

THE DAILY EXAMINER

JANUARY 24, 1894.

RECIPROCITY AND FARM PRODUCE.

The December report of the U. S. Department of Agriculture is mainly devoted to an estimate of the value of farm produce in the local markets of that country.

The following are the prices given: Corn, 37 cents per bushel; wheat, 51.1 cents; oats, 28.8 cents; barley, 46.6 cents; potatoes, 60 cents; hay per ton, \$9.15.

This is the carefully prepared statement of the Government officials regarding the average local prices which the farmers of the neighboring Republic receive for their products at present.

Certainly, we fail to see in it anything to excite the envy of the farmers of P. E. Island. Certain political leaders never cease trying to coax, wheedle or frighten our people into the belief that free trade with the United States is necessary for our prosperity.

We fail to see what advantage it could possibly be to our producers to have their markets flooded with millions of bushels of cheap corn, wheat, oats, and the cheaper animal products which these produce. Potatoes are the only article higher than with ourselves.

But as potatoes do not form one-eighth of our produce, the idea of sacrificing everything else for them would be simply the certain ruin of our farming interest.

Potatoes may be convenient to grow under some circumstances; but growing many potatoes is very expensive to the soil, and everything that would suffer as a consequence.

Improved dairying is infinitely superior to potato growing in every respect. Laying increases fertility of the farm year by year. That is putting money into the farmer's bank, increasing his capital stock—the direct road to solid wealth.

Reciprocity with the States at present would entail a loss of \$1,000,000 on grain, hay and other feed, and \$1,000,000 on live stock. The small gain of \$200,000 or \$300,000 on potatoes would be a poor compensation for this.

Thirty years ago, when we had reciprocity, produce in the States was double the price that it is now. Then we had a market there. Now the effect of reciprocity would be to ruin the market which we have at home, and to give us none abroad.

It is worth while to compare the produce of an acre under dairying and one under potatoes. The last will produce a hundred bushels of marketable produce. If sold at 30 cents, worth \$30; 30 bushels of clover, \$3—in all \$33. Cost for labor, \$15; extra manure, \$15; rent of land, \$3. Profit none. An acre under dairying should give 2,000 lbs. of milk, worth \$20. Cost of labor will be repaid by the value of the manure. Rent of land, \$3. Clear profit \$17.

The profits of dairying, however, are often lost by want of proper selection and management of cattle. It is a much more particular business than growing potatoes, and needs training and experience. But knowledge and culture are the things that always pay.

In dairying, the manure counts for a good deal. By our professors, farm-yard manure is valued at \$2 per ton. Of course, if we compute the nitrogen, phosphate and potash, which it contains at commercial prices, it will come to that price. But in practice we never call yard manure worth more than \$1 a ton.

There is a small field by our house, where we raise early potatoes and fruit. Manure on that patch is worth \$2 a ton, but on the field crops, generally, it is not. At least we could not pay \$2 for it and make both ends meet.

Yet the value of manure is greater than most of us realize. Hugh Miller informs us that when he visited Culloden Moor, one hundred years after the ill-fated battle, every grave was still distinctly marked by a patch of brighter green, proving, as the great geologist remarks, how long the effect of a strong dose of fertilizing material may last in the soil. The same may be seen at the old Fort La Joie, on Cumberland Farms, where the hay growing immediately around the fort, where the refuse of the garrison was thrown, is nearly double as heavy as that on the rest of the field, though it is much more than a hundred years since the fort had an occupant to supply refuse.

If, then, a heavy coat of manure will give returns for a hundred years to come its true value is hard to compute. But the farmer must remember that this result can only be attained where the land is kept in pasture or grass, and not where every grain of fertilizing material is dissipated by constant and exhaustive working of the crops.

In 1883 New Zealand shipped to England 273 hundredweight of butter. In 1890 the quantity was 26,579 hundredweight. Last year it was 41,509 hundredweight. There is in these figures an encouragement for those who are devoting their attention to the promotion of the Canadian butter trade. Canada is less than half the distance from England that New Zealand is, and it ships to that land only about 4,500 hundredweight of butter a year. The skill and energy that has put Canada foremost as a cheese producing country, can, properly directed, raise her proportionately as a butter country.

