, was in town yesterday, arranging for a short dramatic season here as per announcement in previous columns. His company needs no commendation as it is well and favorably known that its appearance in Chatham is a guaranteed success beforehand. Secure your reserved seats at Mackenzie's.

AN INTERESTING LAWSUIT.—The New York Journal of Commerce of the 7th inst., publishes the following:

Chief Justice Adams L. Palmer, of the Supreme Court of the Province of New Brunswick, Canada, is suing the Great Western Insurance company for \$48,000 damage for the loss of the cargo and vessel "Brother's Pride." She went down two days out from Cienfuegos. The case came up before Judge Daly in the Court of Common Pleas. The defence is that the vessel was scuttled, while the plaintiff denies. The case will occupy several days.

DEATH OF MR. COLLIER.—After a long illness, Mr. W. E. Collier, manager of the Bank of British North America branch in St. John, died on 7th inst. at the comparatively early age of thirty-nine years. A Scotchman by birth, Mr. Collier went to St. John in early childhood, entered the Bank of British North America, and his keenness, foresight, knowledge of financial matters and general ability being soon perceived, he was promoted to the management—a position he held with credit to himself and profit to the institution up to the day of his death. Mr. Collier leaves a widow—who is a daughter of Judge Waterhouse—and six children.

SCHOOL MEETINGS.—In district No. 1, Chatham, Rev. J. McCoy was Chairman. Dr. J. S. Benson, retiring trustee was elected. Mr. Wm. Lawlor was elected trustee in place of Mr. Fotheringham, who had removed from the district. Mr. Wm. T. Connors was appointed auditor. An assessment of \$1,400 was voted.

In district No. 2, Chatham, the chair was occupied by Mr. Lemuel Abbott, trustee. Mr. Henry Kelly was elected in place of Mr. James Connors, retiring trustee. An assessment of \$1,100 was voted. There were no changes made in No. 9 district. \$1,400 was voted.

PERSONAL.—Rev. Joseph Pelletier who had been on a visit to Madawaska for a couple of weeks, returned on Wednesday. The reverend gentleman is well and appears to be enjoying the best of health. He was accompanied to St. Louis, by Father Dixon, of Newcastle.—Review.

C. A. C. Bruce, Esq., of the Maritime Chemical Park Company, was a passenger from New York on the steamer Scenic on 4th inst. He is visiting Great Britain and the Continent, and will probably return home before the Christmas holidays.

Mr. Bruce Macdonald, editor of the Restigouche Pioneer was in Chatham on Monday.

Mr. R. H. Coggan of the I. C. R., was in Chatham on Monday and left on Tuesday for a holiday trip to New York and other centres in the United States.

Rev. J. L. McDonald, of Campbellton, and Rev. Jas. Smith, of Dalhousie, were in town on Tuesday.

We are sorry to hear that John C. Miller, Esq., had the misfortune to break one of his arms on Saturday evening by making a misstep when boarding one of his steamers in the darkness.

Rev. R. W. Hudnell, rector of Derby, conducted the service in St. Mary's Church, Chatham, last Sunday evening in the presence of Rev. Dean Forsyth.

Hall's Hair Restorer enjoys a world-wide reputation for restoring the hair to bald heads and changing gray hair to the original color of youth.

Address to Mr. A. D. Smith. Mr. A. D. Smith who has for some two or three years been a valued resident of Chatham, has removed, with his family, to St. John and leaves behind many friends who will regret his departure from the community. He was always ready to do his part in anything tending to the advancement of the town and was also an earnest worker in St. Andrew's Church, with which he was connected, being superintendent of its Sunday School, from a short time after his coming to Chatham until his removal.

Amongst several tokens of the esteem in which he was held by his associates, presented to him before leaving for St. John, was the following address, which speaks for itself:—To Mr. A. D. Smith Superintendent of St. Andrew's Sabbath School.

