

Chicheston Post.

WILLIAM C. MILLER,
Proprietor.

VOL. 9.—NO. 19.

Reserve Success and you shall Command it.

SACKVILLE, N. B., THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1878.

WHOLE NO. 435.

Chicheston Post.

Sackville, N. B., September 12, 1878.

Mr. Chapman's Meeting at Bay Verte.

Mr. Chapman's first political meeting of the campaign was held in Bay Verte last week. The hall was packed to its utmost capacity with enthusiastic supporters of the Liberal Conservative cause. Mr. Chapman took the platform amid great applause. After referring to the pleasure it gave him to be present to address the Electors in the issues of the day he proceeded to discuss the inability, inconsistency and corruption of the present Government.

Mr. Chapman's speech lasted over an hour and was greeted with frequent and vigorous applause. One point which was particularly gratifying to the Electors was his manly and able discussion of the questions of the day as contrasted with that blustering bluff and abuse which are so characteristic of our chivalric knight.

For the Chicheston Post.

Conversation at Dorchester between Mr. B. and Mr. G. and Mr. R. with a Liberal Conservative, about Sir Albert J. Smith's great Picnic Speech at Petitoctia.

Mr. B. reading a newspaper, enter Mr. R.

Mr. B.—"Good morning Mr. R. how do you do?"

Mr. R.—"Good morning, I'm glad to see you. I have been reading Sir Albert's speech at the Petitoctia Picnic."

Mr. B.—"That was a glorious ovation for a distinguished Member, and his speech was worthy of the occasion. The Freeman gives a full report, and an able and more conclusive speech I never read. Have you seen it?"

Mr. R.—"No, I have not yet had the opportunity."

Mr. B.—"Well, if you like, I will read it to you."

Mr. R.—"Thank you, if it is not too much trouble, I shall be pleased to hear it. I am always anxious to get information from every quarter."

Mr. B. continues to read. "He was now in the throes of a political contest, and although it may be considered an extraordinary assertion, nothing could give him more pleasure than to enter this contest."

Mr. R.—"Stop, sir! Have you read that correctly? Surely Sir Albert did not say that?"

Mr. B.—"Yes he did; these are his exact words: 'nothing could give him greater pleasure than to enter this contest.'"

Mr. R.—"Ha! ha! how absurd. Did you believe him?"

Mr. B.—"Sir Albert said so, and I have no doubt, whatever, he told the truth."

Mr. R.—"Why, B., you cannot be serious, surely you cannot be prejudiced to accept that Sir Albert himself feels he is making an extraordinary assertion, and he must have calculated largely on the credulity of his hearers when he made it."

Mr. B.—"Nothing gave him greater pleasure than a political contest? He knew he was saying what was untrue. But go on."

Mr. R.—"Well, I think he was not exactly correct in that," read again. "Already he had seen many of his constituents, and he was due to them, and to all others, that he should defend his conduct during these years."

Mr. R.—"A representative who had never gone among his constituents for eleven years, and only visits them under the great apprehensions of a political contest, need not be thanked by them. The object, to secure votes to benefit himself, is too apparent to deceive any, and the people will value it as it deserves."

Mr. B.—"No man would have the cheek to neglect his constituents for eleven years and then visit them as an Election comes on. It requires a Knight with plenty of the people's money in his pocket to do that."

Mr. R.—"Sir Albert has been so pressed in the public affairs that it is only now he has time to go among his constituents. Look at the \$3 millions he got for the fisheries; he deserves credit for that, and we ought to return him to that, he would have a voice in appointing."

Mr. R.—"Carwright has spent it long ago. Any money got from that only pays a part of the debts he has contracted, so there is no necessity for sending him to Ottawa for that purpose."

Mr. B. reads again: "The Macdonald Government was overthrown, and he felt it his duty to accept a seat in the Mackenzie Government, and in doing so he was doing nothing inconsistent with his previous conduct."