Syrup of Figs
Produced from the laxative and nutritious juice of California figs, combined with the medical virtues of plants which are most beneficial to the human system, acts gently on the kidneys, liver and bowels, effectually cleansing the system, dispelling colds and headaches, and curing habitual constipation.

At a meeting held in London, England, presided over by Lord Knutsford, Lord Lorne is reported as having stated "that something might be done to improve the news transmitted from and to the colonies by any arrangement securing direct transmission." This, no doubt, has reference to such cases as that of Canada, where the news is filtered through United States channels, and often receives a high coloring from the medium through which it passes. But whether anything will be done, at present, and if so, what, is another matter. The fact that the need of a change is felt, is the first step towards bringing it about.

Over Forty Years has Pond's Extract been used by the people and profession as the best remedy for Pain, Sores, Catarrh, etc. Note name of sole proprietors on every wrapper. Pond's Extract Co. New York and London.

To Protect the Public from imposition, Pond's Extract is sold only in bottles with landscape trademark on bull wrapper.

USE SKODA'S DISCOVERY, the great Blood and Nerve Remedy.

THE MANSLAUGHTER CASE.

Conclusion of the evidence.

THE SPEECHES OF THE COUNSEL.

TUESDAY, JAN. 23.

After recess the taking of evidence for the defence was resumed.

Neil H. McNevin was the first witness examined by Mr. Stewart. He said he was a brother of the prisoner McNevin, and remembered the evening of the 8th Dec. He saw Dr. Murchison and his (McNevin's) brother on the road with a man named Ferguson, who had a bottle. Dr. Murchison took three drinks from the bottle and witness' brother two. Dr. Murchison took the first and last drinks. Ferguson was drunk.

Cross-examined by the Attorney-General. He was standing about 40 feet from the men when they were drinking. It was a bright night. He heard every word said. He had none of the liquor. Witness was mixed up in the row with the McNevin in which his brother was concerned. He heard Ferguson say, "Here doctor, here's the bottle," and the doctor took it and handed it to his witness' brother. He did not remember the last time he saw drinking did not remember how many drinks he had or with whom he had been drinking. He took half-a-glass with his brother last night. He had been in rows and before the court for striking a man. The case was settled.

John Gillespie, one of the prisoners, was next sworn. Examined by Mr. Warburton. He remembered the 8th Dec. last. He had a drink over that day, and left for home between six and seven o'clock. He drove out with McLeod. He took one taste out of a bottle of whiskey on the way home. He got to McGillivray's about nine o'clock, and had his tea there. He had one drink there. On getting to Bonshaw, he put his horse in McNevin's shed, and went over to Dr. Murchison's. The doctor was in the house writing. Witness produced a bottle and he and Dr. Murchison each had a drink. There was no one present but the two. Witness asked the doctor if John McNevin was around, and he said he was drunk. He had previously sent his boy over to McNevin, but upon hearing he was drunk he went over to keep him from coming over. He and McNevin went into Murchison's and he and McNevin and the doctor each had a drink. There is no doubt about Dr. Murchison taking the drink. Witness then went on to relate the story of what followed, of the argument over the doctor's right to vote and the subsequent dispute as to the doctor's bill, his story regarding the fracas being substantially the same as that told by him at the coroner's inquest, and which has already been published.

The Examiner did not have the doctor by the throat when the Trainor girl was sent over after Beaton. The doctor, McNevin and the witness each had a drink out of the bottle before they left the house. "It runs in my mind," said the witness, "that when McNevin caught hold of Dr. Murchison to separate him from his wife when he was dragging her about, he also caught hold of Mrs. Murchison. I cannot say positively." Witness said that on the Monday following the row he agreed to sign the apology, the doctor telling him to make out he had paid him (Murchison) \$10, and he (the doctor) would make McNevin pay \$20 for it. He came into town on Saturday with Dr. Murchison, and Dr. Murchison agreed to withdraw the charge against him, saying he did not wish to have him into it. On the day he asked witness in Warburton's office to give him \$10 and he would give him a receipt in full and get \$20 from McNevin. Dr. Murchison and he came into town together. They had a drink of brandy in Mallet's and had their dinner there. Witness had a flask with him, and he and Dr. Murchison drank its contents together on their way home from town. They were as good friends as ever they were.