DEPARTURE.—It is with feelings of regret that the teachers and scholars of St. Andrew's Sabbath School have learned of your approaching departure from our midst, and the consequent severance of the ties that bind us to you as our Superintendent, workers and friends. We cannot allow you to sever your connection with us, without expressing to you the esteem and affection in which we have held you as our Superintendent, and testifying to the progress made and the efficiency attained by the School under your management.

During the three years in which you have held this office the attendance has increased some fifty per cent, the staff of teachers

been enlarged, improvements effected in the Library and Class Rooms, and the School financially becoming self-sustaining, results which we most largely attribute to the deep interest and able management of the teachers and scholars in point of regular attendance, lesson preparation and class collections.

We know that the measure of success achieved by your work is not always to be determined by the visible results, and that with much to cheer and sustain, there is often much to discourage, but we believe that in this the noblest time of life there may and will be impressions made and influences started the fruits of which eternally abide in the hearts of those who remember that in this as in all other work done in the Master's vineyard we have the inestimable privilege of being workers together with Him who is the Head of the Church. And to every faithful worker there is the promise that though they often shall sow in tears, yet shall they also reap in joy.

With love and prayer you will continue to take the same interest in Sabbath School work, in the community in which you will in future reside and particularly that of the church with which you may unite, and we have done here, and we pray that God will abundantly bless you and your family in every relation of life.

On behalf of the School, D. P. MacLachlan, V. C. Wright, Thos. MacLachlan, J. G. Gordon, Ida M. Peck, Mary R. MacLachlan, Annie London, M. C. Logie, Katie Gordon, Andrew Gordon, John W. Logie, E. W. Porter, Alex. Fraser, S. L. T. Frost, J. G. Gordon, Clara J. Logie, Barbara B. Currie, Eliza Cameron, W. S. Logie, Katherine D. Benson.

Lincoln's Melancholy. HIS SYMPATHETIC NATURE AND HIS EARLY MISFORTUNES. Those who saw much of Abraham Lincoln during the latter years of his life, were greatly impressed with the expression of profound melancholy his face always wore in repose.

Mr. Lincoln was of a peculiarly sympathetic and kindly nature. These strong characteristics rendered him happy, as it proved, his entire political career. He would not rest, at first, upon the efficient aids to political success; but in the peculiar emergency which Lincoln, in the providence of God, was called to meet, no vessel of common clay could possibly have become the "chosen of the Lord."

Those acquainted with him from boyhood knew that early grief tinged his whole life with sadness. His partner in the grocery business at New Salem, Billy Green, of Tallahas, Ill., who died at night, when the customers were few, to hold the granary while Lincoln recited his lessons.

It was to his sympathetic ear Lincoln told the story of his love for sweet Ann Rutledge; and he, in return, offered what comfort he could when poor Ann died, and Lincoln's great heart nearly broke.

"After Ann died," says "Uncle" Billy, "on stormy nights, when the wind blew the rain against the roof, she would sit there in the grocery, his elbows on his knees, his face in his hands, and the tears ran freely through his fingers. I hated to see him feel bad, an' I'd say, 'An' don't cry; an' he'd look up an' say 'An' don't cry; I'll be the rain's a fall on me.'"

There are many who can sympathize with this overpowering grief, as they think of a lost loved one when "the rain's a fall on me." What adds poignancy to the grief sometimes is the feeling that the lost one might have been saved.

Fortunate, indeed, is William Johnson, of Corona, L. I., a builder, who writes June 23, 1890: "Last February, on returning from church one night, my daughter complained of having a pain in her ankle. The pain gradually extended until her entire limb was swollen and very painful to the touch. She called a physician, who after careful examination of the limb, said the disease was the result of long standing. All we could do, did not seem to benefit her until we tried Warner's Safe Cure; from the first she commenced to improve. When she commenced taking it she could not turn over in bed, and could just move her hands a little, but to-day she is as well as ever was. I believe I owe the recovery of my daughter to its use."

