

New Advertisements.



SYRUP OF FIGS
ONE ENJOYS
Both the method and results when Syrup of Figs is taken; it is pleasant and refreshing to the taste, and acts gently yet promptly on the Kidneys, Liver and Bowels, cleanses the system effectually, dispels colds, head-aches and fevers and cures habitual constipation. Syrup of Figs is the only remedy of its kind ever produced, pleasing to the taste and acceptable to the stomach, prompt in its action and truly beneficial in its effects, prepared only from the most healthy and agreeable substances, its many excellent qualities commend it to all and have made it the most popular remedy known.

Syrup of Figs is for sale in 75c bottles by all leading druggists. Any reliable druggist who may not have it on hand will procure it promptly for any one who wishes to try it. Manufactured only by the **CALIFORNIA FIG SYRUP CO.** SAN FRANCISCO, CAL. LOUISVILLE, KY. NEW YORK, N. Y.

15 cents to \$2
HAIR BRUSHES!

5 cents to 50
TOOTH BRUSHES!

10 cents to 50
NAIL BRUSHES!

15 cents to \$1.50
CLOTH BRUSHES!

A Large Stock fine Quality and Close Prices.
GARDEN BROS.,
Druggists, - Woodstock, N. B.
January 7, 1892.

T. J. CARTER, LL.B.,
Barrier, Notary Public, Conveyancer, &c.,
ANDOVER, N. B.
Collections a Specialty.

BEST
EVERY DAY
VALUES
IN TOWN!
R. W. BALLOCH'S,
CENTREVILLE.

SHARP'S
BALSAM
OF
HOREHOUND
AND ANISEED.

GROUP WHOOPING COUGH,
COUGHS AND COLDS.
OVER 40 YEARS IN USE.
25 CENTS PER BOTTLE.

ARMSTRONG & CO., PROPRIETORS.
SHEPHERD, N. B.

ESTATE SALE
AT PEEL!

THE following PROPERTY and GOODS be-
longing to the Estate of the late
C. A. HARMON
will be sold BELOW COST, to pay off
the creditors:

SAW AND GRIST MILL, in good repair and
running order, with new Tamarack 30 foot
wheel, new carriage and sawing gear, and
heavy beam.

A SMALL DWELLING HOUSE, with one acre
of land attached, within 50 rods of Peel Station.
4 HAY PRESSES—1 Decker, 1 Geo. Frit and 2
Tombkins.

1 TRESHING MACHINE, in thorough run-
ning order.
40 M CEDAR SHINGLES.
5 HORSES.

Also all the Goods in stock, comprising a large
assortment of DRY GOODS, READY-MADE
CLOTHING, HATS AND SHOES, HATS,
CAPS, GROCERIES, HARDWARE &c., &c.
The above Property and Goods will be sold at low
prices for cash. Now is your chance for Bargains.

**Sale of Goods in Store only lasts THREE
DAYS.**
all persons indebted to the Estate will please
call and pay or arrange at once. This is the last
notice.

H. F. RANDOLPH
Att'y. for, ELIZA A. HARMON,
Executrix.

Peel, Jan. 18, 1892.—2m-5

Sunday School Column.

LESSON CALENDAR.
Feb. 7.—The Good Samaritan. Jan. 25: 1-13
Feb. 14.—The New Covenant. Jan. 27: 1-13
Feb. 21.—Jehoiakim's Wickedness. Jan. 27: 1-13
Feb. 28.—Jehoiakim's Wickedness. Jan. 27: 1-13

The Field Secretary's Plan.
The following are the appointments made
for Field Secretaries for the coming week
at Woodstock, Sunday, 10th inst., and con-
tinued laboring in the county, until the
middle of February. We need not ask the
Pastors, Superintendents, teachers, &c., to
give Bro. Lucas all the aid they can, so that
the best possible results may accrue from his
visit:—

APPOINTMENTS.
Jan. 29th, Summerfield.
30th, Wicklow Parish Convention at Knox-
ford.

31st, Florenceville, and East Florenceville
in the evening.
Feb. 1st, Ball's.
2nd, Bonanza, Kent Parish Convention.

3rd, Glasville, 6:30 p.m.
4th, Argyle, 8:30 a.m.
5th, Knowlville, Parish Convention, 2
p.m. and 8:30 p.m.

7th, Hardland at 2:30 p.m., the two schools
meeting in a mass meeting; and Rockland
at 3:30 a.m.
8th, Field.
9th, Middle Simonds.

10th, Victoria Corner.
11th, Lower Brighton Parish Convention,
afternoon and evening.
12th, Pembroke.
14th, Woodstock, morning and evening.

15th, Woodstock (Ferryville) in the
afternoon.
Brother Lucas will attend the Wakefield Par-
ish Convention, to be held on February 14th.

Wakefield Parish S. S. Convention.
The next (annual) session of the
Wakefield Parish Sunday School Convention
will be held in the Methodist Church, Lin-
dsey, on Tuesday, the 16th day of February,
to commence at 2:30 o'clock p.m. After-
noon and evening sessions.

Among a number of prominent Sunday
School workers who are expected to be pre-
sent, will be Rev. A. Lucas, corresponding
and field secretary of the New Brunswick S.
S. Association.

