

A NEWSPAPER and ADVERTISING MEDIUM for Benfieldside, Blackhill, Consett, Leadgate, Shotley Bridge, and District.

PRICE ONE PENNY.

Business Announcements

JOHN W. DAVISON,

**CABINET-MAKER, FURNITURE BROKER,
IRONMONGER, &c.,
FRONT STREET, CONSETT.**

DEGS to call the attention of Parties furnishing
and the Public generally to his Stock of FUR-
NITURE, including Iron Bedsteads, Mattresses,
Cushions, Floors, Rabbit Down, Looking-Glasses,
&c., together with a general assortment of IRON-
MONGERY GOODS.

PAPER HANGINGS at MODERATE PRICES.

**RESISTIVE DELIVERED FREE OF EXPENSE at ANY
REASONABLE DISTANCE.**

LIGHT! LIGHT! LIGHT!!!
PARAFFIN OIL AND LAMPS.
The New SPONGE LAMP is adapted to all household
purposes, and will be found useful and economical.
Supply of Oil for the above. 11

EARTHQUAKE IN SOMERSETSHIRE.
About five o'clock on Saturday morning hundreds of
houses in Taunton and neighbourhood were startled
from their slumbers by a shock of earthquake. A loud
report was first heard, and this was followed by the
tumbling of houses and various articles of furniture.
The cause of the earthquake is not yet ascertained.

The sentry on guard at the barracks violently trembled. The Rev. J. K. Eagles was writing at the time at a relative's, Miss Warde, of Hestercombe, and describes the noise preceding the shock as similar to an iron chest being thrown down. A farmer near Merry Rivell church conceived that his house had been entered by burglars, and dressing himself, armed him with a revolver, and searched for the suspected intruders. All in this town agree that it was a smart shock of an earthquake. About ten minutes past five shock was felt in the valley of the Parrett, between Somerset and Stoke-sub-Hamdon. At Martock, a low

shaking noise was heard, which looked a few seconds later as if it were a small airplane flying over the Tinslin building. Struck-by-flames the shock was felt, the ice being described as similar to something flying "fully past the windows. At East Lambrook the house was shaken and people were awakened by the rattling of the glass and of the furniture in the bedrooms. At Livingston the postman distinctly heard the shock, which resembled a train passing the house at full speed. Compton, South Petherton, the shock was felt by real persons, and one woman was so frightened that either fell or rolled out of bed. At Muchobury and Murgery Endiscoe, near Langport, people were awake

...the rattling of lambs and windows. The morning was fine and frosty, with no wind. There had been a snow drizzle in the country during the past week, and the Friars had visited Epsom and left a barrel of powder on the railway station, for several persons at Stinkhall, upon hearing the noise, imagined that the powder had exploded. This will give some idea of the nature of the shock.—*Bristol Daily Post*.

Dr. Dalton, appeared to several summonses, one which charged him with being guilty of violent and cruel behavior in the parish church of St. Ethelga, Bishopsgate, London, during the celebration of the service on Sunday the 25th of December. A third summons charged him in respect with molesting, troubling, and vexing the Rev. John Meadows Rodwell, rector, of the same church, and the same day there was a third summons charging the defendant with troubling the rector during the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, but that was eventually withdrawn. The Rev. J. M. Rodwell, in giving evidence, described the conduct of the defendant minutely. He made a noise

the gobbling of a turkey-cock," and conducted so outrageously that (Mr. Rodwell said) "he really frightened the Fifth Commandment out of my soul, and I did not repeat it at all." The rev. gentleman continued—"He came to me and knelt down to give the Sacrament, but I did not administer it. I made no observation, and on my passing him by, he arose and walked straight out of the church. He never came into the vestry, and I asked him why not. Before he could answer, he said, 'Why I do not so grossly insult him from the pulpit, alleging that I had been laying a trap for him, and I think he will wonder the more that I know he dare not answer me.'"

in the congregation, for that it would have been well. I said of course it would, and if he had he said he had been in a police station at that moment. I asked his name, which at first he would not give, but ultimately he did, saying he was not ashamed of it. He first of all said his name was Pembridge. I said, "Is that all?" He then replied, "Pembridge Langdon," and I wrote it down. I then said, "Leave the room instantly; that's the door." The moment I heard name I turned him out, of course; and I told the warden to let a policeman observe him in case he came back.

