

THE DAILY EXAMINER. JULY 24, 1893.

THE TARIFF QUESTION.

The visit of Hon. Messrs. Foster and Angers to this Province, and the object of the visit, will naturally set the people to think about the matter of the tariff. Happily they can do so quietly and calmly, in the light of fifteen years of actual practical experience.

It will be remembered that the moderate incidental protection afforded by the tariff brought in by Sir Leonard Tilley was denounced as ruinous. The wise heads of the Opposition declared that the prices of all imported articles must necessarily advance. It was contended that the actions of the world would no longer buy largely in the Canadian market.

But what are the results? Instead of higher prices for articles of consumption there have been lower prices—the reductions ranging from ten and fifteen per cent. to fifty and sixty per cent. Instead of a demoralized commerce, the commerce of Canada, both internal and external, has grown in volume and importance.

It is presumed that the lower prices are the result, not of the National Policy, but of improvements in the means of production. Let us think a little. Take the article of cotton for instance. Great discoveries, cheapening manufacture, to account for the marked reduction in its price? Not at all. The machinery for cotton making is practically unchanged.

There is no great cause outside the establishment of cotton factories in our own country, as a result of the National Policy, and the competition which is consequent thereupon, which accounts for the cheapening of cotton. The same reasoning holds good concerning woolen clothes of all kinds.

As to tea and coffee and many other staple articles of consumption, necessarily the product of foreign countries, the high duties which were imposed under the Free Trade system have been abolished, and they are now admitted free of duty and are by so much reduced in price.

The value of goods admitted free of duty in the fiscal year 1874, which is the year that Sir Richard Cartwright assumed the management of the tariff, was \$51,000,000, which included \$8,000,000 worth of grain carried through this country for shipment to Europe.

The value of goods admitted free of duty during these five years was about \$39,500,000, while the decline between the first year and the last was \$20,000,000, or nearly 40 per cent! If the figures were corrected by the elimination of goods transhipped and not really imported for consumption, it would be found that the goods admitted for consumption free of duty in 1874 were valued at \$13,000,000 in round figures, while in 1878 the value of such free goods would be \$22,000,000, or a fraction over half as much.

It is plain that in 1878 no less than \$9,000,000 worth of wheat and corn alone shipped from the United States to Great Britain through Canada was included in the statement of goods imported free for home consumption. The original trade table for 1879 included goods transhipped among goods imported free for consumption.

But in a note to the table in the next year's recapitulation the proper deduction was made, and the correct statement is adopted in the following table. Here is a statement of the value of goods admitted into Canada free of duty in the years named and for home consumption:

Table with 2 columns: Year, Value. 1874: \$51,371,639; 1875: 41,480,206; 1876: 34,494,921; 1877: 35,383,726; 1878: 31,422,988.

It is interesting to note that the value of goods admitted free of duty in 1874 was \$13,000,000, or a fraction over half as much. It is plain that in 1878 no less than \$9,000,000 worth of wheat and corn alone shipped from the United States to Great Britain through Canada was included in the statement of goods imported free for home consumption.

It is interesting to note that the value of goods admitted free of duty in 1874 was \$13,000,000, or a fraction over half as much. It is plain that in 1878 no less than \$9,000,000 worth of wheat and corn alone shipped from the United States to Great Britain through Canada was included in the statement of goods imported free for home consumption.

It is interesting to note that the value of goods admitted free of duty in 1874 was \$13,000,000, or a fraction over half as much. It is plain that in 1878 no less than \$9,000,000 worth of wheat and corn alone shipped from the United States to Great Britain through Canada was included in the statement of goods imported free for home consumption.

It is interesting to note that the value of goods admitted free of duty in 1874 was \$13,000,000, or a fraction over half as much. It is plain that in 1878 no less than \$9,000,000 worth of wheat and corn alone shipped from the United States to Great Britain through Canada was included in the statement of goods imported free for home consumption.

It is interesting to note that the value of goods admitted free of duty in 1874 was \$13,000,000, or a fraction over half as much. It is plain that in 1878 no less than \$9,000,000 worth of wheat and corn alone shipped from the United States to Great Britain through Canada was included in the statement of goods imported free for home consumption.

It is interesting to note that the value of goods admitted free of duty in 1874 was \$13,000,000, or a fraction over half as much. It is plain that in 1878 no less than \$9,000,000 worth of wheat and corn alone shipped from the United States to Great Britain through Canada was included in the statement of goods imported free for home consumption.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR. A CONTRADICTION.

Sir,—In a late issue of your paper appears a communication signed "Inquirer," containing a series of malicious libels under the innocent guise of hearsay and "what are told." I would not lower myself to notice a scribbler so devoid of honor and manliness were it not that he makes the ladies of Belfast, who cannot be allowed to pass unchallenged. He states at the outset that the drinking of intoxicants at the Belfast tea was "unprecedented."

This is an absolute falsehood, as there was no more drinking than is usual on such occasions, and, on the whole, the conduct as orderly and peaceable as one could reasonably expect. He further states that "not only men, but many of the gentle sex, whom their friends refused to let go to a glass of so-called ale, they swayed to and fro or sank, in some cases, beneath the treacherous fender's devastating effects."

