them. Three other witnesses testified that they had on many occasions drunk large quantities of this beer, and that it had no intoxicating effect on them.

On this evidence Mr. Tingley was convicted and fined $50. and costs.

If Mr. Tingley really believed that this beer was not intoxicating, and he had no intention of violating the law, it may be a hard case on him, to be convicted. On the other hand, if the beer was really intoxicating, and he sold it, he was clearly violating the law, (even if unintentional) when he sold it. And under the evidence of Mr. McKenzie that it contained 4 and one tenth per cent of alcohol, and of Mr. Menzies that he got drunk on 4 bottles, I cannot see how the Magistrate Mr. McCully could do other than convict him of selling intoxicating liquor.

Another record put in evidence by complainants (exhibit No. 19) was of a case against Mr. Tingley for the unlawful sale of intoxicating liquor at Chatham between the 10th June and 10th September 1894.

The first witness called for prosecution, George Sutton, testified that between the dates mentioned, he was in defendant's shop several times and he got drink there, it was beer, he did not know of what kind. At one time about a fortnight before the trial, he was to some extent intoxicated, he had 8 or 9 drinks at Tingley's that day of beer, that it was about 10 o'clock he first went to Tingley's, that before he went he had had some brandy aboard a ship, an ordinary glass, before 9 o'clock, he said he had drink besides what he got in the ship and at Tingley's, he had several drinks of beer in other places, that he was sober when he left Tingley's at 12.30, he went back at 7 o'clock in the evening, and that if he was drunk at all he was drunk when he went back in the evening to Tingley's. On cross-examination he said he did not get intoxicated on Tingley's beer, "he did not get any intoxicating liquor from Tingley that day or between the dates in the information." He did not know the kind of beer he got.

The next witness James F. Connors testified that he was at Tingley's between the dates, that he got cream soda, ginger beer, and hoffbrew, there was another beer he sells too; I don't know I got salvador beer between these dates, he also said the beer he got at Tingley's never affected his head, he never was intoxicated or partly intoxicated. On cross-examination he said he never got intoxicating liquor at Tingley's, that the beer he got had no more effect than ginger beer.

The next witness for prosecution John H. Lawlor said he was in Tingley's several times between the dates. he got several kinds of beer there, one was called hoffbrew. He did not think the beer he got between the dates was the same as "Salvador" beer. It was in the same kind of bottles, he also said that the beer he got at Tingley's had no intoxicating effect on him at all. On cross-examination he said, "The beer I got between the dates named, did not appear to be Salvador beer, and in my opinion was not Salvador."

The next witness for prosecution, William Coulson, said that he had been in Tingley's some months before the 13th of September, when he left; that his duties were, selling tobacco, beer and attending at pool-table, that he sold ginger ale, cream soda, hoffbrew, that was all the kinds of beer he sold between 10th June up to 13th August, that he did not know of any other kind of beer on the premises, but he also said "there was a "beer there marked Salvador. I sold this "beer there last winter, after describing "the bottles he said, it was labelled; last "winter I sold it without a label on it be-"tween 10th June and 10th September, the "bottles had had labels, but they had no "labels when I sold them, I took the labels "off the bottles, I soaked them off in water "and scraped them off. He also said that "he soaked the bottles and scraped the "labels off because he was told to do so by "Mr. Tingley."

The next witness for the prosecution Mr. Mackenzie gave the same evidence as he gave in former case, that he analized Salvador beer at Mr. Menzies' request, and that it contained 4 and one tenth per cent of alcohol, and he further said he anal zed 2 bottles for Mr. Tingley about same time, and found about the same per cent of alcohol in them as in the ones he tested for Mr. Menzies. On cross-examination he said he would not say that any beer labelled salvador contained the same amount of alcohol.

The magistrate having decided to put Tingley on his defence he was called and sworn, and testified as follows:—"I did not sell any intoxicating liquor directly or indirectly between 10th June and 10th of September, I have sold beer, the beer I sold was not intoxicating, I sold seven or eight different kinds between these dates, I had no salvador beer between those dates, munich hoffbrew was one kind I sold. It was a cheaper beer than salvador. It was the hoffbrew the witness got from me. It is put up same as the salvador, with rubber stoppers and marked hoffbrew on the bottles instead of lager as the salvador is marked. There is about sixty cents difference in the price per box, hoffbrew is milder than salvador. It is not to my knowlege intoxicating. I never knew any one to be intoxicated on it. I don't believe that it is as strong as the home made hop beer. I never sold a drop of salvador between these dates. The reason I got Coulson to wash the labels off the bottles was, that it was labelled salvador, and the raised letters on the bottles was hoffbrew intead of salvador, and I did not want to sell the article with a wrong label. On cross-examination he said "I imported no salvador "since I was fined in May last. I had only "about fifty boxes on hand at that time. I "did not state I had about 200 boxes at that "time nor 100 boxes, I got it all in one "shipment in one carload. There were 400 "cases in the carload. I think I had dis-"posed of about half of it at the time I was "fined before, the salvador was all disposed "of except a few cases, I swear that since "the 10th day of June I did not sell any "salvador beer, by myself or my clerks. I "did not sell any by the case to Daniel "Crimmin since 10th June. I sold some "with the salvador label by the case since "the 10th June to Daniel Crimmin. I have "no recollection of selling it to any other "person. I swear that the beer with the "salvador label was not the same as the "salvador beer. It was munich hoffbrew. "There was no difference in the cases con-"taining salvador or hoffbrew. They were "generally marked with the name of "Rhinehardt & Co., export beer, that was "all I know as to the way they were mark-"ed. The hoffbrew boxes had a blue pencil "mark on ends of the cases, the salvador "boxes were not so marked. When I got "the carload of beer in, I stored it in the "cellar under my shop. They were piled "in tiers with the hoffbrew in two tiers "and the salvador in one tier. Some-"times I would take the cases out "of those tiers and sometimes Coul-"son would. At the time I was fined "before, I had none of the Salvador beer, on "hand, I disposed of the last of it two weeks "before I was fined, I got clear of the last "of the Salvador about the 2nd of June "last, or the 1st of June. I had some of "the beer when I was served with the former papers."