Mr. R.—"If Mr. Smith had said he felt it his interest to accept a seat in the Mackenzie Government, I would agree with him, but perhaps he felt it his duty, he meant to himself, to accept a salary of \$7,000, notwithstanding he declared from the hustings in Dorchester, that the Maritime Provinces had nothing to look for from the Ontario Grits. You remember that, do you not?"

Mr. B.—"Yes, I know he said so, but that was when he was supporting Sir John, and he has learned better since."

Mr. R.—"Yes, I suppose so; he changed his politics when he got the \$7,000 a year. He supported Sir John as long as he was in power, and jumped the fence in power, and supported the Government. Supposing he was justified in doing so, still his conduct was inconsistent with that before. He raised and went with the winning party, and got handsomely paid for it. He has made \$45,000 by the operation, and how a man can support two different Governments having adverse policies without being inconsistent, I do not know. Do you?"

Mr. B.—"A man may change his opinions."

few. What the County wants is a man who knows its wants and is willing to work to have them supplied. If elected he would do all in his power to have the Cape Tormentine Railway built via Bay Verte and Port Egin, and he hoped to come back on tasking for re-election. Mr. Chapman's speech lasted over an hour and was greeted with frequent and vigorous applause. One point which was particularly gratifying to the Electors was his manly and able discussion of the questions of the day as contrasted with that blustering bluff and abuse which are so characteristic of our chivalric knight.

For the Chicheston Post.

Conversation at Dorchester between Mr. B. and Mr. G. and Mr. R. with a Liberal Conservative, about Sir Albert J. Smith's great Picnic Speech at Petitoctia.

Mr. B. reading a newspaper, enter Mr. R.

Mr. B.—"Good morning Mr. R. how do you do?"

Mr. R.—"Good morning, I'm glad to see you. I have been reading Sir Albert's speech at the Petitoctia Picnic."

Mr. B.—"That was a glorious ovation for a distinguished Member, and his speech was worthy of the occasion. The Freeman gives a full report, and an able and more conclusive speech I never read. Have you seen it?"

Mr. R.—"No, I have not yet had the opportunity."

Mr. B.—"Well, if you like, I will read it to you."

Mr. R.—"Thank you, if it is not too much trouble, I shall be pleased to hear it. I am always anxious to get information from every quarter."

Mr. B. continues to read. "He was now in the throes of a political contest, and although it may be considered an extraordinary assertion, nothing could give him more pleasure than to enter this contest."

Mr. R.—"Stop, sir! Have you read that correctly? Surely Sir Albert did not say that?"

Mr. B.—"Yes he did; these are his exact words: 'nothing could give him greater pleasure than to enter this contest.'"

Mr. R.—"Ha! ha! how absurd. Did you believe him?"

Mr. B.—"Sir Albert said so, and I have no doubt, whatever, he told the truth."

Mr. R.—"Why, B., you cannot be serious, surely you cannot be prejudiced to accept that Sir Albert himself feels he is making an extraordinary assertion, and he must have calculated largely on the credulity of his hearers when he made it."

Mr. B.—"Nothing gave him greater pleasure than a political contest? He knew he was saying what was untrue. But go on."

Mr. R.—"Well, I think he was not exactly correct in that," read again. "Already he had seen many of his constituents, and he was due to them, and to all others, that he should defend his conduct during these years."

Mr. R.—"A representative who had never gone among his constituents for eleven years, and only visits them under the great apprehensions of a political contest, need not be thanked by them. The object, to secure votes to benefit himself, is too apparent to deceive any, and the people will value it as it deserves."

Mr. B.—"No man would have the cheek to neglect his constituents for eleven years and then visit them as an Election comes on. It requires a Knight with plenty of the people's money in his pocket to do that."

Mr. R.—"Sir Albert has been so pressed in the public affairs that it is only now he has time to go among his constituents. Look at the \$3 millions he got for the fisheries; he deserves credit for that, and we ought to return him to that, he would have a voice in appointing."

Mr. R.—"Carwright has spent it long ago. Any money got from that only pays a part of the debts he has contracted, so there is no necessity for sending him to Ottawa for that purpose."