Cross-examined by the Attorney-General. He went to Murchison's to settle the bill. He settled the bill with Murchison, and he had his receipt at home. He took his time about settling the bill. He used no insulting language to Mrs. Murchison. He said in Beaton's shop that McNevin might have caught Mrs. Murchison by the breast that night, and did not say positively that he had done so. He was brought up for assaulting a man named Campbell, but the case was settled, witness paying damages. He never described to Mr. Beaton how McNevin had caught Mrs. Murchison and thrown her down. He told Malcolm Macdonald on the Market Square that if Mrs. Murchison was killed the doctor was the boy that did it. In the fall when McNevin was separating Mr. and Mrs. Murchison, McNevin might have fallen on Mrs. Murchison and trampled on her, but he did not see him do it. (The Attorney-General here read over Mrs. Murchison's dying statement to the witness. Witness said he did not see McNevin assault Mrs. Murchison or kick her that night, and there was not a hand on Mrs. Murchison outside the dining room. He also denied some of the statements made in the deposition. He could account for three of the injuries Mrs. Murchison received. The black eye she could receive when her husband struck her; another she could get from the chair while she could get when she fell on the floor with her husband. William Gillespie, the 16 year old son of the previous witness was next sworn and examined by Mr. Warburton. He gave evidence concerning the trouble at Dr. Murchison's house in relation to his wife before Mr. Mellish, J. P., and in line with the evidence of the last two witnesses. Witness said he was not knocked down by his father on that night, as stated by Dr. Murchison.

Cross-examined by the Attorney-General. He had one drink in town on that day, the 8th Dec. He would not swear his father was perfectly sober that night; McNevin was drunk. After the doctor and McNevin had been arguing some time and before a blow was struck, Dr. Murchison said, "get out." Witness thought he meant for McNevin to get out as they had been arguing. McNevin was not very sober when he struck the package of tea. No one attempted to go when the doctor said "get out." Witness' father said he did not come there to raise a row, but to settle a bill. Witness did not hear McNevin say to the Trainor girl, "you can get all the sons of b— from the Green Road?" he might have said so. Witness' father might have struck Mrs. Murchison that night. McNevin did not strike him at all. McNevin did not strike anybody that night; but he caught Dr. Murchison by the collar. Witness' father got two receipts—one was signed and the other was not. Witness said he was never drunk in his life, and did not intend to get that way. Dr. Couray was the next witness examined by Mr. Stewart. He said he had been practicing medicine in Charlottetown since 1878. He was coroner at the inquest in view of the body of Mrs. Murchison, and present at the autopsy on her body. The autopsy was performed by Dr. Taylor. The body was greatly emaciated. There was a distinct discoloration of a portion of the large bowel, but the rest of the bowels were such as he would expect to meet in any other dead person. The discolored portion of the bowels was shiny. Apart from the discoloration there was nothing to indicate any abnormal condition of the bowel. Discoloration alone does not mean peritonitis; this

discoloration was due, in his opinion, to post mortem congestion, or as an extension of the congestion from the inflamed inner lining with which it is in intimate contact. Enteritis could not have been caused by any such thing as a blow, providing, of course, that there was no peritonitis. The bloody and other discharges described by Dr. Robertson would be positive evidence of enteritis, but positively no evidence of peritonitis. These discharges could not have been caused by any blow. The spasms she suffered from, as described by Dr. Robertson, were caused by inflammation of the inner coating of the bowel. Spasmodic pain is a symptom of enteritis. In his opinion, the bloody discharges and spasms were of tuberculous origin, and were caused by the last stages of consumption. The interior of the bowel was not examined. Witness saw the woman's lungs; one was completely gone and the other studded with tubercles. Persons whose lungs are affected do not always show any other signs of disease. He did not see anything about the body to indicate that her death was hastened by violence; there was sufficient disease about the woman to kill her. A rule, he recalled, the jury gave him—show themselves some opinion in her jury is inflamed. If peritonitis resulted from the blow Mrs. Murchison received, she must have had it for a long time and would have shown evidence of peritonitis had discoloration alone.

Cross-examined by the Attorney-General. Witness said: A kick in the side might cause peritonitis of its own accord. A person whose intestines are inflamed could not get enteritis without peritonitis, and a kick in the side would not cause peritonitis. Witness said he was not in a position to say whether or not Mrs. Murchison's life was shortened by the injuries she received. Violence would not cause death in the case of a sound person. If he (Dr. Couray) had made the autopsy on the woman without having heard anything about the case, he would have come to the conclusion that she had died a natural death.