Mr. Collette, in defending his client, com-

stood that Mr. LaFontaine could not answer, as, if he could, he would be able to put a different complexion on the case. He asserted that a trap had been set for the defendant, and that the defendant had been made a witness against himself. He referred to some remarks made by the clerkmaster about the Plaintiff.—The Lord said he was bound to say on the first and second summonses the case was most abundantly proved, and that Mr. Collette, although he had conducted the case of the defendant, had not shaken the evidence in one particular. That being so, he felt it his duty to commit the defendant to prison for one month, and order him to pay the costs of the complainant. Mr.

Well asked that a fine only might be inflicted, and Lord Mayor said he would accept the suggestion, only on getting a distinct promise that the offence will not be repeated. Mr. Langston made the promise very clear terms, and having paid £10 & 6s. in the shape of a fine and costs, was allowed to go.

IMPORTANT BREAD QUESTION.

At the Surrey sessions, on Sunday, an appeal was brought against a conviction of William Wood, of Ewell, for a baker, for selling on the 23rd of August, a loaf of bread.

ally sold under the denomination of French lace, and, or rolls, contrary to the Customs of the Kingdom, can. 37, sec. 4. In support of the conviction the factors of weights and measures for the district and adjoining one were called, and also their assistants. It was proved that on the day in question a witness led into the appellant's shop and asked merely for a sters loaf, and a cottage loaf was sold to him at the great price of a quarter loaf. This loaf, it was said by the appellant's counsel, did not weigh 4lb. It was also proved that about 60 or 70 loaves were purchased in a similar way at different shops in the same district.

of the ordinary household slave. On the part he responded it was common and that the case was fairly within the act and the bread was not to have been by weight, and that the lord was not guilty of bread in the increasing of the execution. On the part of a excellent number of lawyers (town and country) he called to prove that cottage bread, although made in the same larch of dough, and, in fact, all bread of the household slave, was called and sold by the title as fancy bread. It was feared that the practice of selling cottage bread originated in 1519 or 1520, after passing of two statutes, the one in 1515 and the

In 1952, regarding the use of bread in the model, and cottage bread was then known as *fancy* bread. From that time down to the present the practice has been rapidly, until now, as one of the writers admitted, a cross examination, out of several cases of those that he considered over work, one half was made up into household bread, and the other half was made into cottage bread. That writer admitted that a large loaf, commonly understood as the half quantity, only weighed one pound and three quarters. It attempted to be established that the less in weight cottage bread was only an equivalent compensation for the baker for the extra labour and time required in

turn to bake it. For the appellant it was contended that if this was fancy bread at the time of the passing the statutes 6th and 7th William IV. the case was not the exception in the fourth section, and cottage bread need not be sold by weight. It was conceded that in a case of cottage bread was now much more common than in the case of fancy bread. — In reply it was urged that bakers could not be allowed to sell by measure, but must sell bread by weight by merely calling the cottage-loaf fancy bread, and that the act intentionally tried to enact that a loaf of bread should be of any regular shape, in order to prevent bakers from evading its provisions by alterations in such shape.—The

man said that the Bench was unanimously of
tion that the appellant did sell a loaf of bread other
than by weight, the same not being actually sold
under the denomination of fancy loaf, and con-
demned the conviction, with costs. After some discus-
sion it is agreed that a case should be argued for the
fion of the Court of Queen's Bench as to whether
bread, being considered fancy bread at the pas-
sage of the statute, although not now so designated,
does affirm the conviction should stand.