Mr. B. reads again: "The Macdonald Government was overthrown, and he felt it his duty to accept a seat in the Mackenzie Government, and in doing so he was doing nothing inconsistent with his previous conduct."

Mr. R.—"If Mr. Smith had said he felt it his interest to accept a seat in the Mackenzie Government, I would agree with him, but perhaps he felt it his duty, he meant to himself, to accept a salary of \$7,000, notwithstanding he declared from the hustings in Dorchester, that the Maritime Provinces had nothing to look for from the Ontario Grits. You remember that, do you not?"

Mr. B.—"Yes, I know he said so, but that was when he was supporting Sir John, and he has learned better since."

Mr. R.—"Yes, I suppose so; he changed his politics when he got the \$7,000 a year. He supported Sir John as long as he was in power, and jumped the fence in power, and supported the Government. Supposing he was justified in doing so, still his conduct was inconsistent with that before. He raised and went with the winning party, and got handsomely paid for it. He has made \$45,000 by the operation, and how a man can support two different Governments having adverse policies without being inconsistent, I do not know. Do you?"

Mr. B.—"A man may change his opinions."

Mr. R.—"That is true; but if he does one opinion must be inconsistent with the other, although he may change from wrong to right."

Mr. B.—"That is what Sir Albert did."

Mr. R.—"Then why did he not say so, instead of asserting his conduct was not inconsistent?"

Mr. B. (reading)—"He never thought the time would come when we should find advocates of a protective policy in this Province."

Mr. R.—"When? Does Sir Albert forget, or does he think the people forget, when he ran, and ran successfully, in this County, the Protection policy? Does he not remember that his opposition to Confederation was that the Maritime Provinces would be ruined by the trade with Canada, that our farmers and manufacturers would be swept out of existence by Canadians, and that we required a protective duty to keep up the prices of agricultural articles and manufactures? He won on the Protection horse then, so he is betting on Free Trade. Of course there is nothing inconsistent here. Sir Albert is always consistent and he is always right!"

Mr. R.—"The question of Confederation was a good many years ago, and the necessity of protection against Canada was a very different thing from protection against the United States, which Sir John wants. (Reading.) 'In the Neelburg Hotel matter, the Government had nothing whatever to do with the transactions, but to appoint appraisers, and the whole scandal was that the appraisers had valued the property \$800 to \$400 too much.'"

Mr. R.—"It is extraordinary that Sir Albert has not taken the trouble to inform himself about this notorious scandal. He either is ignorant of the facts, or willfully misstates them."

Mr. B.—"Come, come, R., you are getting excited, and must modify your language."

Mr. R.—"No, I am indignant at a man occupying Sir Albert's position being so regardless of his statements. The whole scandal was that the appraisers had valued the property too much. The scandal was that the appraisers had valued the property too much. The scandal was that the appraisers had valued the property too much."

Mr. R.—"That is not satisfactory. Sir Albert made a direct charge against the Editor of the Post, involving moral guilt, alleging there was not a particle of truth in what the Editor stated. The Editor being on the spot affirmed his statement, that Sir Albert told him he would not give him the rails. Sir Albert admits parties made application to him but for the rails, he does not deny that the Editor showed him the plans and that he was unwilling to give application to him, and Sir Albert admits that such application was unsuccessful, and he says he told the parties that after obtaining the rails and obtaining subscriptions they would be unable to finish the road, and the farmers would lose their money. There were good reasons, if true, why he should not give the rails applying for which were wholly inappropriate, if, as he now says, that he never told him to give or refuse them. Sir Albert, if he does not tell him to give or refuse them, he told or hinted to the parties applying for the rails that he had no power to give the rails; or that they were not in his department, but reasons with them as to their inability to finish the road. This much is evident the promoters of the Cape Tormentine Railway made application to Sir Albert, the representative of the County and a Minister of the Government, for old rails, of which the Government had plenty, and they could not get them; Sir Albert telling them that if they had the rails they would be unable to finish the road, and the farmers would lose their money, and the result actually was the rails were not got, and the operations of the Cape Tormentine Railway Company were in consequence stopped. How a person occupying the position Sir Albert does, dare charge a gentleman with willful and malicious lying without having a particle of account is shown to be every word true, is unaccountable unless Sir Albert's Knighthood elevates him so far above others, he is not bound by the laws which should govern gentlemen. It is a way he has. Sir Albert has frequently tried to get out of difficulties by charging others with misstatements. You must remember the affair with Governor Gordon, and his charges against Mr. Chandler, which the latter declined to accept."

