

## Temperance Column.

This column, by special arrangement is under the control of the Executive of the Grand Lodge, I.O.G.T., of New Brunswick. All notices in it may be regarded by the Lodge and Deputies as official.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.—All communications relating to Constitutional questions, must be addressed to James Watts, G. W. C. T., Woodstock, N. B.

All Remittances, Orders and Returns, must be addressed to A. W. D. Knapp, G. W. S. Sackville, Westmorland Co., N. B.

A. W. D. KNAPP, G. W. S. Sackville.

RIGHT WORTHY GRAND LODGE.—The work of the year is now in progress. There is a marked improvement in the character and style of the discussion in almost every question, and there is very little of that grumbling and railing of position order that was at the New York session. The proposed amendment to our constitution to represent the juvenile temples to our Grand Lodge, is a growing desire to change our white regalia, yet a motion at this session to do so was lost; the majority, however, against the change, growing less every year. The matter was referred to a select committee, who reported that the whole matter be referred to the Subordinate Lodge, requesting them to vote upon the matter at the third meeting in October next, and certify result to G. W. Sackville. A proposition was made to transfer the members of the juvenile temples to the subordinate lodges at the age of 16 without initiation fee, but upon payment of quarterly dues and the usual initiation fee, it was declared in part out of order and the matter dropped. It is believed that a systematic canvass to be in force in November next, and at the close of each superintending visit, the purpose of raising as far as possible one dollar or upward from each member, the amount collected to form a Temperance Literature Fund, for the purpose of disseminating anti-temperance literature. Your representative from Quebec has been appointed a member of the Standing Committee on Temperance Literature. The approval of S. A. Levesque to Grand Lodge of Quebec is sustained, so that a person who resigns from the Order is to be considered still a member until his name is stricken from the roll. The by-law fixing the basis of representation in this grand body was declared illegal, as it conflicts with the constitution, but it was decided that the representation shall be based upon the membership at the session of each Grand Lodge. The report of the Committee on the substitute for resolution presented was presented on Thursday evening and a very lively discussion took place, but the change proposed was defeated by a vote of 55 yeas and 35 nays, thus leaving six votes of the necessary two-thirds vote required to make it law.

The anniversary day of our Order was fixed for the 17th of July, and the Grand and Subordinate Lodges throughout the jurisdiction are requested to observe the day with appropriate exercises.

The constitution was changed so as to make representation from five Lodges to one Grand Lodge a quorum. An amendment was adopted permitting the receipt of members of the order, without the usual initiatory ceremonies. The following places were nominated in which to hold next session of I. O. G. T., Baltimore, Ind., Charleston, S. C., Raleigh, N. C., Indianapolis, Saratoga, and Philadelphia. Much good feeling was exhibited in the contest, and several interesting speeches were made in bidding for the next meeting. When a ballot was held, Charleston, S. C., was away ahead, and several of the W. G. L. will gather next year in the Palmetto groves of South Carolina.

W. H. LAMBLEY, G. W. C. T. Quebec.

Special care to Winners.

THE CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT APPEAL.—In the case of Charles Russell, appealed to the Judicial Committee of the Grand Lodge, leave has been granted to appeal, and the papers were served yesterday upon Sergeant Woodward, the respondent. The appellants must deposit \$200 as security for the costs of the appeal, and to appeal to the Grand Lodge, that he did in fact sell liquor, but relied upon the fact that the law was unconstitutional; that the New Brunswick and Ontario Legislatures passed laws regulating the sale of liquor, and that the Supreme Court of New Brunswick, Judge Palmer dissenting, held that the C. T. A. act to be ultra vires; that the Parliament, not the Supreme Court of Canada, Judge H. R. Darling dissenting, held it to be constitutional; that Thomas Barker's case dropped because of his death; and that the Supreme Court of New Brunswick adhere to their former judgments, although they yield to the authority of the Supreme Court of Canada. The appellants are authorized to incorporate in the printed record of this case the proceedings in Thomas Barker's case, if they are so advised.

The statement in the Maritime Column, that the Marshall has been requested by the attorney for the Temperance party to give up the papers, but acting under eminent legal advice, he refuses to do so, until he has guarantee of indemnity, should judgment by the Privy Council be given adverse to the prosecution, which he represents. This for the present has created a deadlock. Mr. Lugin has been asked to give up the papers, or about indemnification, except the Police Magistrate, who told him that the statement in the Maritime Column, that Mr. Lugin had written to the Temperance Alliance, to ask if it was their intention to indemnify Mr. Woodward and oppose the appeal.—Capital.