It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer." It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer."

It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer." It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer."

It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer." It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer."

It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer." It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer."

It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer." It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer."

It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer." It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer."

It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer." It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer."

It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer." It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer."

It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer." It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer."

It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer." It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer."

It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer." It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer."

It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer." It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer."

It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer." It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer."

It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer." It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer."

It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer." It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer."

It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer." It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer."

It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer." It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer."

It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer." It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer."

It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer." It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer."

It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer." It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer."

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR. A CONTRADICTION.

Sir,—In a late issue of your paper appears a communication signed "Inquirer," containing a series of malicious libels under the innocent guise of hearsay and "what are told." I would not lower myself to notice a scribbler so devoid of honor and manliness were it not that he makes the ladies of Belfast, who cannot be allowed to pass unchallenged. He states at the outset that the drinking of intoxicants at the Belfast tea was "unprecedented."

This is an absolute falsehood, as there was no more drinking than is usual on such occasions, and, on the whole, the conduct as orderly and peaceable as one could reasonably expect. He further states that "not only men, but many of the gentle sex, whom their friends refused to let go to a glass of so-called ale, they swayed to and fro or sank, in some cases, beneath the treacherous fender's devastating effects."

It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer." It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer."

It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer." It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer."

It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer." It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer."

It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer." It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer."

It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer." It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer."

It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer." It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer."

It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer." It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer."

It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer." It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer."

It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer." It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer."

It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer." It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer."

It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer." It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer."

It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer." It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer."

It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer." It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer."

It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer." It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer."

It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer." It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer."

It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer." It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer."

It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer." It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer."

It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer." It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer."

It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer." It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer."

It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer." It is a pity that the "Inquirer" is not more zealous in his denunciations of the conduct of the "Inquirer" than he is in his praise of the conduct of the "Inquirer."



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, headaches and fevers and cures habitual constipation.

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. W. R. Watson, Druggist, Charlotteville, P. E. Island.

A GRAND OPPORTUNITY! SPEECHES

HON. MR. FOSTER AND HON. MR. ANGERS AT THE HOTEL ACADIA, TRACADIE BEACH.

On the Grounds in Front of the Acadia Hotel, Tracadie Beach, Saturday, July 29, at 8 o'clock, P. M.

Speeches will be delivered during the course of the afternoon by the HON. MESSRS. FOSTER and ANGERS.

This will be a grand opportunity to enjoy a pleasant afternoon and hear the Trade Question discussed by the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Agriculture.

Arrivals at Hotel Acadia, Wednesday, July 19th: Dr. Mitchell, Hamilton, N. York; Mrs. Bayfield, Miss Bayfield, W. C. Laird, Miss Belle Nash, Mrs. T. P. Calkin, Miss Beer, Charlotteville.

Thursday, July 20: Mr. and Mrs. Albert Kingman, Montreal; Miss Elsie Kingman, do; Rev. Henry Kingman, China; John Coombs and wife, Ch'town; Friday, July 21: Mrs. Geo. D. Longworth, Chas. H. Kirk, Lewis D. Poole, Montreal, I. T.

Saturday, July 22: Mrs. Adams, Montreal; Miss Dawson, Quebec; Miss Johnson, Miss Alley, Gordon Alley, G. D. Longworth, B. W. Fitzgerald, A. A. MacIntosh, Miss Fitzgerald, Mr. and Mrs. W. S. Stewart, H. D. Johnson, C. D. Rankin, Charlotteville.

Sunday, July 23rd: Geo. Offer, John A. McDonald, Ch'town; Eugene M. Morier, Worcester, Mass.; Geo. G. Dunlop, wife, Hartford, Conn.; H. E. Carlisle, Boston; W. J. Fraser, C. Lewis, E. R. Turner, Ch'town; James H. Good and wife, H. A. Bayfield, G. E. Bayfield, Alfred J. Quirk, Dr. J. P. Murray, Mrs. Bayfield, Mrs. Hazard, Dennis E. O'Brien, Boston, Mass.; Miss Russell, Grand Tracadie; Miss Carrie Peters, Gagetown, N. B.

NEWS NOTES. An Arkansas man extracts saltwater from cotton seed. Mount Tacoma is the highest peak in the United States—15,000 feet.

Professor Lippmann has succeeded in photographing simultaneously all the colors of the rainbow on a layer of albumen.

The oldest architectural ruins in the world are believed to be rock temples at Ipsambul, on the left bank of the Nile, in Nubia.

A Virginia mob caught a negro barn burner the other day and hanged him. After the mob left the rope broke and the negro escaped to tell his experience. He says hanging is a pleasant death.

Experience Has Proved It. A triumph in medicine was attained when experience proved that Scott's Emulsion would not only stop the progress of Pulmonary Consumption, but by its continued use health and vigor could be fully restored.

Breaking It Gently. "Give me your candid judgment on these lines," said the young man of literary aspirations. "Do they convey the idea of Patience at all?"

