

Communitated.

FOR THE CARLETON SENTINEL.

MR. EDITOR.—Your comments on mine of the 27th ult. were, no doubt, called for by the view you appear to have taken of the misadventure of the farmers who were offered, the farmers would naturally conclude that there was no market for such produce, notwithstanding quotations might run at high prices. Now what I wish to draw your attention to is the lamentable fact that the farmers of Carleton and the upper Counties have not got a market for their produce in the Town of Woodstock.

It is true, no doubt, that you pay as good prices for home consumption as do your neighbors at home or abroad. But what can the Town of Woodstock consume of the surplus produce of Carleton County? I think I am safe in saying that not one quarter. Then what are they to do with the other three-quarters? They can't take them, and they can't sell them. They can't take them, and they can't sell them. They can't take them, and they can't sell them.

It is true, no doubt, that you pay as good prices for home consumption as do your neighbors at home or abroad. But what can the Town of Woodstock consume of the surplus produce of Carleton County? I think I am safe in saying that not one quarter. Then what are they to do with the other three-quarters? They can't take them, and they can't sell them. They can't take them, and they can't sell them. They can't take them, and they can't sell them.

Respectfully, yours,

JIM.

Brighton, Dec. 6, 1880.

REMARKS.—We fear our correspondent asks too much, in asking for a market for his produce, at all times, and under all circumstances, a satisfactory market for the produce of the farm.

The demand at home and abroad must in the very nature of things determine the market. Of course the demand for consumption here, of farm produce, is very limited—by-and-by, when there are more extensive manufactures in operation it will be difficult. Now, in good seasons, our farmers have a large surplus of the chief products of such, and a sale, as the proper seasons there are lots of buyers either scouring the country or here in town who purchase for exportation. Our own traders do this, and outside people come here with their money and do it. Witness the large shipments of hay, of oats, of potatoes, of sheep, of cattle, of butter, of eggs, of meat, that have crowded or do crowd our railways. As we stated before, the result of an attempt to sell, perhaps at an unreasonable time, a few potatoes and cabbage is not the criterion of the state of the market or the enterprise of our traders. The "golden horn" most essential is composed of a sufficiency of this world's necessities, with the happiness that comes from a proper enjoyment of them; and this we think, perhaps our farmers can find here more surely than they can anywhere between this and the Pacific.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

—Eds.

CRIMINAL DOCKET.

The Queen vs. William Wharton. "True Bill" found against defendant for an indecent assault upon Margaret L. Lockhart.

The first case on the civil docket was then taken up. Lewis P. Fisher vs. Wm. J. Porter, it being an action of trespass for the recovery of mesne profits, and the costs of an action of ejectment previously brought against defendant—Verdict for plaintiff for \$84.10. A. B. Connell, counsel for plaintiff; E. L. Wetmore, counsel for defendant.

The remainder of the day was occupied in hearing argument upon the summons in case B. Maddox vs. E. Donnelly, which was tried last July, resulting in a verdict for the defendant, whereupon plaintiff made an application for a new trial. Decision reserved. G. F. Gregory, counsel for plaintiff; E. L. Wetmore, counsel for defendant.

In the case of Sands Gillespie vs. Jas. Gray, an application for security for costs was refused. W. M. Connell for plaintiff; A. B. Connell for defendant.

On Wednesday morning the case of The Queen vs. Wm. Wharton was taken up and concluded, resulting in a verdict of "Not Guilty." During the course of the trial the Judge made some observations upon the impropriety of private individuals making use of the process of the law to gratify their own private feelings of ill-will towards others, and strongly reprehended the conduct of Magistrates sending cases up for trial without any evidence to warrant them in so doing, and recognizing witnesses to attend court who knew nothing of the case, putting the County to unnecessary expense. W. M. Connell for plaintiff; G. F. Gregory, counsel for defendant.

David R. Thomas vs. C. W. Clapham was then taken up. This was an action brought to recover the amount due on a promissory note made in 1876 by defendant, payable in 4 years. Defence, that the note was void, being altered after its date. Verdict for plaintiff \$104. A. B. Connell for plaintiff; G. F. Gregory, counsel for defendant.

