THE HERALD

WEDNESDAY, JULY 29, 1885.

Mr. L. H. Davies.

Mr. L. H. Davies has addressed to the "Editors of the city papers" a long letter purporting to be a reply to one or two articles which recently appeared in the Herald calling in question some of his public actions. The value attached to Mr. Davies' letter by the public may be judged from the fact that no Editor of any paper, city or country, has thought worth while to publish it or notice it, excepting the *Patriot* in whose columns of the 21st inst. the communication appeared, and even that paper made no editorial or other mention of it. Mr. Davies' letter has not produced the impression that he expected. The case which we urged against him was plain and unanswerable—and to assist him in his very lame defence he indulges in abuse and falsehood about the Editor of this paper. Whether Mr. Davies was ever our friend or did us a kindness, is a matter with which the public have no concern. We fancy that they will agree with us that whatever obligation we have been under to Mr. Davies is fully discharged by his ostentatious publication of it before the world.

We charged Mr. Davies with having "for immoral purposes, wilfully and maliciously mis-stated the truth" in certain particulars in a speech which he delivered at the railway station in Charlottetown, upon his return from Ottawa a few weeks ago. These particulars were in regard to the financial condition of the Dominion—to the Franchise Bill and to the cost of the Pacific railway. We disputed the correctness of Mr. Davies' statements and declared them false and deceptive. What do we find? The *Patriot* came to Mr. Davies' relief but did not dare to defend his utterances—and Mr. Davies in his two columns and a quarter letter makes no attempt to defend himself. What is the inference but that Mr. Davies did mis-state the truth and cannot successfully deny having done so?

We charged Mr. Davies with having betrayed the Island before the Halifax Commission, and with having accepted a retainer from the Dominion Government while he was the sworn guardian of the Island's interests which he well knew were not akin to those of Canada. We pointed out that his proper position before the Commission was that of Counsel for the Island, as Sir William Whiteway was for Newfoundland and that, although special provision had been made that we should have an Agent before the Commission, Mr. Davies allowed the Island to be unrepresented there. What has Mr. Davies to say in answer to these charges? Here are his own words:—

"The commission or arbitration sat in 1877. Their duties expressed and defined by the treaty were to find how much the United States should pay Great Britain for the free use, for 12 years, from 1st July, 1873, of the British American waters. The Commissioners had *nothing whatever to do with any claims* Canada, or P. E. Island, or *Newfoundland might have* upon the moneys awarded to the Imperial Government. They could not determine upon those claims, *nor would, nor could they have heard any counsel to advocate them.* They had simply to find the amount payable to Great Britain. They did so; their duty was then ended."

The italics are ours. Is it true that the Commission, had nothing whatever to do with any claims Canada, or P. E. Island, or Newfoundland might have upon the moneys awarded to the Imperial Government? If so how did it happen that the British case was presented by the Imperial agent, Mr. Ford, in two parts: Part I. dealing exclusively with the case of the Dominion of Canada, Part II. dealing exclusively with the case of the Colony of Newfoundland? How does Mr. Davies explain the fact that the Commissioners received a separate statement of case on the part of Newfoundland extending in the report of the proceedings from page 73 to page 79? How does he explain the fact that the British agent made two separate claims before the Commission in the following words:

"For these and other reasons Her Majesty's Government, for the concession of these privileges in respect of the Dominion of Canada, claim, over and above the value of any advantages conferred on British subjects under the Fishery Articles of the Treaty of Washington, a gross sum of 12,000,000 dollars, to be paid in accordance with the terms of the Treaty."

"In conclusion, for the concession of the privileges showed above, Her Majesty's Government claim, in respect of the Colony of Newfoundland, over and above any alleged advantages conferred on British subjects under the Fishery Articles of the Treaty of Washington, a gross sum of 2,880,000 dollars, to be paid in accordance with the terms of the Treaty."

And then summing up, the British agent concluded:—

"In Part I. of this case, the claim of Her Majesty's Government, in respect of the Dominion of Canada, has been stated at a sum of 12,000,000 dollars; their claim in respect of the Colony of Newfoundland has been stated in Part II. at a sum of 2,880,000 dollars; or a gross total of 14,880,000 dollars—which is the amount which they submit should be paid to them by the Government of the United States, under the provisions of Article XXII of the Treaty of Washington of the 8th May, 1871."

Will Mr. Davies now state that no claim was presented on behalf of Newfoundland, and that the Commissioners had nothing whatever to do with any such claim?