"Yes, sir," replied the editor, looking them over, "they do. There is something in every line that conveys the idea. Every line, confirmed the kind-hearted man, letting him down as gently as he could, "begins with a capital letter."

Parents Must Have Rest. A President of one of our Colleges says: "We spent many sleepless nights in consequence of our children suffering from colds, but never occurs now: We use Scott's Emulsion and it quickly relieves pulmonary troubles."

F. G. Blacklock, of Cape Spencer light station, tried all kinds of remedies for rheumatism, that had left him almost unable to walk, and at last got Dr. Manning's German Remedy. Before he had finished a bottle he could walk without a cane.

TELEGRAPHIC. A Remarkable Sudden Death.

HALIFAX, July 24. Mrs. Ann Olsen, widow of Capt. Olsen, died very suddenly here last evening. Mrs. Olsen had prepared for church, apparently in her usual health. She left home on the way to service shortly before 7 o'clock, but she had not gone far when a loud crash of thunder came, and the lady determined to return home. When she came into her house she complained of a pain in her head. Medical aid was summoned, but before the physician arrived, a few minutes later, she was dead.

Collapse of a Railway Bridge. HALIFAX, July 24. On Sunday morning the Intercolonial Railway bridge across the Narrows connecting the main line of the I. C. R. with the Dartmouth branch collapsed. The western end for the greater portion from near the draw to the Halifax side was carried away. This is the second collapse for the Narrows bridge.

Preparing for War. LONDON, July 24. A despatch from Paris says that Siam's reply to France's ultimatum is unsatisfactory to the French government, and that M. Poincaré, the French Minister resident in Bangkok is preparing to leave the city.

Sunday Closing. CHICAGO, July 24. The White City was deserted yesterday. The Sunday closing order was rigidly enforced, and any person who entered the Exposition grounds had to prove that his presence there was absolutely necessary.

Lacrosse Match. TORONTO, July 24. The lacrosse match between the Toronto and Cornwall, held on Saturday, resulted in favor of the home team five to one.

Steamship Ashore. QUEBEC, July 24. Anticosti advices state that the Donaldson line steamship Alcides, from Glasgow to Montreal is ashore there.

Champion Record Breaker. LONDON, July 24. F. W. Shorland has beaten the world's 24-hour bicycle record, making 428 miles and 440 yards.

Fatal Railway Accident. DENVER, Cal., July 24. A freight train was wrecked at Oxford, Colorado, yesterday. Seven people were killed.

The Latest Fishing Report. It is that MATTHEW McLEAN & Co., Souris East, pay the highest prices in cash for Mackinac, Goldfish and Hake, delivered at their Warehouse, and supply the fishermen with the cheapest Salt, Salt Barrels and other supplies.

DAMAGED BY WATER!

Grey Cottons, Canton Flannels, Flannettes, Bed Ticks, Drills and all other goods damaged by the flooding of our cellar clearing out at greatly reduced prices.

Come and get a bargain. All must go quick.

JAS. PATON & CO., 168 VICTORIA ROW.

Charlotteville, July 20, 1893.—ly

Marine Insurance

on Cargoes and Hulls can be effected with E. R. Brow

CHARLOTTETOWN OFFICE, BROWN'S BLOCK.



TO-DAY the series of Athletic sports, held under the auspices of the Caledonian Club, opens at the World's Fair, Chicago.

All honor to those who win in athletic sports or in any other legitimate calling, for we are all fighting for the winning post, whether in fitting you out with a good-fitting Suit or striving to win laurels on the field of battle.

We are endeavoring in our own humble way to show the public the advantages of trading with us, for we give bargains now at this season of the year to close out our Summer Stock that cannot be given in the regular way of trade.

JOHN T. MCKENZIE, The Star Tailor.

A BARGAIN IN Summer Dress Goods.

We are offering a line of Double Width All-wool Dress Goods at 25 cents.

HARRIS & STEWART, LONDON HOUSE.

TO CONTRACTORS. Tenders for the erection of a House on Brighton Road will be received by the subscriber up till noon of SATURDAY, the 29th inst.

NOTICE. The Public are hereby warned not to manufacture the "CHAMPION BUG SPRINKLER," as we now hold the Patent, and will protect ourselves as the law provides.

Yours truly, JAMES McLEOD & SON.

Your Eyes

may be all right—we hope so—but if there is anything wrong call and see us. We keep a very large stock of the finest SPECTACLES, and by testing, for which we make no charge, we find what each eye needs, and give the proper correcting glass or advise what is best to do.

E. W. TAYLOR, Jeweler and Optician, Cameron Block.

FOR SALE.—300 Mackerel Barrels at my Cooperage, adjoining Spring Park Old Brewery property.

JOHN J. JACKSON.

Advertisement for W. Baker & Co.'s Breakfast Cocoa, highlighting its health benefits and quality.

Charlotteville, July 22, 1893.—ly

Charlotteville, July 21, 1893.—m w f

July 24, 1893.

July 24, 1893.—ly

July 21.—fw