Mr. Stewart here announced that this evidence closed the case for the defence.

The Attorney-General said he had some rebuttal evidence to submit.

The Court then adjourned until 10.30 a. m., on Wednesday.

WEDNESDAY, JAN. 24.

The Court met at 10.30, when the taking of evidence in the case against Dr. Murchison and Gillespie for manslaughter was resumed.

Dr. Couray (re-called)—Examined by Mr. Stewart. He said the dark discoloration of the bowels was not a symptom of peritonitis on the extreme right. He would expect to find the injury on the side on which the witness was inflicted.

Samuel Beaton (re-called) To the Attorney-General—In the conversation he had with Gillespie in his shop a few days after the affair at Dr. Murchison's, Gillespie said that Murchison caught Mrs. Murchison by the night dress and threw her to the floor, and then the doctor on the other side of her. Gillespie made the statement of his own free will. The statement of Gillespie had no reference to Mrs. Murchison's making hold of Mrs. Murchison and trying to separate them, as he (Gillespie) stated. When asked if the doctor struck his wife, Gillespie said, "Tut, tut, no."

Cross-examined by Mr. Stewart—This conversation was after the information was laid.

Lauchlin McDonald (sworn)—Examined by the Attorney-General.—He lived at Argyle Row, and was in Mr. Beaton's store the day after the trouble at Murchison's, and heard the conversation about it. After Gillespie came in, Beaton said to Gillespie there were queer reports going around that he had been in the house and had killed the woman. Gillespie said, "No, nothing of the kind. Gillespie then caught hold of witness by the throat and illustrated how McNevin had taken hold of Mrs. Murchison and tried to drag her down and then threw the doctor over her, adding that it was his son William who picked her up and said "for God's sake don't kill the woman. Gillespie did not say that McNevin only caught the woman to separate her from her husband."

Cross-examined by Mr. Stewart.—He never hit McNevin with a hoe, but saved him from being struck with one.

Dr. Murchison (re-called), examined by the Attorney-General.—He heard the statement made by Gillespie regarding the signing of the apology. There was no arrangement made that Gillespie was to pay \$10, which was to be given back to him (Murchison) was to get \$20 from McNevin. It was not true that he had arranged with McNevin to bring a bottle home that night which they were to drink, but McNevin had told him to go over at nine o'clock. He did not see any bottle with Gillespie when he came in alone, and did not drink with him. Gillespie pulled the bottle out of his pocket and he and McNevin came in and out it alongside of John McNevin. Gillespie did not ask him for "that dish" when he and McNevin came in, as he (Gillespie) said he did. He remembered New Year's Eve twelvemonth. He was at Wm. McFadyen's, Long Creek, attending his wife. He had been there nearly two nights. He (witness) was not at home on New Year's Eve, as stated by McNevin.

The Attorney-General then said that this was all the evidence he had to offer.

Mr. Fitzgerald, one of the counsel for the defence, then addressed the jury. He referred to the contradictory evidence that had been adduced, and said it was for the jury to determine who it was that injured the woman. They have to judge between the two sides, regardless of who is prosecutor, who is in the witness-box, or who is in the dock. He then referred to Dr. Murchison's settlement with Gillespie and McNevin after the assault, and said his conduct in that particular, as well as in the matter of the prosecution before the jury, was not that of a man who was should be the prosecutor in this case. The doctor only came into court when he was forced to do so. As for the apologies, they were only signed, as was stated by the witness for the defence, because the reports in circulation regarding the doctor's connection with the affair. In view of this fact he asked if the doctor's conduct was the conduct of a man who had a motive as pure as that of the man who went to go over the evidence carefully and weigh it well, and to consider the motives of the prosecutor. He claimed that it was not true, as stated by Dr. Murchison, that there was ill-feeling between the prisoners and the doctor. They were all on friendly terms. There was no reason for ill-feeling. The doctor was the family physician for both men and their families, and it was not reasonable to suppose that they would have him in that capacity if they were the enemies the doctor said they were. The men called at the doctor's house that night with their money, and started in to talk politics, as was quite natural at that time. The evidence regarding the reason for bringing Mrs. Murchison down was very contradictory. It was not reasonable to suppose that the man went up stairs after his wife to get her to help him put the men out; there is no doubt whatever that he went up after her to get her to prove he had a council vote. Dr. Murchison's statement that he brought his sick wife down to turn the men out was unnatural and untrue. It was not the act one would expect from any reasonable man. Dr. Murchison's statement that he caught Mrs. Murchison by the throat and threw her down was absolutely unsupported; it was not even supported by his wife's statement. The doctor was the first man to raise a chair and threaten to strike McNevin, and it was his conduct that caused the damage. If Dr. Murchison's story is true he is one of the most cowardly men in the world. No man with a spark of manliness in him would stand by and see his wife assaulted by a drunken man