Mr. B. reads—"One man, Dr. Tupper, has been found who delights in justifying the act, (Pacific scandal) an act which has been condemned everywhere, where the Bible is read and where Christianity is recognized."

Mr. R.—"What is the use of Sir Albert talking such trash. Where has the Pacific Scandal been condemned? To condemn is to pronounce to be guilty. It expresses more than a censure, and where has it been pronounced open and avowed? Have the Governments or people of the United States, or Great Britain, or France, or Italy, or Germany ever condemned it. Have the Legislatures of the different Provinces of the Dominion ever condemned it. What body of men have ever done so, except the Grits, who used it as a stepping stone to power? Perhaps he means that he does not. Can any person be so senseless as to imagine that if a duty of \$1 a bushel was imposed on

potatoes imported from the United States, that it would increase the price here, yet from the argument of Sir Albert it would result, that putting such a duty on potatoes, farmers would get \$1.40 per bushel for them. If Mackenzie is any authority, Sir Albert is wrong."

Mr. B.—"I don't know but what you are right. If putting a duty on potatoes would not increase the price to the farmer, I do not see how putting a duty on wheat would increase the price of flour, seeing the Dominion raises of both more than we have consumption for. Suppose a duty was put on hay or oats imported, I do not think it would raise the price here, because we raise all and more than there is a local demand for. It will speak for Sir Albert and get him to explain. I will now read on."

"He then went on to explain his position in reference to the Cape Tormentine Railway, and said he could satisfy the people that there was no better friend to the road."

Referring to some statements in the Post, he said there was not a particle of truth in them, and that the writer knew this."

Mr. R.—"That's strong, accusing the Editor of the Post of willfully lying, not a particle of truth in the Editor of the Post's statements, lies made out of whole cloth—and willfully made, because he knew they were false. Pretty rough on our young Editor. Go on."

Mr. B. (reading on)—"Mr. Milner, Editor of the Post, said he was Secretary of the Cape Tormentine Railway Company, and took the plans, etc., to Sir Albert, and that Sir Albert told him he would not give him the rails. Sir Albert, reminding him that he would lose much if he could at all times have so ready an opportunity of contradicting it. It was utterly impossible for him to say he would not give the rails. He never had the power to give or refuse the rails; they were not in his Department; and when the parties came to him for the rails, he told them that after getting the rails and obtaining subscriptions they would be unable to build the road, and the farmers would be induced to subscribe money."

Mr. R.—"That is not satisfactory. Sir Albert made a direct charge against the Editor of the Post, involving moral guilt, alleging there was not a particle of truth in what the Editor stated. The Editor being on the spot affirmed his statement, that Sir Albert told him he would not give him the rails. Sir Albert admits parties made application to him but for the rails, he does not deny that the Editor showed him the plans and that he was unwilling to give application to him, and Sir Albert admits that such application was unsuccessful, and he says he told the parties that after obtaining the rails and obtaining subscriptions they would be unable to finish the road, and the farmers would lose their money. There were good reasons, if true, why he should not give the rails applying for which were wholly inappropriate, if, as he now says, that he never told him to give or refuse them. Sir Albert, if he does not tell him to give or refuse them, he told or hinted to the parties applying for the rails that he had no power to give the rails; or that they were not in his department, but reasons with them as to their inability to finish the road. This much is evident the promoters of the Cape Tormentine Railway made application to Sir Albert, the representative of the County and a Minister of the Government, for old rails, of which the Government had plenty, and they could not get them; Sir Albert telling them that if they had the rails they would be unable to finish the road, and the farmers would lose their money, and the result actually was the rails were not got, and the operations of the Cape Tormentine Railway Company were in consequence stopped. How a person occupying the position Sir Albert does, dare charge a gentleman with willful and malicious lying without having a particle of account is shown to be every word true, is unaccountable unless Sir Albert's Knighthood elevates him so far above others, he is not bound by the laws which should govern gentlemen. It is a way he has. Sir Albert has frequently tried to get out of difficulties by charging others with misstatements. You must remember the affair with Governor Gordon, and his charges against Mr. Chandler, which the latter declined to accept."