Municipal Council Returns. The election returns for Almiracle are as follows:—

Philipson, 117; Jerniah Sullivan, 114; M. Bransfield, 76; Geo. W. Fowles, 74.

Trotting at Newcastle. The Fall meeting of Newcastle Driving Park Association, which took place on Wednesday and Thursday, 8th and 9th inst., was a very interesting one for horsemen as well as the general public. The track was heavy, owing to recent rains, but as it is quite perfect in its grading the drivers expressed themselves as fairly satisfied with it, while the fair treatment all around—on the part of the directors as well as in the judges' stand—contributed materially to the great success of the meeting.

GREEN RACE. The first event was the green race, in which the entries, starters and result were as follows:—

Time 2:04, 3:02, 3:01. The heats of the green race were sandwiched with those of the 2:45 class. In addition to the six starters, the grey gelding "White Jack" had been entered by W. A. Hutchison, but he did not show up. The starters and result were as follows:—

Time 2:51, 2:51, 2:51, 2:48, 2:45, 2:47. The last two heats of the 2:45 race were trotted on Thursday forenoon.

On Thursday afternoon the three-minute horses were run. The following horses which were entered, did not start.

The starters and results were:—

Time 2:45, 2:46, 2:47. The 17th annual session of the Presbyterian Synod of the Maritime provinces, including N. B., N. S., P. E. I., Newfoundland and Trinidad, was convened in Moncton on Thursday, 2nd inst. Several in connection with the Synod proper assembled in St. John's church at 7 P. M., the retiring moderator, Rev. Neil McKay of Chatham, in the chair. A vote being taken upon the nominations for the office of moderator, Rev. John McMillan of Chalmers church, Halifax, was declared elected. The roll call showed an attendance 118 ministers and 47 elders, a total of 165. The statistics of the church for the past year were of a very favorable

nature. Churches and Mission stations had increased by 7, families had increased by 858, Communicants had increased by 1351, S. S. attendants had increased (over) 2000. The finances were also healthy; contributions to stipends had increased by over \$12,000 although only \$10,000 increase had been promised and there had also been an increase of \$6,500 in contributions to the schemes of the church. There was every reason to hope for even greater prosperity in the future.

Newcastle's Representation. NEWCASTLE, Oct. 7. To the Editor of the Sun:—The councillors election today resulted in Messrs. L. Doyle and Wm. Woods, both of Douglastown, being elected, D. Morrison and J. G. Kethro being left out. Mr. Morrison has represented the town for three years. Mr. Kethro is a new aspirant for the chairmanship of this go-behind town.

It has been generally known that Douglastown should elect one man to represent the lower part of the parish, and Newcastle one for the town. This time Douglastown has given Messrs. Morrison and Kethro a back-handed slap. Messrs. Morrison and Doyle were the conservative men (not the wumpwump), while Kethro and Woods looked to the liberals for support.

For Mr. Doyle helped Morrison in the lower part of the parish he had just won, probably six votes out of about 160, while Mr. Woods, who promised to assist Kethro, did not get a vote for him and not even voting for his friend himself.

So no vote the shiretown is well represented, in this way:—

James Robinson for 2nd ward, 11th ward, 12th ward, 13th ward, 14th ward, 15th ward, 16th ward, 17th ward, 18th ward, 19th ward, 20th ward, 21st ward, 22nd ward, 23rd ward, 24th ward, 25th ward, 26th ward, 27th ward, 28th ward, 29th ward, 30th ward, 31st ward, 32nd ward, 33rd ward, 34th ward, 35th ward, 36th ward, 37th ward, 38th ward, 39th ward, 40th ward, 41st ward, 42nd ward, 43rd ward, 44th ward, 45th ward, 46th ward, 47th ward, 48th ward, 49th ward, 50th ward, 51st ward, 52nd ward, 53rd ward, 54th ward, 55th ward, 56th ward, 57th ward, 58th ward, 59th ward, 60th ward, 61st ward, 62nd ward, 63rd ward, 64th ward, 65th ward, 66th ward, 67th ward, 68th ward, 69th ward, 70th ward, 71st ward, 72nd ward, 73rd ward, 74th ward, 75th ward, 76th ward, 77th ward, 78th ward, 79th ward, 80th ward, 81st ward, 82nd ward, 83rd ward, 84th ward, 85th ward, 86th ward, 87th ward, 88th ward, 89th ward, 90th ward, 91st ward, 92nd ward, 93rd ward, 94th ward, 95th ward, 96th ward, 97th ward, 98th ward, 99th ward, 100th ward.