and not "brain" him. The doctor's statement was highly improbable, and he did not think he jury would believe it. The doctor's story that Gillespie was slapping his face, and that he was highly abused and unnatural, the doctor wanted to evade the fact that he had struck his own wife and he had to fasten an assault on some one. Gillespie's story that he slapped Murchison's face when he struck his wife in the face was quite natural; it was what any man would do when he saw poor, weak woman struck. He then referred to the evidence of Gillespie's son, and asked if there was anything suspicious in the way of giving it. To his mind it was the best evidence of the truth of the lad's story that he never attempted to shield his father, but said in reply to question that his father had struck Dr. Murchison that night. The doctor had been drinking that night, and was irascible; he had lost control of his temper, and, being under the influence of liquor, struck his wife. Why did he not button over to Murchison's that night when the doctor called for him? It was because he was that the doctor had been drinking. He then considered the evidence given by Murchison regarding McNevin's holding him by the throat when the Trainor girl came down, and pointed out where it was flatly contradicted by the girl. He asked the jury if it was reasonable to suppose that the doctor would have held on to his wife, who three times interfered between the doctor and McNevin, would turn around and assist Murchison to assault the doctor. It was not a natural story. The story of the doctor by the throat when the doctor struck McNevin and Gillespie with a chair, and in swinging the chair about he struck his wife, seemed the more natural story of the two. The last act of the doctor in this affair was to order the Trainor girl off to bed and dragging her down. This evidence is contradicted by the doctor. It was for the jury to determine which was the true statement. The men were heard after Mrs. Murchison's statement concerning the condition of affairs when she came down stairs—the statement that she was quiet and the men did not have the doctor by the throat was a most material point in favor of the prisoners, as it corroborated the statement of the prisoners. Then he took up the medical evidence and here, he said, he considered it. Dr. Robertson thought that the cause of the woman's death was the injuries she received. He attributed her decease to peritonitis. Dr. Couray put the matter very clearly before the jury, showing how the tubercles worked down from the lungs and resulted in enteritis, from which she died. Dr. Taylor is of the opinion that the death was caused by peritonitis, and said that nothing he saw at the autopsy indicated that death was due to violence. Dr. Couray also saw nothing that would indicate that the woman died from violence. His testimony is very clear as to her death, which he says, was due to enteritis, which could not have in her case, he contended, been caused by a blow. In Mrs. Murchison's deposition she says: "The injuries received probably were the cause of my death," and she said she was in no doubt as to whether or not they were the cause of her death. Dr. Couray says they could not have been, and that he saw nothing that would indicate she had died from violence. He said that McNevin was struck, did the blows cause her death? That was the question. No verdict of "guilty" could be rendered in a case of man-slaughter unless the testimony was sufficient to prove that she died from her injuries. He pointed out that in trying the count for manslaughter the deposition would be before the jury; but in trying the count for murder it would not, but that must be tried as if it had never been before them.

At this point the Court took recess for an hour.