"How long after the date of the summons "in the former case was it that you dis-"posed of the last of the Salvador?

"I could not tell, nor how long after the "service of the summons. I remember that "I was served with a summons in the former "case. At that time I had about 25 or 50 "cases of Salvador on hand. I sold this beer "by the case and bottle. I got clear of all "this before the 1st or 2nd day of June. I "have sold as many as 30 cases after the 1st "day of May. I think Doyle in Newcastle "got some of it. I only had a couple or "three cases, no more, on the 31st May. I "think three cases no more. The beer was "stored in my cellar until I was convicted. "I moved the beer to another building after "I was previously convicted, because I had "not time to wash the labels off, and was "afraid it would be seized as Salvador. I "know it was not all Salvador beer. I "never said to anyone, I imported a car-"load of Salvador beer. I said I imported "a car load of beer. I never stated I had "a monopoly of the Salvador beer. I did "not object to the firm selling it to any "other party in Chatham.

On re-examination he said "This is the "invoice I got from the parties I got the "beer from. I bought 250 dozens of Salva-"dor and 550 dozens of Munich hoffbrew "in the last lot. I purchased from Biglow & "Hood in April last, they do business in "Truro. I got an invoice from Biglow & "Hood, I checked the goods by the invoice, "and the goods and invoice corresponded. "This is the invoice. I had none of the "Salvador on hand after the 2nd of June. "I don't remember the date of service of "summons in first suit. This beer analyzed "by Mr. Mackenzie was Salvador beer, and "the same Thompson gave to Menzies. It was "different beer from hoffbrew. I never saw "any one get intoxicated on it, and as far as "my knowledge goes, it is not. I sold no "Salvador between 10th June and 10th of "September that I know of."

This evidence closed the evidence for the defence, and the prosecution called rebutting evidence. The first witness on rebuttal was Daniel Crimmin, he testified as follows:—"I reside in Chatham keep "a beer saloon. I purchased salvador beer "from Mr. Tingley. I bought some from "him, Tingley, since a few days before he "was convicted. It was two or three days "before he was convicted, I purchased two "other cases of salvador beer from Tingley. "I was selling it while Tingley's trial was "going on, but stopped selling as soon as he "was convicted. I did not examine the "bottles as to there being raised letters on "them. I got some salvador from Tingley "while the former trial was going on. I "would get two or four cases or whatever I "wanted at a time. The bottles were "labeled. I have bought salvador beer from "him all along and the last I bought from "him was the same to my thought as the "salvador I was in the habit of getting "from him. I paid the same price for all "of it." On cross-examination he said. "I "will not swear that I bought any beer "from Tingley after the ninth of June. I "did not examine all the bottles. I paid "for salvador. It was marked salvador. I "did not examine one bottle when it came. "I could not swear that it was the same "strength as that analysed by Mr. Mac-"kenzie. I know there were labels on the "bottles. I did not see all the bottles. I "will not swear that Tingley's statement is "not correct, and that the beer he sold was "not salvador." On re-examination he said "I have no recollection of the day of "the month, but know it was a few days "before he was convicted, I stopped selling "it for a while during time of the former "trial, and got some more from Tingley and "sold it before he was convicted. I ordered "the beer from Tingley himself. I had the "same arrangement all along. I did not "go myself for the beer. There was no "difference in the price of the beer, and "as far as I know, no difference in the "beer." On re-cross-examination he said. "As far as I know Mr. Tingley is telling the "truth when he says it was different beer "he sold me, I can't say if he is or not." William Coulson was recalled and testified as follows. "I gave evidence in this case "before. This beer I have spoken of was all "stored in Tingley's cellar, it was piled in "tiers along the wall, in three or four tiers "I think. I made no distinction as to which "tiers I took the case from. I dont mind "getting any instructions from Tingley "about them. He did not to my recollect "ion tell me there was any difference in the "tiers. I took off the front tier first in "using. I took all the front tier till it "was used, and then began on the next tier. "I helped to stow it, I just put it there as "it came, the first load went to the back "tier, and so on until it was filled up. I "was not guided by any marks, there was "no distinction made that I mind of. When "I left Tingley's there were 40 or 50 cases "of what was marked Salvador. There "were raised letters on the bottles that I "washed the labels off. I can't say what "the letters were. I helped to move the "cases out of Tingley's cellar. There was "no distinction made in moving the lot of "cases." On cross-examination he said "there was not any Hoffbrew with the "Salvador that I know of. I did not take "that much notice. I never saw the blue "pencil mark on boxes, it may have been "there, Tingley never told me there was any "difference, he was there when we were "stowing, Tingley told me that there was "no more Salvador beer, that was after he "was fined as far as I remember. He had "no Hoffbrew there until then, as far as I "know." On re-examination he said. "I "did not hear of any beer called Hoffbrew "on the premises of Mr. Tingley until after "he was fined, that I can mind of, it was "right after, he told me of Hoffbrew that I "can mind, I am not sure how long before "he was fined, that beer came in, there was "no Munich Hoffbrew in it as far as I know, "there was ginger ale, cream soda. I dont "mind Tingley saying to look out for cases "with blue pencil marks on them".