Mr. B. reads—"One man, Dr. Tupper, has been found who delights in justifying the act, (Pacific scandal) an act which has been condemned everywhere, where the Bible is read and where Christianity is recognized."

Mr. R.—"What is the use of Sir Albert talking such trash. Where has the Pacific Scandal been condemned? To condemn is to pronounce to be guilty. It expresses more than a censure, and where has it been pronounced open and avowed? Have the Governments or people of the United States, or Great Britain, or France, or Italy, or Germany ever condemned it. Have the Legislatures of the different Provinces of the Dominion ever condemned it. What body of men have ever done so, except the Grits, who used it as a stepping stone to power? Perhaps he means that he does not. Can any person be so senseless as to imagine that if a duty of \$1 a bushel was imposed on

potatoes imported from the United States, that it would increase the price here, yet from the argument of Sir Albert it would result, that putting such a duty on potatoes, farmers would get \$1.40 per bushel for them. If Mackenzie is any authority, Sir Albert is wrong."

Mr. B.—"I don't know but what you are right. If putting a duty on potatoes would not increase the price to the farmer, I do not see how putting a duty on wheat would increase the price of flour, seeing the Dominion raises of both more than we have consumption for. Suppose a duty was put on hay or oats imported, I do not think it would raise the price here, because we raise all and more than there is a local demand for. It will speak for Sir Albert and get him to explain. I will now read on."

"He then went on to explain his position in reference to the Cape Tormentine Railway, and said he could satisfy the people that there was no better friend to the road."

Referring to some statements in the Post, he said there was not a particle of truth in them, and that the writer knew this."

Mr. R.—"That's strong, accusing the Editor of the Post of willfully lying, not a particle of truth in the Editor of the Post's statements, lies made out of whole cloth—and willfully made, because he knew they were false. Pretty rough on our young Editor. Go on."

Mr. B. (reading on)—"Mr. Milner, Editor of the Post, said he was Secretary of the Cape Tormentine Railway Company, and took the plans, etc., to Sir Albert, and that Sir Albert told him he would not give him the rails. Sir Albert, reminding him that he would lose much if he could at all times have so ready an opportunity of contradicting it. It was utterly impossible for him to say he would not give the rails. He never had the power to give or refuse the rails; they were not in his Department; and when the parties came to him for the rails, he told them that after getting the rails and obtaining subscriptions they would be unable to build the road, and the farmers would be induced to subscribe money."

Mr. R.—"That is not satisfactory. Sir Albert made a direct charge against the Editor of the Post, involving moral guilt, alleging there was not a particle of truth in what the Editor stated. The Editor being on the spot affirmed his statement, that Sir Albert told him he would not give him the rails. Sir Albert admits parties made application to him but for the rails, he does not deny that the Editor showed him the plans and that he was unwilling to give application to him, and Sir Albert admits that such application was unsuccessful, and he says he told the parties that after obtaining the rails and obtaining subscriptions they would be unable to finish the road, and the farmers would lose their money. There were good reasons, if true, why he should not give the rails applying for which were wholly inappropriate, if, as he now says, that he never told him to give or refuse them. Sir Albert, if he does not tell him to give or refuse them, he told or hinted to the parties applying for the rails that he had no power to give the rails; or that they were not in his department, but reasons with them as to their inability to finish the road. This much is evident the promoters of the Cape Tormentine Railway made application to Sir Albert, the representative of the County and a Minister of the Government, for old rails, of which the Government had plenty, and they could not get them; Sir Albert telling them that if they had the rails they would be unable to finish the road, and the farmers would lose their money, and the result actually was the rails were not got, and the operations of the Cape Tormentine Railway Company were in consequence stopped. How a person occupying the position Sir Albert does, dare charge a gentleman with willful and malicious lying without having a particle of account is shown to be every word true, is unaccountable unless Sir Albert's Knighthood elevates him so far above others, he is not bound by the laws which should govern gentlemen. It is a way he has. Sir Albert has frequently tried to get out of difficulties by charging others with misstatements. You must remember the affair with Governor Gordon, and his charges against Mr. Chandler, which the latter declined to accept."