SOME PEOPLE IN ENGLAND have strange ideas as to what constitute "teetotal" drinks according to testimony recently forwarded to Liverpool courts, showing the necessity of more active work upon the part of the temperance co-operators. A large portion of the Liverpool laboring class, it is asserted, consider port wine a temperance beverage, while the companions of a man who was found on the streets of the city of London, and who was taken to the police station, and North-Western Railway Company described him at the inquest as "teetotal," although at the same time stating he was a sherry drinker. Temperance workers will have to have a brave heart who hope to work successfully among a class whose palate is so depraved as to class as "light" drinking the heavy English wine as "teetotal" or "corrected," or "doctored," or whatever other euphemistic term the "wine" makers are pleased to call alcoholic adulteration.

The principle of local option, as applied to the liquor traffic, seems to be making progress in England. On Tuesday night the House of Commons by a vote of 198 to 154 passed Wilfrid Lawson's resolution that it is desirable to give legislative effect to the former resolution, which affirmed the justice of local communities being entrusted with the power to protect themselves from the operation of the liquor traffic.

A NEW PLEDGE.—The Board of Trustees of the Business Men's Moderation Society of New York met recently and adopted the following:

Resolved, That said society hereby and hereafter abandon the pledge and principle of total abstinence, and substitute in place thereof the principle set forth in the following pledge, viz: "I hereby pledge my sacred honor not to use as a beverage any intoxicating drinks stronger than beer, ale and light wine, and these only in moderation."

Resolved, That the society exert its influence in every honorable way possible against the use of whiskey, rum, brandy and other spirituous liquors as a beverage.

The Canada Temperance Act is now in force in twenty-two counties and two cities in the Dominion—the Maritime Provinces counting twenty of the number.

Sometimes words wound more than swords. Youth looks at the possible; age at the probable.

It is a quick traveler, but an unwise guide. Consider not so much your dress as your address.

A good book supplies the place of a companion.

## In the Election Court.

The Dominion Controversial Elections Act 1871.

Election of a Member for the House of Commons in the County of Carleton, in the Province of New Brunswick.

THE Petition of Frank Alfred Nevers, of the Parish of Brighton, in the County of Carleton, Doctor of Medicine, whose name is subscribed to the Petition, sheweth that

1. That said election was held on the thirtieth day of March, A.D. 1881, when David Irvine and Charles Pitt Council were candidates, and the returning officer has returned the said David Irvine as being duly elected.

2. That the receipt of the Return to the writ of Election for the said electoral district by the Clerk of the Court in Chancery, was published in the Canada Gazette on the twenty-first day of May, in the year aforesaid.

3. Your petitioner states that the said David Irvine was by himself and by his agents and other persons on his behalf and by his actual knowledge and consent guilty of bribery before, at, during and after the said election, and that he was and is disqualified to sit in the House of Commons of Canada, during the seven years next succeeding the date of his being proved guilty of such corrupt practices as last aforesaid before the Honorable Court.

4. Your petitioner further states that the said David Irvine was by himself and by his agents and other persons on his behalf and by his actual knowledge and consent guilty of bribery before, at, during and after the said election, and that he was and is disqualified to sit in the House of Commons of Canada, during the seven years next succeeding the date of his being proved guilty of such corrupt practices as last aforesaid before the Honorable Court.

5. Your petitioner further states that the said David Irvine was by himself and by his agents and other persons on his behalf and by his actual knowledge and consent guilty of bribery before, at, during and after the said election, and that he was and is disqualified to sit in the House of Commons of Canada, during the seven years next succeeding the date of his being proved guilty of such corrupt practices as last aforesaid before the Honorable Court.

6. Your petitioner further states that the said David Irvine was by himself and by his agents and other persons on his behalf and by his actual knowledge and consent guilty of bribery before, at, during and after the said election, and that he was and is disqualified to sit in the House of Commons of Canada, during the seven years next succeeding the date of his being proved guilty of such corrupt practices as last aforesaid before the Honorable Court.

7. Your petitioner further states that the said David Irvine was by himself and by his agents and other persons on his behalf and by his actual knowledge and consent guilty of bribery before, at, during and after the said election, and that he was and is disqualified to sit in the House of Commons of Canada, during the seven years next succeeding the date of his being proved guilty of such corrupt practices as last aforesaid before the Honorable Court.