G. M. Cossett and Newton Cossett vs. John Perkins, Executor, &c. Application for judgment quod nullus for not proceeding to trial, according to the practice of the Court. Application refused with costs. S. B. Appleby, counsel for plaintiff; A. B. Connell, counsel for defendant.

David Kennedy vs. John McAdam, &c., and John McAdam, Jr., was next commenced. This was an action to recover the amount of a promissory note given in 1873 by defendant, to plaintiff, upon which there was paid \$10.25 in Aug., 1874. Defence, Statute of Limitation. Verdict for plaintiff for \$69.60. A. B. Connell, counsel for plaintiff; G. F. Gregory, counsel for defendant.

Now, when the sudden death of Hon. Justice Fisher affects the public mind, will be both and bar press have, giving form to the most expressive feelings of respect, reminded Provincial society of the past life of the deceased, now is a proper time to recur to a subject that has been referred to several times in the past. Hon. L. A. Wilnot, a subject in connection with which the names of the two deceased gentlemen may be used in common.

An eminent preacher in the United States said the other day, "When two men have passed away freedom will prevail in Russia." There the death of two men will accomplish what there has been accomplished by the lives of these two men. Now we have passed away the two men who have now passed away. They were the instruments of accomplishing their political purposes. And now we have passed away the public of this Province will command, or, rather, will expect some immediate action by their representatives to mark in some tangible form the general respect for and Provincial indebtedness to Lemuel Allan Wilnot and Charles Fisher.

There are names that, written in the world's history, will never be effaced. Names ennobled in connection with the record of exploits that earned the immortality of a perpetual remembrance. The names of L. A. Wilnot and Charles Fisher are written on the pages of New Brunswick history, but that history is as yet mainly confined to local records and is at best but desultory. The names of these two men are written in the annals of the Province, and are as yet mainly confined to local records and is at best but desultory.

There are names that, written in the world's history, will never be effaced. Names ennobled in connection with the record of exploits that earned the immortality of a perpetual remembrance. The names of L. A. Wilnot and Charles Fisher are written on the pages of New Brunswick history, but that history is as yet mainly confined to local records and is at best but desultory. The names of these two men are written in the annals of the Province, and are as yet mainly confined to local records and is at best but desultory.

We go back a few years. In the retrospect it seems but a few years, although it was as long ago as 1853, when the spirit of reform began to inspire those who a few years later gave that spirit embodiment. We go back a few years and the Government of this Province was an oligarchy. There was a representative branch, the Assembly, but it was only a misnomer in the light of what the term representative institution would imply, and to that body, or to the public man, or to any other person, the Legislature of the Province was not responsible. The Legislature of the Province was not responsible. The Legislature of the Province was not responsible.

We go back a few years and the Government of this Province was an oligarchy. There was a representative branch, the Assembly, but it was only a misnomer in the light of what the term representative institution would imply, and to that body, or to the public man, or to any other person, the Legislature of the Province was not responsible. The Legislature of the Province was not responsible. The Legislature of the Province was not responsible.

We go back a few years and the Government of this Province was an oligarchy. There was a representative branch, the Assembly, but it was only a misnomer in the light of what the term representative institution would imply, and to that body, or to the public man, or to any other person, the Legislature of the Province was not responsible. The Legislature of the Province was not responsible. The Legislature of the Province was not responsible.

We go back a few years and the Government of this Province was an oligarchy. There was a representative branch, the Assembly, but it was only a misnomer in the light of what the term representative institution would imply, and to that body, or to the public man, or to any other person, the Legislature of the Province was not responsible. The Legislature of the Province was not responsible. The Legislature of the Province was not responsible.

We go back a few years and the Government of this Province was an oligarchy. There was a representative branch, the Assembly, but it was only a misnomer in the light of what the term representative institution would imply, and to that body, or to the public man, or to any other person, the Legislature of the Province was not responsible. The Legislature of the Province was not responsible. The Legislature of the Province was not responsible.

CRIMINAL DOCKET.

The Queen vs. William Wharton. "True Bill" found against defendant for an indecent assault upon Margaret L. Lockhart.

The first case on the civil docket was then taken up. Lewis P. Fisher vs. Wm. J. Porter, it being an action of trespass for the recovery of mesne profits, and the costs of an action of ejectment previously brought against defendant—Verdict for plaintiff for \$84.10. A. B. Connell, counsel for plaintiff; E. L. Wetmore, counsel for defendant.