Mr. B. reads—"One man, Dr. Tupper, has been found who delights in justifying the act, (Pacific scandal) an act which has been condemned everywhere, where the Bible is read and where Christianity is recognized."

Mr. R.—"What is the use of Sir Albert talking such trash. Where has the Pacific Scandal been condemned? To condemn is to pronounce to be guilty. It expresses more than a censure, and where has it been pronounced open and avowed? Have the Governments or people of the United States, or Great Britain, or France, or Italy, or Germany ever condemned it. Have the Legislatures of the different Provinces of the Dominion ever condemned it. What body of men have ever done so, except the Grits, who used it as a stepping stone to power? Perhaps he means that he does not. Can any person be so senseless as to imagine that if a duty of \$1 a bushel was imposed on

potatoes imported from the United States, that it would increase the price here, yet from the argument of Sir Albert it would result, that putting such a duty on potatoes, farmers would get \$1.40 per bushel for them. If Mackenzie is any authority, Sir Albert is wrong."

Mr. B.—"I don't know but what you are right. If putting a duty on potatoes would not increase the price to the farmer, I do not see how putting a duty on wheat would increase the price of flour, seeing the Dominion raises of both more than we have consumption for. Suppose a duty was put on hay or oats imported, I do not think it would raise the price here, because we raise all and more than there is a local demand for. It will speak for Sir Albert and get him to explain. I will now read on."

"He then went on to explain his position in reference to the Cape Tormentine Railway, and said he could satisfy the people that there was no better friend to the road."

Referring to some statements in the Post, he said there was not a particle of truth in them, and that the writer knew this."

Mr. R.—"That's strong, accusing the Editor of the Post of willfully lying, not a particle of truth in the Editor of the Post's statements, lies made out of whole cloth—and willfully made, because he knew they were false. Pretty rough on our young Editor. Go on."

Mr. B. (reading on)—"Mr. Milner, Editor of the Post, said he was Secretary of the Cape Tormentine Railway Company, and took the plans, etc., to Sir Albert, and that Sir Albert told him he would not give him the rails. Sir Albert, reminding him that he would lose much if he could at all times have so ready an opportunity of contradicting it. It was utterly impossible for him to say he would not give the rails. He never had the power to give or refuse the rails; they were not in his Department; and when the parties came to him for the rails, he told them that after getting the rails and obtaining subscriptions they would be unable to build the road, and the farmers would be induced to subscribe money."