It is hoped there will be a large attendance
both of delegates from the several schools of
the parish, and of the Sunday School work-
ers of the County.

At the evening session a collection will be
taken in aid of the fund for the support of
the Field Secretary.

J. T. FLETCHER,
Sec. Treas.
Waterville, Jan. 25th, 1892.

Communicated.
To the Editors of the Carleton Sentinel:

In a recent issue of the Woodstock Press
the Editor says:—
"We have a large quantity of barley to sell;
they (the Americans) make that barley into
whiskey. If we expect them to buy our bar-
ley, say the Liberals, we must buy their
whiskey."

It is indeed refreshing to read the above,
and such like sophistries of the glib-tongued
Editor of the Press. The natural inference
is drawn from such reasoning is that the
Liberals are utterly regardless of the inter-
ests of Temperance and that the Tories,
as represented by the Press at least, are
anxious for Prohibition. Well, if that be so,
the friends of Temperance—those anxious
to see greater restrictions upon the traffic
in alcoholic liquors, while giving to the
Liberals all the aid they can, should be
gladly to support the temperance movement.

A rather amusing complaint was entered
at the police court the other day. A Miss
Hatch made complaint to the effect that her
husband, a down town barter, had perjured her
and voted in the recent Mayoralty election.

The returning officer on election day was given
a fair report as to the conduct of the (assumed)
four voters who expressed her delight at hav-
ing cast a ballot by throwing her arms
around the officer's neck and indulging in a
variety of amorous embraces.

The real Mrs. Hatch is boiling over with indignation,
and would very much like to make it "hot" for
that barter. The same barter is said to
have boasted that he had voted seven times.

Fredrickton, Feb. 4th, 1892
Judge Palmer registered at the Barker on
Monday.

F. E. Coleman, caterer to the House of
Commons, arrived from Ottawa on Saturday.
He will return to the capital in a few days.

No doubt the Editor of the Press knows
his pretences to the contrary notwithstanding,
that the Liberals have spoken clearly on
that point, both in and out of Par-
liament, in speaking of Intemperance, *Articles
of Excess are excused.* Alcoholic liquors and
substances are articles that the United States
(Great Britain or Canada) would not think of
admitting to the free list. It has never been
seriously supposed that either Canadian or Amer-
ican shippers, proposed to have these articles
included in the exchange list. Sir Richard
Cartwright has been particularly explicit in
expressing his opposition to the proposed
plan of reciprocal trade with the United States.

The temperance people of this County will
be gratified to have reliable assurance that
the Woodstock Press is really in earnest in
its desire to aid in making it hard to do
wrong and easy to do right as regards the
traffic in intoxicating liquors. There was a
time when the Press gave no uncertain sound-
ings in its columns, lately, however, its posi-
tion has been rather doubtful. It is to be
hoped the reverend editor of the Press,
who has so frequently very creditably filled
the presser's desk, is all right on the ques-
tion of Prohibition versus Rum and Whisky.

All events the best interests of Prohibition
are made in the hands of the Liberal party;
especially in this true of the Liberal member
for Carleton Co. He is convinced of the
evil of intemperance and of the desirability
of Prohibition, and what is quite as poten-
tial in a representative, he has the courage of his
convictions. He has placed himself on the
side of Prohibition in his own mind, and in
his address to them, and there is
little fear of his supporting any party or
plan inimical to the temperance cause.

Dr. Oliver is a man of honesty and spirit,
and the moment his party loses sight of the
claims of temperance that moment the party
will lose his support.

"German Syrup"
Martinsville, N.J., Methodist Par-
sonage. "My acquaintance with
your remedy, Boschee's German
Syrup, was made about fourteen
years ago, when I contracted a Cold
which resulted in a Hoarseness and
a Cough which disabled me from
filling my pulpit for a number of
Sabbaths. After trying a Physician,
without obtaining relief—I cannot
say now what remedy he prescribed
—I saw the advertisement of your
remedy and obtained a bottle. I
received such quick and permanent
help from it that whenever we have
had Throat or Bronchial troubles
since in our family, Boschee's Ger-
man Syrup has been our favorite
remedy and always with favorable
results. I have never hesitated to
report my experience of its use to
others when I have found them
troubled in like manner." RAY.
W. H. HAGGARTY,
of the Newark, N. J. A Safe
Remedy.

G. C. GREEN, Sole Manfr. Woodbury, N.J.

BLANKS Of all kinds can be had at Sen-
tinel Office, very cheap.

Two Sides to the Question.

To the Editors of the Carleton Sentinel:
The correspondence of Progress Jan. 30th,
recently published, is a presentation of an
interesting question. No person of fair mind
would pretend to deny to the press such
a one-sided presentation of a question. It
always has been the custom of the press to
present one side of a question, and to leave
the reader to draw his own conclusions.
Article attempts to present the other side
of the question, and to leave the reader to
draw his own conclusions. But this is not
the case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and to leave the reader to draw
his own conclusions. But this is not the
case. The article attempts to present the
other side of the question, and to leave the
reader to draw his own conclusions. But this
is not the case. The article attempts to pre-
sent the other side of the question, and to
leave the reader to draw his own conclu-
sions. But this is not the case. The article
attempts to present the other side of the
question, and