On this evidence the magistrate convicted defendant, and fines him $100 and costs, it being a second offence. On record put in evidence, the magistrate gives his judgment in the following words.

"Tingley was previously convicted on "5th July. Coulson says he heard nothing "of hoffbrew until after Tingley was con-"victed, when he was told that the beer was "hoffbrew. That he sold Salvador with the "labels washed off between the 10th June "and 10th September. That he washed off "the labels at Tingley's direction. That on "13th of August when he left Tingley's "employ, there were 40 or 50 cases of Salva-"dor on hand. Crimmin says he bought "Salvador from Tingley, stopped buying it "while his trial was in progress, and re-"sumed it again during time of trial and "finally bought two or three cases of Salva-"dor from him two or three days before he "was convicted, or about 1st July, always "paid the same price for all beer from Ting-"ley but got none since he was convicted. "Tingley, the defendant, says he got clear of "all the Salvador about two weeks before he "was convicted which would be about 21st "of June. That he had only three cases on "hand 31st May. That he had 25 or 50 "cases on hand when he was served with "the papers in the former trial, which has "been shown were served on 4th June. "Got no hoffbrew analyzed, but considered "neither hoffbrew nor salvador intoxicating, "but as a matter of fact Salvador has been "proved to be intoxicating. That he had 50 "boxes of Salvador on hand when he was "fined last, which was on 5th July. The "court does not consider defendant has re-"butted evidence of sale of Salvador beer. "Evidence of defendant is very contradic-"tory, and the court cannot give it such "credence as to warrant a dismissal of the "information."

I have set out all the evidence bearing on the case in full, because that under the evidence, I would not have arrived at the same conclusion as the magistrate. Admitting that the evidence showed that the beer called Salvador is intoxicating liquor, there is no evidence whatever that the beer called hoffbrew is intoxicating. The first witness says he got beer at Tingley's one day. He was not asked what kind of beer he got. He said he might have been a little drunk that day, but he also said he had a glass of brandy on a ship that day, before he went to Tingley's that morning, and after he left Tingley's he had a good deal of beer outside of Tingley's. He said he left Tingley's about 12.30 and he was sober then, that he went back to Tingley's at 7 o'clock in the evening. "If "I was drunk at all that day it was when I "went back to Tingley's in the evening. "On cross-examination he said," I did not "get intoxicated on Tingley's beer, I did not "get any intoxicating liquor from Mr. "Tingley that day, nor between the dates "in the information. I did not get any "intoxicating liquor from Tingley or any "one in his employ. Although admitting I "was intoxicated that day, nothing I got at "Tingley's caused that intoxication."

The next witness for prosecution, Mr. Connors said that he was at Tingley's between the dates and said. "I am in the "habit of getting cream soda, ginger beer "and Hoffbrew there, I dont know that I got "Salvador beer between the dates "He said he got Salvador beer the winter previous, and that between the dates he procured beer at Tingley's which may have been the same. In his opinion it was about the same, he said. "I wont say it was "exactly the same. I wont say in my opinion "it was the same. I dont think it was as good beer." He also said that on some of the bottles of the beer he got between the dates there were labels and on some there were not, that the label on them was a different looking label from the one on last winter's bottles. He also said the beer he got between the dates never affected his head, he also said "the beer I got there is "not in my judgment intoxicating it had no "more effect on me than ginger beer."

The next witness Lawlor said he got beer between the dates at Tingley's. That he got Salvador beer there the previous winter. He also said the bottles containing the beer he got between the dates were different from the bottles containing Salvador. He said the Salvador bottles had labels on them but these bottles had a different sort of label. It was not the same beer. I did not notice any other difference, I dont think the beer was very much like Salvador beer. He also said the beer he got had no intoxicating effect at all.