Mr. R.—"That is not satisfactory. Sir Albert made a direct charge against the Editor of the Post, involving moral guilt, alleging there was not a particle of truth in what the Editor stated. The Editor being on the spot affirmed his statement, that Sir Albert told him he would not give him the rails. Sir Albert admits parties made application to him but for the rails, he does not deny that the Editor showed him the plans and that he was unwilling to give application to him, and Sir Albert admits that such application was unsuccessful, and he says he told the parties that after obtaining the rails and obtaining subscriptions they would be unable to finish the road, and the farmers would lose their money. There were good reasons, if true, why he should not give the rails applying for which were wholly inappropriate, if, as he now says, that he never told him to give or refuse them. Sir Albert, if he does not tell him to give or refuse them, he told or hinted to the parties applying for the rails that he had no power to give the rails; or that they were not in his department, but reasons with them as to their inability to finish the road. This much is evident the promoters of the Cape Tormentine Railway made application to Sir Albert, the representative of the County and a Minister of the Government, for old rails, of which the Government had plenty, and they could not get them; Sir Albert telling them that if they had the rails they would be unable to finish the road, and the farmers would lose their money, and the result actually was the rails were not got, and the operations of the Cape Tormentine Railway Company were in consequence stopped. How a person occupying the position Sir Albert does, dare charge a gentleman with willful and malicious lying without having a particle of account is shown to be every word true, is unaccountable unless Sir Albert's Knighthood elevates him so far above others, he is not bound by the laws which should govern gentlemen. It is a way he has. Sir Albert has frequently tried to get out of difficulties by charging others with misstatements. You must remember the affair with Governor Gordon, and his charges against Mr. Chandler, which the latter declined to accept."

Mr. B. reads—"One man, Dr. Tupper, has been found who delights in justifying the act, (Pacific scandal) an act which has been condemned everywhere, where the Bible is read and where Christianity is recognized."

Mr. R.—"What is the use of Sir Albert talking such trash. Where has the Pacific Scandal been condemned? To condemn is to pronounce to be guilty. It expresses more than a censure, and where has it been pronounced open and avowed? Have the Governments or people of the United States, or Great Britain, or France, or Italy, or Germany ever condemned it. Have the Legislatures of the different Provinces of the Dominion ever condemned it. What body of men have ever done so, except the Grits, who used it as a stepping stone to power? Perhaps he means that he does not. Can any person be so senseless as to imagine that if a duty of \$1 a bushel was imposed on

potatoes imported from the United States, that it would increase the price here, yet from the argument of Sir Albert it would result, that putting such a duty on potatoes, farmers would get \$1.40 per bushel for them. If Mackenzie is any authority, Sir Albert is wrong."

Mr. B.—"I don't know but what you are right. If putting a duty on potatoes would not increase the price to the farmer, I do not see how putting a duty on wheat would increase the price of flour, seeing the Dominion raises of both more than we have consumption for. Suppose a duty was put on hay or oats imported, I do not think it would raise the price here, because we raise all and more than there is a local demand for. It will speak for Sir Albert and get him to explain. I will now read on."

"He then went on to explain his position in reference to the Cape Tormentine Railway, and said he could satisfy the people that there was no better friend to the road."

Referring to some statements in the Post, he said there was not a particle of truth in them, and that the writer knew this."

Mr. R.—"That's strong, accusing the Editor of the Post of willfully lying, not a particle of truth in the Editor of the Post's statements, lies made out of whole cloth—and willfully made, because he knew they were false. Pretty rough on our young Editor. Go on."

Mr. B. (reading on)—"Mr. Milner, Editor of the Post, said he was Secretary of the Cape Tormentine Railway Company, and took the plans, etc., to Sir Albert, and that Sir Albert told him he would not give him the rails. Sir Albert, reminding him that he would lose much if he could at all times have so ready an opportunity of contradicting it. It was utterly impossible for him to say he would not give the rails. He never had the power to give or refuse the rails; they were not in his Department; and when the parties came to him for the rails, he told them that after getting the rails and obtaining subscriptions they would be unable to build the road, and the farmers would be induced to subscribe money."