The remainder of the day was occupied in hearing argument upon the summons in case B. Maddox vs. E. Donnelly, which was tried last July, resulting in a verdict for the defendant, whereupon plaintiff made an application for a new trial. Decision reserved. G. F. Gregory, counsel for plaintiff; E. L. Wetmore, counsel for defendant.

In the case of Sands Gillespie vs. Jas. Gray, an application for security for costs was refused. W. M. Connell for plaintiff; A. B. Connell for defendant.

On Wednesday morning the case of The Queen vs. Wm. Wharton was taken up and concluded, resulting in a verdict of "Not Guilty." During the course of the trial the Judge made some observations upon the impropriety of private individuals making use of the process of the law to gratify their own private feelings of ill-will towards others, and strongly reprehended the conduct of Magistrates sending cases up for trial without any evidence to warrant them in so doing, and recognizing witnesses to attend court who knew nothing of the case, putting the County to unnecessary expense. W. M. Connell for plaintiff; G. F. Gregory, counsel for defendant.

David R. Thomas vs. C. W. Clapham was then taken up. This was an action brought to recover the amount due on a promissory note made in 1876 by defendant, payable in 4 years. Defence, that the note was void, being altered after its date. Verdict for plaintiff \$104. A. B. Connell for plaintiff; G. F. Gregory, counsel for defendant.

G. M. Cossett and Newton Cossett vs. John Perkins, Executor, &c. Application for judgment quod nullus for not proceeding to trial, according to the practice of the Court. Application refused with costs. S. B. Appleby, counsel for plaintiff; A. B. Connell, counsel for defendant.

David Kennedy vs. John McAdam, &c., and John McAdam, Jr., was next commenced. This was an action to recover the amount of a promissory note given in 1873 by defendant, to plaintiff, upon which there was paid \$10.25 in Aug., 1874. Defence, Statute of Limitation. Verdict for plaintiff for \$69.60. A. B. Connell, counsel for plaintiff; G. F. Gregory, counsel for defendant.

Now, when the sudden death of Hon. Justice Fisher affects the public mind, will be both and bar press have, giving form to the most expressive feelings of respect, reminded Provincial society of the past life of the deceased, now is a proper time to recur to a subject that has been referred to several times in the past. Hon. L. A. Wilnot, a subject in connection with which the names of the two deceased gentlemen may be used in common.

An eminent preacher in the United States said the other day, "When two men have passed away freedom will prevail in Russia." There the death of two men will accomplish what there has been accomplished by the lives of these two men. Now we have passed away the two men who have now passed away. They were the instruments of accomplishing their political purposes. And now we have passed away the public of this Province will command, or, rather, will expect some immediate action by their representatives to mark in some tangible form the general respect for and Provincial indebtedness to Lemuel Allan Wilnot and Charles Fisher.

There are names that, written in the world's history, will never be effaced. Names ennobled in connection with the record of exploits that earned the immortality of a perpetual remembrance. The names of L. A. Wilnot and Charles Fisher are written on the pages of New Brunswick history, but that history is as yet mainly confined to local records and is at best but desultory. The names of these two men are written in the annals of the Province, and are as yet mainly confined to local records and is at best but desultory.

There are names that, written in the world's history, will never be effaced. Names ennobled in connection with the record of exploits that earned the immortality of a perpetual remembrance. The names of L. A. Wilnot and Charles Fisher are written on the pages of New Brunswick history, but that history is as yet mainly confined to local records and is at best but desultory. The names of these two men are written in the annals of the Province, and are as yet mainly confined to local records and is at best but desultory.

We go back a few years. In the retrospect it seems but a few years, although it was as long ago as 1853, when the spirit of reform began to inspire those who a few years later gave that spirit embodiment. We go back a few years and the Government of this Province was an oligarchy. There was a representative branch, the Assembly, but it was only a misnomer in the light of what the term representative institution would imply, and to that body, or to the public man, or to any other person, the Legislature of the Province was not responsible. The Legislature of the Province was not responsible. The Legislature of the Province was not responsible.