Tingley's evidence was to effect.—That he had bought a car load of beer, consisting of 250 cases of Salvador and 550 cases of Hoffbrew. That before the 10th of June he had disposed of all the Salvador beer and he, in the most positive manner swore that he did not sell any Salvador between 10th June and 10th September (the dates in information) that all he sold after 10th June was Hoffbrew, and under what would appear a severe cross-examination did not waver in his testimony. This if true would be a complete answer. Then the only question would be, whether he was so contradicted by the evidence of Coul on and Crimmin, as to make it apparent that he had sworn falsely. It appeared to me that their evidence could largely be reconciled with that of Tingley. Coulson when first called swore (pages 8 and 9 of record) that he was in Tingley's employ. that his duties as clerk were selling tobacco, beer and attending to the pool table. He said he sold ginger ale, cream soda and hoffbrew, that was all the kinds of beer he sold between 10th June up to the time he left the employ of Tingley on 13th August, so far he corroborated Tingley, but he went on to say "There was a beer there "marked Salvador. I sold this last winter," Then he went on to describe the bottles and stoppers. he said it was labelled last winter, and then went on to say. "I sold it without labels between 10th June and 10th September, and said he scraped the labels off by the direction of Tingley. This is apparently a flat contradiction but Tingley explained it by swearing that there were labels on the Hoffbrew, and that it was the Hoffbrew bottles that the labels were scraped off. That on both the Hoffbrew and the Salvador the labels were the same, but on the bottles themselves, of the Hoffbrew there were raised letters on the glass, that the reason for his having the labels scraped off was "the reason I got "Coulson to wash the labels off the bottles "was, that it was labelled Salvador, and the "raised letters on the bottles was Hoffbrew "instead of Salvador, and I did not want to sell "the article with a wrong label." He also said that the cases containing the bottles of Hoffbrew were marked with a blue pencil.

Coulson on being called on rebuttal, described how the beer was stowed when it first came in, in three or four tiers, and in taking off cases he took front tier first. He said he did not "mind" getting any instructions from Tingley about them. He was not guided by any marks. That when he left Tingley's there were 40 or 50 cases marked salvador. That there were raised letters on the bottles he washed the labels off, could not say what the letters were, could not say what the bottles were. On cross-examination he said. "There was not any "hoffbrew with the salvador that I know "of, I did not take that much notice. I "never saw the blue pencil mark on boxes, "it may have been there." He also said "Tingley told me that there was no more "salvador beer, that was after he was "fined, *as far as I can remember.*"

It appears to me that this evidence can be reconciled with that of Tingley. Coulson by his own evidence does not appear to have taken much notice of anything, he knows that there were 40 or 50 boxes marked salvador when he left, did not know anything about pencil mark, knew he washed the labels off of the bottles in 4 or 5 cases. He knew that the beer he sold between 10th June and 13th August had had the labels washed of, everything he said might be true, and so might all Tingley said be true, and indeed if it be true that the bottles which contained hoffbrew were the ones the labels were washed off, Coulson's evidence would make it almost conclusive that no salvador had been sold by him, Coulson, as Tingley's agent after the 10th June.

As regards the evidence of Daniel Crimmin I cannot see the slightest contradiction. Mr Crimmin swears that he got beer from Tingley which he clearly thought was salvador, and although he would not swear is was after the 9th June, he thinks it was a few days before Tingley was convicted in the first case.

By the record in this case, put in evidence, the conviction appears to have been made on the fifth of July. Mr. Tingley in his evidence admitted that he did sell beer to Crimmin after the 10th July with the Salvador labels on the case, but he said "I swear that the beer with the "Salvador "label was not the same as the Salvador "beer, it was Munich hoffbrew." That beer was sold by Tingley after 10th of June was admitted, and the only question that could arise would be was this beer Salvador or not, as there was no evidence that any other beer he sold was intoxicating. If the beer Tingley sold was not Salvador, then there was no evidence at all to convict him, and the only ground on which the magistrate could convict him would be be, that he believed that Tingley was guilty of a subterfuge in selling Salvador under the name of Hofforew, and that the evidence he gave that it was not Salvador was wilful and deliberate perjury. I do not see that there was evidence strong enough to support so wholesale a charge, indeed the magistrate seemed to have felt a difficulty, although the reason he gave for convicting would really amount to that. On the trial, counsel for Tingley offered in evidence the invoice of the car load of beer, but on objection being taken by counsel for prosecution, the magistrate would not allow it to be put in evidence. It appeared to me that the magistrate erred in not allowing this evidence, for the invoice (if not tampered with) would have shown what the beer was, and if by the invoice it appeared that the larger part of the car load was Hoffbrew and not Salvador, it would be strong testimony to the truth of his evidence, but if it showed that it was all Salvador it would be almost conclusive evidence that Tingley had committed perjury.