After recess Mr. Fitzgerald resumed his address, referring to the dying deposition of Mrs. Murchison, and questioning authorities learning upon the value of such depositions and the weight they should have with the jury. He did not want to say a word of disrespect for the dead, but at the same time he must have a feeling of justice for the living. He asked the jury if they considered a deposition written out when a woman was not dying, and which was afterwards read over to the woman and she signed it, what an impression it would have the same effect as one taken from the lips of the dying woman at the time. What weight can you attach to a statement every word of which was read over in the presence of her husband sitting by her bedside, and he suggested that certain things be put into it. The husband got her to clear him, it having been reported that he had caused her death. She knew that these reports were in circulation. Was she ever asked if her husband struck her? What a flood of light would have been thrown on the case had all the prisoners, their counsel or anyone on their behalf been there to ask questions? Was she ever asked why her husband called her down? But weak in body and mind, and in love for her husband, and in the presence of her husband, she went on, let us test the truthfulness of Murchison's evidence. He says he did not drink with Gillespie; Robertson says he did. Again, in his evidence he said he told Dr. Stewart that if (the apology) was not a settlement of the prosecution—only to show that the blame was not on me." R. B. Stewart, however, swears that so far as McNevin was concerned it was a settlement. The doctor saw the inconsistency in his conduct, and now swears there was no settlement. Again, look at McEachern's evidence, who is drinking does not stamp him an untruthful man. He takes a light on this dark transaction. He takes you back a year, and says he saw Murchison drinking, and was drinking with him. He was in the matter of the prosecution before the magistrate, and was not drinking any whisky. During this time the doctor struck his wife and called her the same name he called her on the night of the row, as sworn to by Gillespie and McNevin and young Gillespie. McEachern had no antipathy to Murchison. If the doctor struck his wife once would he not do it again? McEachern's evidence is at least as credible as that of Dr. Murchison. There is nothing but doubt throughout the whole case—doubt as to the criminal, doubt as to the crime, and doubt as to the cause of the woman's death. Was there an attempt to show that the prisoner's evidence was reliable? Unquestionably not. These men ask not for mercy but for justice between man and man. Doctor Murchison said on the stand his wife was bruised by a scratch; yet he says an untruthful man. Such a man would not protect her at the risk of his own life. On the other hand, Gillespie had his finger broken and a cut on his head. The jury make up their minds, and say they have no doubt as to the guilt of these men. Is there a little of evidence that Gillespie was near enough to the woman to do her a bit of harm. Except when Murchison says both men threw him down and had him by the throat after knocking his wife down and tramping on her. When you have made up your minds that these men are guilty of manslaughter, you must be able to show upon what piece of evidence you make it. Such evidence has not been given you, and in this case they should be allowed to go free. The man who brought on the patient was just as much a murderer as the anxious about the grammatical construction of the apologies that was his wife's condition of his wife—when his wife's life lay in the balance. "Think of these men," said Mr. Fitzgerald in conclusion, "and judge as you would be judged."

Dr. Stewart followed in a lengthy and able address, which is not yet concluded.

Begin

Aright

this year by Insuring with

E. R. Brown

CHARLOTTETOWN.

TELEGRAPHIC.

SPECIAL DESPATCHES TO THE EXAMINER

Notes at the Capital.

OTTAWA, Jan. 24.

Sir John Thompson has not made any report on the Northwest School Ordinance matter. The subject is being investigated by a sub-committee of the Privy Council, and their report will be before the cabinet in a day or two.

Lieut. C. N. Mitchell, of Winnipeg, will probably be adjutant this year of the Bisley team. This is mere conjecture, however. The name of the commanding officer has not yet been mentioned.

Fast Skating.

MADISON, Wis., Jan. 24.

J. S. Johnson skated a quarter of a mile in 31 1/2 seconds, flying start, beating Donoghue's record of 35 seconds, standing start. The difference in starting leaves Johnson's time 1 1/2 seconds better than Donoghue's.

Liberal-Conservative Nominations.

TUROU, Jan. 23.

The Liberal-Conservative electors here nominated T. G. McMullin and T. W. Cummings as candidates for the local legislature.

Obituary.

SYDNEY, Jan. 23.

Rev. Hugh McLeod, D. D., died last night.

PERSONAL.

Messrs. Frank and Fred Bayfield crossed in the Stanley today, to return to Rotley School.

Miss Ethel Davies, Master Tom. Davies and Master Col Arnaud crossed in the Stanley today to resume their studies at Windsor, N. S.

Mr. and Mrs. George Longworth and Miss Minnie Longworth were passengers in the Stanley today. Miss Longworth goes to the Church School at Windsor, N. S. Mr. and Mrs. Longworth proceeded to New York and Montreal.

Miss Ella Blake was a passenger in the Stanley today, on her return to the School of the Sacred Heart, Halifax.

Miss Baynes of Toronto, who has been visiting at Charlottetown for some time past, crossed in the SS. Stanley today.