We go back a few years and the Government of this Province was an oligarchy. There was a representative branch, the Assembly, but it was only a misnomer in the light of what the term representative institution would imply, and to that body, or to the public man, or to any other person, the Legislature of the Province was not responsible. The Legislature of the Province was not responsible. The Legislature of the Province was not responsible.

We go back a few years and the Government of this Province was an oligarchy. There was a representative branch, the Assembly, but it was only a misnomer in the light of what the term representative institution would imply, and to that body, or to the public man, or to any other person, the Legislature of the Province was not responsible. The Legislature of the Province was not responsible. The Legislature of the Province was not responsible.

We go back a few years and the Government of this Province was an oligarchy. There was a representative branch, the Assembly, but it was only a misnomer in the light of what the term representative institution would imply, and to that body, or to the public man, or to any other person, the Legislature of the Province was not responsible. The Legislature of the Province was not responsible. The Legislature of the Province was not responsible.

We go back a few years and the Government of this Province was an oligarchy. There was a representative branch, the Assembly, but it was only a misnomer in the light of what the term representative institution would imply, and to that body, or to the public man, or to any other person, the Legislature of the Province was not responsible. The Legislature of the Province was not responsible. The Legislature of the Province was not responsible.

CRIMINAL DOCKET.

The Queen vs. William Wharton. "True Bill" found against defendant for an indecent assault upon Margaret L. Lockhart.

The first case on the civil docket was then taken up. Lewis P. Fisher vs. Wm. J. Porter, it being an action of trespass for the recovery of mesne profits, and the costs of an action of ejectment previously brought against defendant—Verdict for plaintiff for \$84.10. A. B. Connell, counsel for plaintiff; E. L. Wetmore, counsel for defendant.

The remainder of the day was occupied in hearing argument upon the summons in case B. Maddox vs. E. Donnelly, which was tried last July, resulting in a verdict for the defendant, whereupon plaintiff made an application for a new trial. Decision reserved. G. F. Gregory, counsel for plaintiff; E. L. Wetmore, counsel for defendant.

In the case of Sands Gillespie vs. Jas. Gray, an application for security for costs was refused. W. M. Connell for plaintiff; A. B. Connell for defendant.

On Wednesday morning the case of The Queen vs. Wm. Wharton was taken up and concluded, resulting in a verdict of "Not Guilty." During the course of the trial the Judge made some observations upon the impropriety of private individuals making use of the process of the law to gratify their own private feelings of ill-will towards others, and strongly reprehended the conduct of Magistrates sending cases up for trial without any evidence to warrant them in so doing, and recognizing witnesses to attend court who knew nothing of the case, putting the County to unnecessary expense. W. M. Connell for plaintiff; G. F. Gregory, counsel for defendant.

David R. Thomas vs. C. W. Clapham was then taken up. This was an action brought to recover the amount due on a promissory note made in 1876 by defendant, payable in 4 years. Defence, that the note was void, being altered after its date. Verdict for plaintiff \$104. A. B. Connell for plaintiff; G. F. Gregory, counsel for defendant.

G. M. Cossett and Newton Cossett vs. John Perkins, Executor, &c. Application for judgment quod nullus for not proceeding to trial, according to the practice of the Court. Application refused with costs. S. B. Appleby, counsel for plaintiff; A. B. Connell, counsel for defendant.

David Kennedy vs. John McAdam, &c., and John McAdam, Jr., was next commenced. This was an action to recover the amount of a promissory note given in 1873 by defendant, to plaintiff, upon which there was paid \$10.25 in Aug., 1874. Defence, Statute of Limitation. Verdict for plaintiff for \$69.60. A. B. Connell, counsel for plaintiff; G. F. Gregory, counsel for defendant.

Now, when the sudden death of Hon. Justice Fisher affects the public mind, will be both and bar press have, giving form to the most expressive feelings of respect, reminded Provincial society of the past life of the deceased, now is a proper time to recur to a subject that has been referred to several times in the past. Hon. L. A. Wilnot, a subject in connection with which the names of the two deceased gentlemen may be used in common.

An eminent preacher in the United States said the other day, "When two men have passed away freedom will prevail in Russia." There the death of two men will accomplish what there has been accomplished by the lives of these two men. Now we have passed away the two men who have now passed away. They were the instruments of accomplishing