The magistrate in his judgment says:—"Evidence of defendant is very contradic-"tory. The first contradiction he puts out, is: "Tingley the defendant says he got "clear of all the Salvador about two weeks "before he was convicted, which would "be about 21st of June. "Here the magistrate has only quoted part of Tingley's answer. The paragraph in the Record is, "I disposed of the last of it two weeks before I was fined. I got clear of "the last of the Salvador beer about the 2nd "of June last or the 1st. The other supposed contradiction is, that he had 50 boxes on hand when he was fined last, which was on 5th July." Referring to the evidence, I find in answer to the first question put to him, on his cross-examination, (what this question was, does not appear in the evidence, but may be suggested by the answer) he said, "I imported no Salvador "since I was fined in *May last.* I had only "50 boxes on hand at that time. I did not "state I had 200 boxes at time nor 100 "boxes". Now he was not fined in *May "last*, but the summons in the case in which he was fined on 7th July had been issued on the 31st of May last or 1st June, either the witness was mislead by the counsel in putting his question, assuming that he had been fined in May (which was untrue) or the question was in reference to the issuing of the summons, and the magistrate by error used the word *fined* instead of served. Otherwise the whole is nonsense, as the counsel and also the magistrate both knew he had not been fined in May. As a contradiction, the Magistrate in his judgment says. "That he had 50 boxes of Salvador on hand when he was fined last, which was on 5th July." In the evidence as shown by the record, Tingley said "I re-"member that I was served with a summons "in the former case; at that time I had "about 25 or 50 cases of Salvador on hand." This is not a contradiction, but it is a misstatement by the magistrate in his judgment of the evidence given on the trial. Tingley no where in his evidence said he had 50 boxes of Salvador on hand when he was fined last. The magistrate in his judgment as a matter that influenced him says, that Tingley "got no Hoffbrew analyzed."

Why should he do so?

Was not this a duty imposed on the prosecution?

I think that there was no such contradictions in Tingley's evidence as would justify him in finding that Tingley had been guilty of deliberate perjury. There was plenty of evidence which might well raise a suspicion in the mind of the magistrate that it was a subterfuge, but in these so called Scott Act cases, when the decision of the magistrate is final, (if he has jurisdiction,) it is most important that the magistrate should see that the case is clearly proved, and that every benefit of the doubt should be given to the accused. That the magistrate had at least a doubt, is to my mind clearly shown by his judgment, and the manner which in it, he has quoted the evidence he had taken himself. While I differ from the magistrate in the conclusion he arrived at, I must admit that the fact of the beer being in boxes marked salvador, and the washing off of the labels, are such facts as might well lead the magistrate to entertain a suspicion that the defence was a mere subterfuge, and it does not appear to me to be more than an error in judgment and not a malicious desire to convict, though to Tingley, if he really thought that the beer he sold was not intoxicating it would appear so. The magistrate does not appear to have considered that in convicting Tingley on a suspicion he was practically finding him guilty of perjury. There is one thing which in this investigation is more important in my mind than the case itself, it is this: from the manner of trying the case, and from his judgment it would appear that the magistrate in Canada Temperance Act cases, considers that the onus of proving his innocence lies on the accused the moment facts are shown which might raise a mere suspicion. And from his judgment it to me appears, that he has not dealt with the facts in a candid manner.

[We defer the publication of the remainder of Commissioner G. G. Gilbert's report until next week.]

The Weather for Colds.

This is the time when colds are in the fashion—every body who is anybody has one, if not himself there's one in the family. For no complaint under the sun are there more remedies than for a cold in the head, but of the thousands Chase's Catarrh Cure is the best. "In twelve hours I was cured of a bad cold in the head by Chase's Cure," writes Miss Dwyer, Alliston, Ont. 25c. of all druggists, with blower free.

See That You Get
"GOLDEN RULE" or
"WHITE EAGLE"
FLOUR
FROM YOUR GROCER
AND TAKE NO OTHER.

Miramichi and the North Shore, etc.

THE ADAMS CUP is to be raced for by the Miramichi Club yachts next Thursday.

THE "ADVANCE" is for sale at Johnson's Bookstore, and the Circulating Library, Desmond building, next door to the Telephone Exchange.

Headache, costiveness and piles are thoroughly cured by a judicious use of Ayer's Pills.

Scrofula cannot resist the purifying powers of Ayer's Sarsaparilla. Sold by druggists.

GOOD FISHING:—Col. Call and Mr. G. H. Harrison visited the Colonel's fishing camp on the Northwest Miramichi last week and killed nine grilse and a salmon, with one rod only.

BIG SALMON:—Mr. R. H. Armstrong and wife of Newcastle returned last week from a trip to Camp Adams on the Northwest Miramichi. They brought with them, as part of their catch, a fresh run salmon which weighed 28lbs.