8. Your petitioner further states that the said David Irvine was by himself and by his agents and other persons on his behalf and by his actual knowledge and consent guilty of bribery before, at, during and after the said election, and that he was and is disqualified to sit in the House of Commons of Canada, during the seven years next succeeding the date of his being proved guilty of such corrupt practices as last aforesaid before the Honorable Court.

9. Your petitioner further states that the said David Irvine was by himself and by his agents and other persons on his behalf and by his actual knowledge and consent guilty of bribery before, at, during and after the said election, and that he was and is disqualified to sit in the House of Commons of Canada, during the seven years next succeeding the date of his being proved guilty of such corrupt practices as last aforesaid before the Honorable Court.

10. Your petitioner further states that the said David Irvine was by himself and by his agents and other persons on his behalf and by his actual knowledge and consent guilty of bribery before, at, during and after the said election, and that he was and is disqualified to sit in the House of Commons of Canada, during the seven years next succeeding the date of his being proved guilty of such corrupt practices as last aforesaid before the Honorable Court.

11. Your petitioner further states that the said David Irvine was by himself and by his agents and other persons on his behalf and by his actual knowledge and consent guilty of bribery before, at, during and after the said election, and that he was and is disqualified to sit in the House of Commons of Canada, during the seven years next succeeding the date of his being proved guilty of such corrupt practices as last aforesaid before the Honorable Court.

12. Your petitioner further states that the said David Irvine was by himself and by his agents and other persons on his behalf and by his actual knowledge and consent guilty of bribery before, at, during and after the said election, and that he was and is disqualified to sit in the House of Commons of Canada, during the seven years next succeeding the date of his being proved guilty of such corrupt practices as last aforesaid before the Honorable Court.

13. Your petitioner further states that the said David Irvine was by himself and by his agents and other persons on his behalf and by his actual knowledge and consent guilty of bribery before, at, during and after the said election, and that he was and is disqualified to sit in the House of Commons of Canada, during the seven years next succeeding the date of his being proved guilty of such corrupt practices as last aforesaid before the Honorable Court.

14. Your petitioner further states that the said David Irvine was by himself and by his agents and other persons on his behalf and by his actual knowledge and consent guilty of bribery before, at, during and after the said election, and that he was and is disqualified to sit in the House of Commons of Canada, during the seven years next succeeding the date of his being proved guilty of such corrupt practices as last aforesaid before the Honorable Court.

15. Your petitioner further states that the said David Irvine was by himself and by his agents and other persons on his behalf and by his actual knowledge and consent guilty of bribery before, at, during and after the said election, and that he was and is disqualified to sit in the House of Commons of Canada, during the seven years next succeeding the date of his being proved guilty of such corrupt practices as last aforesaid before the Honorable Court.

16. Your petitioner further states that the said David Irvine was by himself and by his agents and other persons on his behalf and by his actual knowledge and consent guilty of bribery before, at, during and after the said election, and that he was and is disqualified to sit in the House of Commons of Canada, during the seven years next succeeding the date of his being proved guilty of such corrupt practices as last aforesaid before the Honorable Court.

17. Your petitioner further states that the said David Irvine was by himself and by his agents and other persons on his behalf and by his actual knowledge and consent guilty of bribery before, at, during and after the said election, and that he was and is disqualified to sit in the House of Commons of Canada, during the seven years next succeeding the date of his being proved guilty of such corrupt practices as last aforesaid before the Honorable Court.

18. Your petitioner further states that the said David Irvine was by himself and by his agents and other persons on his behalf and by his actual knowledge and consent guilty of bribery before, at, during and after the said election, and that he was and is disqualified to sit in the House of Commons of Canada, during the seven years next succeeding the date of his being proved guilty of such corrupt practices as last aforesaid before the Honorable Court.

19. Your petitioner further states that the said David Irvine was by himself and by his agents and other persons on his behalf and by his actual knowledge and consent guilty of bribery before, at, during and after the said election, and that he was and is disqualified to sit in the House of Commons of Canada, during the seven years next succeeding the date of his being proved guilty of such corrupt practices as last aforesaid before the Honorable Court.

20. Your petitioner further states that the said David Irvine was by himself and by his agents and other persons on his behalf and by his actual knowledge and consent guilty of bribery before, at, during and after the said election, and that he was and is disqualified to sit in the House of Commons of Canada, during the seven years next succeeding the date of his being proved guilty of such corrupt practices as last aforesaid before the Honorable Court.