Mr. R.—"That is not satisfactory. Sir Albert made a direct charge against the Editor of the Post, involving moral guilt, alleging there was not a particle of truth in what the Editor stated. The Editor being on the spot affirmed his statement, that Sir Albert told him he would not give him the rails. Sir Albert admits parties made application to him but for the rails, he does not deny that the Editor showed him the plans and that he was unwilling to give application to him, and Sir Albert admits that such application was unsuccessful, and he says he told the parties that after obtaining the rails and obtaining subscriptions they would be unable to finish the road, and the farmers would lose their money. There were good reasons, if true, why he should not give the rails applying for which were wholly inappropriate, if, as he now says, that he never told him to give or refuse them. Sir Albert, if he does not tell him to give or refuse them, he told or hinted to the parties applying for the rails that he had no power to give the rails; or that they were not in his department, but reasons with them as to their inability to finish the road. This much is evident the promoters of the Cape Tormentine Railway made application to Sir Albert, the representative of the County and a Minister of the Government, for old rails, of which the Government had plenty, and they could not get them; Sir Albert telling them that if they had the rails they would be unable to finish the road, and the farmers would lose their money, and the result actually was the rails were not got, and the operations of the Cape Tormentine Railway Company were in consequence stopped. How a person occupying the position Sir Albert does, dare charge a gentleman with willful and malicious lying without having a particle of account is shown to be every word true, is unaccountable unless Sir Albert's Knighthood elevates him so far above others, he is not bound by the laws which should govern gentlemen. It is a way he has. Sir Albert has frequently tried to get out of difficulties by charging others with misstatements. You must remember the affair with Governor Gordon, and his charges against Mr. Chandler, which the latter declined to accept."

Mr. B. reads—"One man, Dr. Tupper, has been found who delights in justifying the act, (Pacific scandal) an act which has been condemned everywhere, where the Bible is read and where Christianity is recognized."

Mr. R.—"What is the use of Sir Albert talking such trash. Where has the Pacific Scandal been condemned? To condemn is to pronounce to be guilty. It expresses more than a censure, and where has it been pronounced open and avowed? Have the Governments or people of the United States, or Great Britain, or France, or Italy, or Germany ever condemned it. Have the Legislatures of the different Provinces of the Dominion ever condemned it. What body of men have ever done so, except the Grits, who used it as a stepping stone to power? Perhaps he means that he does not. Can any person be so senseless as to imagine that if a duty of \$1 a bushel was imposed on

potatoes imported from the United States, that it would increase the price here, yet from the argument of Sir Albert it would result, that putting such a duty on potatoes, farmers would get \$1.40 per bushel for them. If Mackenzie is any authority, Sir Albert is wrong."

Mr. B.—"I don't know but what you are right. If putting a duty on potatoes would not increase the price to the farmer, I do not see how putting a duty on wheat would increase the price of flour, seeing the Dominion raises of both more than we have consumption for. Suppose a duty was put on hay or oats imported, I do not think it would raise the price here, because we raise all and more than there is a local demand for. It will speak for Sir Albert and get him to explain. I will now read on."

"He then went on to explain his position in reference to the Cape Tormentine Railway, and said he could satisfy the people that there was no better friend to the road."

Referring to some statements in the Post, he said there was not a particle of truth in them, and that the writer knew this."

Mr. R.—"That's strong, accusing the Editor of the Post of willfully lying, not a particle of truth in the Editor of the Post's statements, lies made out of whole cloth—and willfully made, because he knew they were false. Pretty rough on our young Editor. Go on."

Mr. B. (reading on)—"Mr. Milner, Editor of the Post, said he was Secretary of the Cape Tormentine Railway Company, and took the plans, etc., to Sir Albert, and that Sir Albert told him he would not give him the rails. Sir Albert, reminding him that he would lose much if he could at all times have so ready an opportunity of contradicting it. It was utterly impossible for him to say he would not give the rails. He never had the power to give or refuse the rails; they were not in his Department; and when the parties came to him for the rails, he told them that after getting the rails and obtaining subscriptions they would be unable to build the road, and the farmers would be induced to subscribe money."

Mr. R.—"That is not satisfactory. Sir Albert made a direct charge against the Editor of the Post, involving moral guilt, alleging there was not a particle of truth in what the Editor stated. The Editor being on the spot affirmed his statement, that Sir Albert told him he would not give him the rails. Sir Albert admits parties made application to him but for the rails, he does not deny that the Editor showed him the plans and that he was unwilling to give application to him, and Sir Albert admits that such application was unsuccessful, and he says he told the parties that after obtaining the rails and