NEWCASTLE BOY.—The Vancouver Daily World of the 1st inst. says: "Mr. F. R. McD. Russell has passed his qualifying examination as barrister." The Mr. Russell referred to is a son of Mr. Matthew Russell and a brother of Mr. John Russell, steamboat owners of this place.—(News.

MIRAMICHI MARBLE WORKS:—No experiment in buying from us. We always send out the best stock and work that can be obtained. No order too small, none too large. We are watching the mails for your correspondence on the subject of cemetery work.

J. H. LAWLOR & Co.

SALE OF PRIZE LOGS:—On Tuesday of last week, Mr. Geo. Stables, auctioneer sold the prize logs coming into the Northwest and Southwest booms during the present season. Mr. Ernest Hutchison bought the Northwest lot at $6.45 per thousand s. f. and the Southwest logs were sold to the Maritime Sulphite Fibre Company at $7.60 per thousand s. f.

PICNIC AND EXCURSION:—S. Paul's and S. Mary's congregational and Sunday school picnic and excursion will be held on Beaubear's Island to-day. The Steamer "Rustler" will leave Muirhead's wharf at 10 o'clock a. m., calling at Bushville, and if necessary at Newcastle and Nelson. Tickets for adults 25cts. Sunday school children free. Where convenient, families will kindly provide picnic baskets.

KILLED BY A FALL:—George Barr, 27 years old, a seaman belonging to the barque Armenia, lying at the Hutchison mill wharf, Douglastown, fell from the fore royal yard while engaged in painting it on Saturday last. He belonged, we understand, to Glasgow, but had a wife and child in New York. The mate of the vessel states that the poor fellow held a certificate as an electrical engineer.

A FINE TRIP:—Fishery Commissioner Smith and Mr. Geo. Dean returned to Chatham last week from their round trip from Chatham to Fredericton, up the St. John, across from St. Leonards to the Restigouche, and down the latter river from a point 100 miles above Campbellton to Metapedia, and thence home—some 450 miles. They enjoyed the outing thoroughly and speak highly of the country through which they passed. They found the Restigouche, below Kedgwick teeming with salmon and trout.

PICNIC AT NELSON:—The picnic at Nelson on Wednesday of last week, under the auspices of the ladies of St. Mark's Guild was a great sucess. It was held in Flett's grove where every necessary preparation for the event, in the way of booths, tents amusement facilities etc., was made, and besides the attractive desplay of useful and fancy articles offered for sale, an ample tea and tempting refreshments were provided. The gross receipts were over $245, which will net to the church over $200.

AN ATTRACTION to buyers of family groceries, provisions, dry goods and general household supplies is offered by Mr. Roger Flanagan at his well known store on St. John Street, Chatham, in the form of silver knives and forks, silver spoons, silver cruet stands and boxes of tea. He issues tickets which are presented by customers every time they make purchases, and no matter how small the amount, it is punched off, and when the purchases aggregate either $15 or $30, as the case may be, one of the articles specified viz.—a cruet stand, or a dozen of silver knives or forks for a $30 ticket or a 5 lb. box of tea, or 1 doz. silver spoons for a $15 ticket is given free.

We are glad to learn that the great English remedy Halloway's Red Blood Syrup can now be obtained in Chatham, Mr. Thos Flanagan merchant having just received a large consignment. Mr E. Lee Street of Newcastle also keeps it for sale in Newcastle and we are informed he has a very large sale for it. Halloway's Syrup is the great English remedy for pale, weak, nervous persons or those run down by overwork or other causes and wherever sold has been the means of decreasing the death rate, and improving the health of the community, and all sufferers should try it.

PERSONAL:—Mr. John A. Wilson who has been making one of his usual summer visits to Miramichi, left for New York on Thursday morning last. None of our visitors receive a more hearty welcome. A host of friends accompanied him to the station.

Mr. Harry Shirreff, of Hull, is paying a holiday visit to his parents at Chatham and many old friends are giving him a hearty welcome.

P. O. Inspector King was in town on Tuesday.

Hon. Senator Snowball left for Ottawa on Monday night.

Mr. W. Moore Kelly was in town yesterday and was heartily welcomed by many old friends.

Mr. and Mrs. W. C. Whittaker have been amongst Chatham's visitors this week.

Miss Ada Russel, who is visiting her mother and family in Chatham, was accompanied by a large number of her young friends on a very pleasant excursion in the Str. Florence to Bay du Vin on Monday last.

Mr. and Mrs. W. T. Harris, have taken up their residence at Blink Bonnie, having arrived at Chatham on Saturday night, after enjoying their wedding trip.

Evangelistic Meetings.

Messrs. Hunter and Crossley, the well known evangelists, began a series of meetings in the Curlers' Rink, Chatham, on Sunday last. The place has been fitted up for the purpose with a large platform at the west end, and all available seats have been procured and placed to accommodate the very large audiences attending the services. Each meeting seems to increase in interest and the series promises excellent results. Rev. Geo. Steel, Dr. Neil McKay and other clergymen, and many prominent workers in several of the local churches are actively assisting the evangelists.