Rev. A. C. Hall, S. S. J. E., Bishop-elect of Vermont, has received the degree of D. D. from Oxford University. Father Hall left England a few days ago for the United States, having recovered from an attack of influenza. It is expected his consecration will take place on February 2d.

USE SKODA'S DISCOVERY, the great Blood and Nerve Remedy.

Japanese Goods!

We have just received and opened part of a lot of goods DIRECT FROM JAPAN. These goods we expected in time for the Holiday Trade, but which were delayed on the way.

They are real Japanese Goods, and comprise many useful and pretty novelties in—

Lacquered Photo Frames, Amoyan Photo Frames, Wall Pockets, Real Tortoise Shell Trays, Japanese Fans (for decorating), Fancy Work Baskets, Office Backets, Wall Brackets, Bamboo Tables, Jewellery Trays, Jewel Boxes, Jewel Cabinets, Handkerchief and Glove Boxes, etc.

Call and see these goods and get your choice at

CARTER'S BOOKSTORE, Jan 19 Market Square.

Burns Anniversary.

GRAND SCOTCH CONCERT

—IN THE—

Masonic Opera House,

—ON—

THURSDAY, JAN. 25, 1894.

PROGRAMME.

- 1. Songs of Scotland. Prof. Vinnicombe's Orchestra.
2. Vocal Solo. Mrs J. M. Macleod.
3. Quartette. Messrs Bruce, Lewis, Cook, McLean.
4. Corset-Song. Mrs C. P. Fletcher.
5. Vocal Solo. Mrs J. M. Macleod.
6. Violin (10) Scotch Air. Miss M. A. Macdonald.
7. Song—"Battle of Striving". Mr William McKay.
8. Vocal Solo. Mrs James Byrne.
9. Annie Laurie Waltz (R. Brunwald). Orchestra.
10. Village Festival. Grand Gathering of Scotch Lads and Lassies, introducing Patriotic and Shepherd's Drell, Gillie Callum, etc. Mr. D. McDonald, Piano. Secord, Tire and Machines by Miss Macnab, from Scotland.
11. Duet—"Wha'll be King but Charlie". Misses Webster.
12. Vocal Solo—"Jessie's Dream". Miss E. Hill.
13. Vocal Solo—"Graveyard". Mr Charles Hermans.
14. Violin Solo—"Auld Lang Syne". Prof. Vinnicombe.
15. Vocal Solo—"My Laddie in the Scotch Blygde". Miss Annie Hudman.
16. "Gems of Scotland" (Sibbald). Orchestra.
17. Vocal Solo—"Scotland Yet". Mr James Davison.
18. Trio—"O, Willie Brew'd a Peck o' Maut". Messrs Bruce, Cook, McLean.
19. Character Sketch—"The Law of Gravitation". Messrs Wheelock and Webster.
20. Comic Song—"Laird o' Cockpen". Mr William McKay.
21. Tricorin (Beattie). Orchestra.
22. "Auld Lang Syne". "GOD SAVE THE QUEEN". Reserved Seats, 25 cents; Unreserved, 25 cents. Plan of Grand Floor and Tables at Paton & Co's. Plan of Balcony and Tickets at Dodd's Magic Hall. Doors open at 7.30. Concert at eight sharp. JAMES PATON, J. M. CAMPBELL, Chairman, Secretary. Jan 15

BLACK DRESS GOODS

DIRECT IMPORTATION.

Round! Round! Round!

Turns the Wheel of Thought, Never Ceasing, Never Ending.

White Goods One Week!

Black Goods the Next!

Always something new, something to wonder at, something to admire. The wonder is

OUR LOW PRICES!

QUALITY, STYLE AND LOW PRICE

are the levers that move our large Stock and brings the trade in our direction.

JAMES PATON & CO'S.,

The Popular Dry Goods Store.

THE EXAMINER'S

COUPON FOR PORTFOLIO NO. 1. THE EXAMINER'S HISTORICAL ART SERIES OF THE World's Fair and Midway Plaisance. "THE MAGIC CITY."

Clearance Sale of Boots.

We are placing on our Bargain Counter a large lot of Men's, Ladies', Misses' and Children's Boots, which we intend to clear out regardless of cost. Call and you will get bargains. GOFF BROTHERS. Charlottetown, January 24, 1894—in w f