21. Your petitioner further states that the said David Irvine was by himself and by his agents and other persons on his behalf and by his actual knowledge and consent guilty of bribery before, at, during and after the said election, and that he was and is disqualified to sit in the House of Commons of Canada, during the seven years next succeeding the date of his being proved guilty of such corrupt practices as last aforesaid before the Honorable Court.

22. Your petitioner further states that the said David Irvine was by himself and by his agents and other persons on his behalf and by his actual knowledge and consent guilty of bribery before, at, during and after the said election, and that he was and is disqualified to sit in the House of Commons of Canada, during the seven years next succeeding the date of his being proved guilty of such corrupt practices as last aforesaid before the Honorable Court.

23. Your petitioner further states that the said David Irvine was by himself and by his agents and other persons on his behalf and by his actual knowledge and consent guilty of bribery before, at, during and after the said election, and that he was and is disqualified to sit in the House of Commons of Canada, during the seven years next succeeding the date of his being proved guilty of such corrupt practices as last aforesaid before the Honorable Court.

24. Your petitioner further states that the said David Irvine was by himself and by his agents and other persons on his behalf and by his actual knowledge and consent guilty of bribery before, at, during and after the said election, and that he was and is disqualified to sit in the House of Commons of Canada, during the seven years next succeeding the date of his being proved guilty of such corrupt practices as last aforesaid before the Honorable Court.

25. Your petitioner further states that the said David Irvine was by himself and by his agents and other persons on his behalf and by his actual knowledge and consent guilty of bribery before, at, during and after the said election, and that he was and is disqualified to sit in the House of Commons of Canada, during the seven years next succeeding the date of his being proved guilty of such corrupt practices as last aforesaid before the Honorable Court.

26. Your petitioner further states that the said David Irvine was by himself and by his agents and other persons on his behalf and by his actual knowledge and consent guilty of bribery before, at, during and after the said election, and that he was and is disqualified to sit in the House of Commons of Canada, during the seven years next succeeding the date of his being proved guilty of such corrupt practices as last aforesaid before the Honorable Court.

27. Your petitioner further states that the said David Irvine was by himself and by his agents and other persons on his behalf and by his actual knowledge and consent guilty of bribery before, at, during and after the said election, and that he was and is disqualified to sit in the House of Commons of Canada, during the seven years next succeeding the date of his being proved guilty of such corrupt practices as last aforesaid before the Honorable Court.

28. Your petitioner further states that the said David Irvine was by himself and by his agents and other persons on his behalf and by his actual knowledge and consent guilty of bribery before, at, during and after the said election, and that he was and is disqualified to sit in the House of Commons of Canada, during the seven years next succeeding the date of his being proved guilty of such corrupt practices as last aforesaid before the Honorable Court.

29. Your petitioner further states that the said David Irvine was by himself and by his agents and other persons on his behalf and by his actual knowledge and consent guilty of bribery before, at, during and after the said election, and that he was and is disqualified to sit in the House of Commons of Canada, during the seven years next succeeding the date of his being proved guilty of such corrupt practices as last aforesaid before the Honorable Court.

## In the Supreme Court.

The Dominion Controversial Elections Act 1871.

Election for the Electoral District of the County of Carleton, in the Province of New Brunswick, in the Dominion of Canada, held on the thirtieth day of March, for the polling of the vote of the electors on the thirtieth day of March, and for the summing up of the number of votes given to the several candidates, and the returning officer has returned the said David Irvine as being duly elected.

1. Your petitioner was a candidate at the above election.

2. The petition of David Irvine, of the Parish of Winkfield, in the County of Carleton, and Province of New Brunswick, sheweth that

1. Your petitioner was a candidate at the above election.

2. Your petitioner states that the said election was held on the thirtieth day of March, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighty-one, for the nomination of our candidates, when Charles Pitt Council, of the town of Woodstock, in the County of Carleton, and Province of New Brunswick, sheweth that

1. Your petitioner was a candidate at the above election.

2. Your petitioner states that the said election was held on the thirtieth day of March, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighty-one, for the nomination of our candidates, when Charles Pitt Council, of the town of Woodstock, in the County of Carleton, and Province of New Brunswick, sheweth that

1. Your petitioner was a candidate at the above election.

2. Your petitioner states that the said election was held on the thirtieth day of March, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighty-one, for the nomination of our candidates, when Charles Pitt Council, of the town of Woodstock, in the County of Carleton, and Province of New Brunswick, sheweth that