Completely Knocked Out.

"I was so much run down I had to give up work, and I felt as if life was not worth living," writes Wm. W. Thompson, Zephyr, Ont. "I took Scott's Sarsaparilla and am now feeling as I did years ago." Scott's Sarsaparilla tones up the entire system, purifies the blood, and eradicates rheumatic and scrofulous poisons. Ask for Scott's and get it.

[Liberal Herald.]

The Liberal Club.

A very representative gathering met at Masonic Hall on Wednesday afternoon at 4 o'clock, and formed a Liberal club. The object of the club is to assist in promoting the interests of the Liberal party in Northumberland. A constitution was adopted and the following gentlemen became charter members:—

Warren C. Winslow.
M. S. Hocken.
James Anderson, Church Point.
D. M. Loggie.
Ernest F. Pleiger, Escuminac.
John Russell, Newcastle.
John Morrissy.
Charles Bernard.
John Bassett.
Samuel Johnson.
James A. Stewart.
C. A. C. Bruce.
Alexander Burr.
P. C. Johnson.
Thomas Gaynor.
Frank Cassidy.
Wm. Wilson.
Geo. Reed, Newcastle.
Donald Loggie Church Point.
Andrew Cassidy.
J. D. B. F. Mackenzie.
John Fotheringham.
W. J. Mowat.
T. B. Williston, Bay du Vin.
Herbert Alex. Loggie.
Clifford M. Mowat.
Norman Henderson.
B. W. Smith.
Thos. McFarlain.
George Morris.
T. M. Gaynor.
Ambrose Hazes.
W. B. Stewart, Neguac.
Geo. Johnston.
John Folly.
T. W. Butler.
John Cantwell.
Edward Gallivan.
T. M. Harrington.
J. W. McLennan.
W. A. Lowdoun.
Stanley Mowat.

The meeting then adjourned and met again at 8. p. m., when the following officers were elected:—

Warren C. Winslow, President.
James Anderson, 1st Vice President.
T. B. Williston, 2nd Vice President.
M. G. Hocken, Treasurer.
T. M. Gaynor, Secretary.

A committee was appointed to draft bylaws and the meeting adjourned to meet again at Masonic Hall, on Friday, Aug. 21st, at 7.30 p. m.

[There appears to be an error or two in the names given in the above. Ambrose "Hazes", no doubt, means Ambrose Hays, John "Folly," John Foley and the Treasurer should be printed M. S., instead of M. G. Hocken. ED. ADVANCE]

Cold Storage.

The subject of cold storage has been engaging the attention of our Moncton friends. A meeting was held in that town last Friday in which a large number of leading citizens took part. It was addressed by Mr. Wm. Johnston, who has been instrumental in establishing cold storage houses in Montreal, Toronto and other large cities and who visited Moncton to enquire into the prospects of establishing cold storage in that city. After the matter was fully discussed a committee consisting of Mayor Chapman, Alds. Masters and Robinson and Messrs. Ayer and J. Peters was appointed to further investigate and report on the scheme. This committee met Mr. Johnston in the evening and agreed to recommend the city council to give his company free water and free light and in lieu of land, the city to give the company $1,000 to do what they pleased in the matter of a site.

A Poor Man's Comfort.

Cold and hunger are no respecters of persons. The winter winds howl around the rich man just as searchingly as it sweeps through a poor one. And Fibre Chamois is equally a boon to both with its wonderful, healthful, warmth giving qualities, its light weight and trifling cost. Those to whom money is no object prefer using it to being burdened down by the weight of many wraps and those who perform outdoor duties in cold weather find it invaluable as it keeps out all wind and cold—not for an hour or so, but for all day, and yet adds nothing which hampers them no matter what their exercise may be. With it through their outer garments everyone can enjoy winter's coldest snaps in perfect comfort.

Newcastle Post Office Irregularities.

For some time past startling rumors have been current here in reference to irregularities in the post office and these rumors culminated last week in an information being laid against and the arrest of M. P. Smith, who quite recently held the position of clerk in the post office here.

The information was laid by W. C. Winslow, Esq., Barrister, for the Department of Justice, Messrs. Tweedie & Bennett appearing for the accused. The preliminary examination was postponed until the 19th inst., the accused being admitted to bail, himself in $500, and two others each in the same amount, Messrs. R. R. Call and W. A. Hickson. The following is a list of the letters alleged to have been stolen:—

A letter written by Rev. Edward Pettenaude, mailed at Bay du Vin and addressed to John McKane at Newcastle, containing $27.00.

One by Harvey McDougall, mailed at Renous Bridge, addressed to Bain Bros., Mfg. Co., Brantford, Ont., contain $22 45.

One by Albert Bryenton, mailed at Bryenton, addressed to Steel Briggs, Seed Co., Toronto, containing $27.97.

One by Mary Clancy, mailed at Boston and addressed to Matthew Clancy, Red Bank, containing $10.00.

One by Albert Bryenton, addressed to W. H. Thorne & Co., St. John containing $11.79.