What our road commissioner will do for compost for his farm next year is a question.

LETTEL'S LIVING AGE.—The numbers of the Living Age for October 4th and 11th contain John Henry Newman, Fortnightly Review; Rome and the Romans, Cornhill Magazine; The Unattached Student, Macmillan's Magazine; Water in Australia, Sahara, Nineteenth Century; The Vale of the Manor and the Black Dwarf, Blackwood's Magazine; A Hot Morning, Chambers' Journal; Chelsea Botanic Garden, Nature; Mutual Aid among Animals, Nineteenth Century; Jane, Longman's Magazine; Montaigne, Macmillan's Magazine; Excursion in Jacka, Contemporary Review; The Story of a Revolution, Macmillan's Magazine; The Battle of the Eggs, Longman's Magazine; Selan, Cornhill Magazine; Richard Jeffries, Murray's Magazine; the continuation of "Marcella," by W. E. Norris, and poetry and Miscellaneous.

For fifty-two numbers of sixty-four large pages each, (or more than 3,300 pages a year) the subscription price (\$8) is low; while for \$10 the reader receives all the news of the American \$100 monthlies or weeklies with The Living Age for a year, both postpaid. Littell & Co., Boston, are the publishers.

Birchall Tells Part of the Truth. TORONTO, Oct. 6.—A special to the Globe from Woodstock says that Birchall's story of the murder of Benwell is gradually coming out of him. It cannot be said that he has made anything like a clean breast of the matter. What he has done, and all he has done, so far, is to make a narrative of the statements and to drop hints and admissions, which pieced together, form a tolerably coherent story. He began throwing out signals that he was guilty shortly after the trial commenced. Mr. Osler's opening speech made him uneasy, and that night he let fall remarks to the effect that he feared the jury would convict. As the evidence of the Crown was being unfolded he grew more and more restless. Those who saw him enter the court to hear the verdict said he "got the hunted look" as of a wild animal at bay that overpassed his countenance. On his return to the jail he talked and chattered for hours, and let it be understood there and then that he was guilty to the extent of having been an accessory before and after the fact. Since then he has made further admissions and by suggestion or implication told a good deal about the case. He is apparently unable to tell a straight story about anything. In these conversations with different persons whose duties bring them in contact with him, he does not let up and suggests them, bit by bit. He varies the details, taking back one breath what he has conveyed in another, but the outline remains pretty much untouched. To sum up, he acknowledges, as he has said, that he was an accessory, and therefore he merits the sentence passed on him. It is all the more regrettable that the testimony advanced in behalf of the Crown was untrue. He does not say much about his negotiations with young Jewell and his father; though he now freely admits that he went in to swindle both then and Polly. Charles Benwell, I hear, says that Birchall told his father that it would be better not to mark Fred's linen and underclothes, that the Customs authorities in Canada would charge more on them if marked than if unmarked. Col. Russell would have testified to this had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing to say on the subject at present, except that the story is not true. The type writer Birchall does not attempt to explain or account for. Birchall does not challenge the accuracy of the Crown's case in any of its material features. He maintains that the case was not as it was originally stated, but that he was not a party to it. He says he would not have testified to it had he been able to attend the trial. As it was, Charles got off at second-hand, and therefore it could not be brought out in his evidence. Birchall has nothing