1. Your petitioner was a candidate at the above election.

2. Your petitioner states that the said election was held on the thirtieth day of March, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighty-one, for the nomination of our candidates, when Charles Pitt Council, of the town of Woodstock, in the County of Carleton, and Province of New Brunswick, sheweth that

1. Your petitioner was a candidate at the above election.

2. Your petitioner states that the said election was held on the thirtieth day of March, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighty-one, for the nomination of our candidates, when Charles Pitt Council, of the town of Woodstock, in the County of Carleton, and Province of New Brunswick, sheweth that

1. Your petitioner was a candidate at the above election.

2. Your petitioner states that the said election was held on the thirtieth day of March, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighty-one, for the nomination of our candidates, when Charles Pitt Council, of the town of Woodstock, in the County of Carleton, and Province of New Brunswick, sheweth that

1. Your petitioner was a candidate at the above election.

2. Your petitioner states that the said election was held on the thirtieth day of March, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighty-one, for the nomination of our candidates, when Charles Pitt Council, of the town of Woodstock, in the County of Carleton, and Province of New Brunswick, sheweth that

1. Your petitioner was a candidate at the above election.

2. Your petitioner states that the said election was held on the thirtieth day of March, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighty-one, for the nomination of our candidates, when Charles Pitt Council, of the town of Woodstock, in the County of Carleton, and Province of New Brunswick, sheweth that

1. Your petitioner was a candidate at the above election.

2. Your petitioner states that the said election was held on the thirtieth day of March, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighty-one, for the nomination of our candidates, when Charles Pitt Council, of the town of Woodstock, in the County of Carleton, and Province of New Brunswick, sheweth that

1. Your petitioner was a candidate at the above election.

2. Your petitioner states that the said election was held on the thirtieth day of March, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighty-one, for the nomination of our candidates, when Charles Pitt Council, of the town of Woodstock, in the County of Carleton, and Province of New Brunswick, sheweth that

1. Your petitioner was a candidate at the above election.

2. Your petitioner states that the said election was held on the thirtieth day of March, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighty-one, for the nomination of our candidates, when Charles Pitt Council, of the town of Woodstock, in the County of Carleton, and Province of New Brunswick, sheweth that

1. Your petitioner was a candidate at the above election.

2. Your petitioner states that the said election was held on the thirtieth day of March, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighty-one, for the nomination of our candidates, when Charles Pitt Council, of the town of Woodstock, in the County of Carleton, and Province of New Brunswick, sheweth that

1. Your petitioner was a candidate at the above election.

2. Your petitioner states that the said election was held on the thirtieth day of March, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighty-one, for the nomination of our candidates, when Charles Pitt Council, of the town of Woodstock, in the County of Carleton, and Province of New Brunswick, sheweth that

1. Your petitioner was a candidate at the above election.

2. Your petitioner states that the said election was held on the thirtieth day of March, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighty-one, for the nomination of our candidates, when Charles Pitt Council, of the town of Woodstock, in the County of Carleton, and Province of New Brunswick, sheweth that

## NEW SUMMER MILLINERY!

INCLUDING ALL SHADES OF

Ombre Ribbons & Satins!

WITH A FULL LINE OF

Bonnets, Hats, Flowers, AND SHADY FEATHERS,

AT MRS. W. D. CAMBERS, Woodstock, June 17, 1881.

WYETH'S

Beef Iron and Wire!

—AT—

Apothecaries' Hall.

Brilliant Stove Polish!

Protects Stoves, Pipes, Grates, &c. against Rust. Price 15 Cents a Bottle.

Eureka Furniture Polish

Renovates and gives lustre to Furniture of every description. Price 25 Cents per Bottle.

Camphor Cerate!

Will cure Sunburn, Tan, Chapped Hands and Lips, Roughness of the Skin, &c. Price 20 Cents a Box.

The above preparations to be had at

APOTHECARIES' HALL, PAXTON BAIRD, DRUGGIST, Woodstock, June 17, 1881.

PARASOLS!

PARASOLS!

—IN—

Cambric, Zanella, Serge, Silk and Satin.

A Beautiful Assortment and at Astonishingly Low Prices.

Special attention is called to a line of

SATIN PARASOLS!

handsomely trimmed with rich Black Lace, which were bought at an immense sacrifice, and are being closed out at a very slight advance.

John McLaughlan.

Stores on Main and Connell Streets. Woodstock, June 17, 1881.

BARK!

BARK!