One by Morgan Hays, mailed at North Renous, addressed to W. A. Fillmore, Amhert, containing $18.00.

One by Francis D. Jardine, mailed at Renous Bridge, addressed to McLaughlin Carriage Co., Oshawa, containing the sum of $20.00.

One by Caleb Berry, mailed at Newcastle, addressed to Mrs. Lewis A. Wilson, Nixon, N. B., containing an unknown sum.

One by Daniel Sullivan, mailed at Renous Bridge, addressed to John Hogan, Charlo, N. B. containing $5.50.

One by Caleb Berry, mailed at Newcastle, addressed to Mrs. C. Berry, Little River, Nixon, N. B., containing an unknown sum of money.

One by agent of the Bank of Montreal, at Montreal, addressed to W. H. Byers, Whitneyville, N. B., containing $82.

One by Merrit Bros. & Co., addressed to P. Hennessy, Newcastle, N. B., containing $8.60.

One by John S. Harris, mailed at Patten, Me., addressed to E. Tozer, Redbank, N. B., containing $15.

One by George Gratto, mailed at South Brewer, Me., addressed to Mrs. George Gratto, Douglastown, N. B., containing $20.

One by J. A. Johnston, mailed at Northwest Bridge, addressed to Mrs. J. A. Johnston, Berry's Mills, N. B., containing $30.

One by George W. Cowie, mailed at Pictou, addressed to Mrs. Rebecca R. Cewie, Douglastown, containing $25.

One by J. D. Murray, Redbank, addressed H. N. Fairbank, Bangor, Me., containing $14.

One by Zachias Haggett, mailed at Newcastle, addressed to Miss Jane Haggett, Harbor Breton, N. F., containing $15.

One addressed to Annie Harvey, Douglastown, containing an unknown sum of money.

One by Edward Hayes, mailed at South Renous, addressed to Saml. Freeze, Doaktown, containing $20.

One by Israel Legere, mailed at Legere, addressed to Manager of Bank of Nova Scotia, Newcastle, containing an unknown sum of money.

One from Lamec, addressed to Bank of Nova Scotia, Newcastle, containing $5.

The information contains other charges than those enumerated above, such as unlawfully and knowingly changing, altering and defacing the date stamps upon a number of letters.

Startling disclosures are expected to be brought out at the preliminary examination which opens this morning, probably in the Court House. [Advocate.

There is little room to doubt that the condition of affairs which lately existed in the management or mismanagement of both the Newcastle and Chatham post offices, is chargeable to the worse than neglect of well founded complaints made to the Ottawa authorities and which were never properly investigated. If the irregularities—the dishonesties—reported a year or more ago in connection with the Newcastle office had been properly dealt with and brought to an end as they should have been, it is probable that the young man who is now in disgrace would never have fallen. It is right to say that no charge of tampering with money letters has ever been made in connection with the Chatham office, but neglect and demoralization of the service there was a leading feature under the late administration and it seemed impossible to secure thorough reform. Even up to a month since the dispatch of mails at proper times was neglected, simply because it had become the practice to handle them to suit the lazy convenience of those in charge of the office, rather than to perform the duties properly. Since the office has been in charge of Mr. Thompson there has been a reform in this respect and we hope for a continuation of the improved service.

The enquiry into the charges against the late Newcastle post office clerk, Smith, began before Police Magistrate Nevin yesterday at 12.30 at the Court House. W. C. Winslow, Esq, prosecuted; R. B. Bennett, Esq., appeared for the accused; A. A. Davidson, Esq., Q. C., was present to advise the police magistrate.

The charges were read over by the police magistrate, and Stephen J. King, Esq., Post Office Inspector was called as the first witness. He gave testimony as to certain registered letters, from the envelopes which had contained them, showing the dates at which they had passed through the mails from some of the date-stamps on them, while he also testified that some of the dates on the stamps had been obliterated. He was giving this class of testimony when our reporter left.

Hon L. J. Tweedie Q. C. also appeared for the accused in the afternoon. Quite a large number of witnesses are present and the case promises to occupy a good deal of time.

Corns! Corns! Corns!

Why should you go limping round when Putnam's Painless Corn Extractor will remove your Corns in a few days. It will give almost instant relief and a guaranteed cure in the end. Be sure you get the the genuine Putnam's Corn Extractor, made by Polson & Co., Kingston, for many substitutes are being offered, and it is always better to get the best. Safe, sure, painless.

A Montreal Business Man

Won the Battle Through His Wife's Advice.

A short time ago a Montreal business man returned from a New York private hospital, to which institution he had gone last February for treatment.

The case was a serious one—kidney disease—and had baffled the skill of the local doctors. The New York specialist, after a month's close attention could not hold out very strong hopes of a complete cure, but advised patience and continued treatment.

The sick man, hoping for better results, remained for some weeks longer, but finally left for home sick, unhappy and despondent. Upon his arrival in Montreal, friends were alarmed when they found his cond