A LARGE QUANTITY OF HEMLOCK BARK required by the undersigned. Most of the bark is of the best quality, and is being offered at a low price. Also taken taken to past and yard back on the Narrow Gauge Railway, below the Carleton County line. Any information can be obtained from our agent, W. H. CROCKER, Lower Corner. SHAW & BROS. Woodstock, June 17, 1881.—Simp. 24.

WOODSTOCK

JEWELLERY STORE!

HAY'S BLOCK.

Our Specialties

THIS WEEK ARE

Colored Gold Sets,

Colored Gold

Ear Rings,

AND

Wedding Rings.

CHEAP!

W. B. JEWETT, Proprietor. Woodstock, June 10, 1881.

Bank of Nova Scotia.

CAPITAL, ----- \$1,000,000. RESERVE FUND, ----- 275,000.

DRAPERS GRANTED ON MONTREAL, NEW YORK, BOSTON, and all Towns in the LOWER PROVINCES.

STERLING EXCHANGE BOUGHT AND SOLD. American Drafts Negotiated. Collections made at all accessible points. Interest allowed on special deposits. Office at Woodstock: HOURS—9 A.M. to 3 P.M. SATURDAY, 9 A.M. to 1 P.M. JAS. B. FORGAN, Agent. August 27, 1880.—28.

## SEWING MACHINES

New Machines & New Improvements!

Mrs. W. A. STEVENS will assist this Summer in selecting for you the best Sewing Machine in the market. Send for Illustrated Circular and Price, &c. Woodstock, June 9, 1881. J. G. EMBERY.

Important Notice!

KNIVES, GUARDS, SECTIONS AND RIVETS for all the different MOWERS, can be found at my Shop during the Season.

Also Repairs for Coslett's Rakes and Mowers.

I can also supply Repairs for several other make of Mowers. Farmers, fit up your Mowers early and avoid being late. The month of June is the best time. Woodstock, June 9, 1881. J. G. EMBERY.

COSSITT'S

Improved Itasca Horse Dumping Hay Rake!

THE BEST TO BUY, for the following reasons:

1st. The Rake has Rock Elm wood Hubs, instead of cast iron.

2nd. The Teeth remain without fastening. The Teeth are made of the best of Spring Steel and are Oil Tempered.

3rd. The Teeth do not scratch the ground like other rakes—hence they trip the teeth. The Rake will contain less dust.

4th. Coslett's Patent Lever Trip is Simple and Durable, and the horse helps to trip the teeth. There are no springs, clutches, gears, friction breakers or other complicated machinery. It wears smoothly, is easy and sure.

5th. J. W. MANN & CO'S NEW SOWEN A-TACKER for Horse Rake only fits the Coslett Rake; by having the Rake you will save \$15 in purchasing Sower.

6th. Farmers who buy Coslett's Rakes are more certain of procuring pieces for repairs than if they bought other Rakes. Johnson & Co., have Agents in New Brunswick, and repair for Coslett's Rakes can be found at any agency. Should repairs for their Rakes burn up at any of these agencies, pieces will be shipped there by Express immediately after the pieces. Farmers do not run the risk of seeing fire destroying all the repairs for Coslett's Rakes.

Over 15,000 Coslett Rakes in use in Canada, and less than 100 Teeth sold in 1880 to repair breakages. For sale on reasonable terms by J. G. EMBERY. Woodstock, June 9, 1881.

COSSITT'S

New Model Buckeye Mower!

IMPROVED FOR SEASON 1881.

1st. There is a new Tool Box, giving double capacity for holding and lowering the mower.

2nd. All the gears are covered and protected from the rain getting into them and from dirt and dust.

3rd. A Tilling Lever has been attached, so that Coslett's Mower for 1881 has greater capacity for tilling and lowering the mower than any other machine.

4th. A new Lower and Leveling Wheel has been made, by which more grain is gained in raising and lowering, and the knife falls more easily and without jarring the cutter bar.

5. There is a new, stronger and better shaped Foot Plate and Box lid.

6th. Malleable Iron is used in greater quantity than heretofore.

7th. The Pole, the Driving Wheels and Oil Cans have been modified to suit the advanced knowledge and experience of the farmers and manufacturers.

For sale on easy Terms, by J. G. EMBERY. Woodstock, June 9, 1881.—3m. 21.

WHALE OIL SOAP!

POWELL, HELLBORE, Insist Pure!

Bromo Chloride; Phosol Sodium; T. B. BARKER & SONS, 35 and 37 King Street, St. John, N.B., 18