Mr. Davies also says: "The Commissioners could not determine upon these claims, nor would, nor could they have heard any counsel to advocate them." Will Mr. Davies be surprised to learn that Sir William Whiteway, before the Commission, personally advocated the claim of Newfoundland? Let us see what the record says: Pages 297 to 313 contain a report of the "Final arguments on behalf of her Britannic Majesty, by the Hon. Mr. Whiteway, Q. C.," from which we make the following extracts:

"The argument which I desire to advance in support of the claim of Her Majesty's Government, I may here observe, will be confined entirely to that branch of the enquiry which has reference to Newfoundland; and I shall limit my observations to a consideration of such facts as have a direct practical bearing on the subsequent enquiry.

"I have thus endeavored to state concisely the ground on which Her Majesty's Government sustains *the claim preferred on behalf of Newfoundland.* I have only to add that, when I have seen around me, the array of eminent Counsel and Attaches, as well on the part of the United States as of Canada, when I have felt that no one amongst them had but a general knowledge of that most ancient colony of the British Crown, *which I have the privilege of representing at this Commission,* and that I alone of those around me am intimately acquainted with her resources, and that *a fair and true representation of her interest and claim depended solely upon my exertions,* I must confess that I have felt a grave responsibility resting upon me."

Will Mr. Davies now say that no claim was preferred on behalf of Newfoundland, and that the Commission heard no Counsel in advocacy of such claim? The extracts which we have quoted afford the clearest evidence that not only was Newfoundland's claim presented and received, but that Sir William Whiteway was heard at length, *exclusively in support of Newfoundland's claim.* How Mr. Davies can explain his deliberate statements in this matter we are at a loss to know. Was he lying, or did his memory fail him, or was he too idle to refer to the proofs in his own possession for verification of what he said?

Why was not a claim made on behalf of Prince Edward Island at the same time? For the simple reason that Mr. Davies, whose duty it was to have made such claim, had for nearly two years previously been engaged as Counsel for the Dominion Government, and had assisted in compiling and settling the case of Great Britain, which, *he took care,* should include whatever claim Prince Edward Island had or might have. Mr. Davies says he was Counsel for Great Britain; so was Sir William Whiteway, yet, as we have shown he presented the separate claim of Newfoundland, and confined his arguments exclusively to that branch of the enquiry having reference to that Colony.

The claim of this Island was much stronger than that either of the Dominion or of Newfoundland. We had thrown open our fisheries to the Americans two years before the Washington Treaty came into force, while the Dominion Government did not ratify the Treaty till 1873, and Newfoundland till 1874. Our fisheries were also of more value to the Americans than those of Newfoundland, and used to a larger extent by them. Hence there was a far stronger reason why the Island claim should have been separately presented by the Commission than existed in the case of Newfoundland. But Mr. Davies' duty as Counsel for the Dominion was to see that no part of the award should be set aside for this Island, and that we should have no consideration whatever, notwithstanding the fact that we were a contracting party to the Washington Treaty. His duty as Premier and Attorney General was to have asked for a hearing before the Commission in support of our claim, and afterwards to have applied to the British Government for our share of the Award, at the time when a million dollars were appropriated to Newfoundland. It was here that he shamefully failed.

That it was contemplated that the Island should be represented before the Commission, as was Newfoundland, is abundantly proved in the correspondence which passed between the Local Government and the Imperial Authorities in 1871. In a Despatch of Lieut. Governor Robinson, dated 25th July of that year, he said:—

"I may add that, in the event of the acts necessary to give effect to the Treaty being passed by the Legislature of Prince Edward Island, my Government will apply to your Lordship for permission to send a representative to Halifax for the purpose of conferring with the agent of the Imperial Government, and of urging upon him the claims of this Island to a just share, proportionate to the value of our fisheries, of whatever compensation may be awarded as an equivalent for the privileges which the colonies are asked to surrender."

In reply to which Lord Granville expressed his opinion that "it would not only be permissible but highly desirable" that the Island should furnish the fullest information before the Commission as to the value of her inshore fisheries; and that, as the Treaty provided that the Commission should receive such oral or written testimony as either Government should present, it would be competent for the Island Government to send to Halifax any person who might be so selected. When the Halifax Commission sat, Mr. Davies was Premier and Attorney General of the Island, and it was his duty, in pursuance of the foregoing agreement, to have had the Island represented before the Commission. But this Mr. Davies dared not do, because he was the servant—the creature—the slave of the Dominion Government to work for their best interests and against ours.

To the question why Prince Edward Island was not given a share of the Halifax Award, Mr. Davies replies—:

"Simply because Prince Edward Island had become part and parcel of the Dominion on 1st July, 1873, and was part and parcel of the Dominion every day of the time that the Commissioners had awarded the money for."

Why, these are the identical reasons advanced by the Dominion Government for not paying what we claim as our share of the Award, and we find Mr. Davies adopting as his only defence the same argument as the Dominion Government. What else can be inferred then that he considers these reasons equal advantages, for which compensation is claimed. I propose then, first, to consider what has been conceded to the United States *as concerns Newfoundland,* and, what is the value of that concession; and, secondly, what has been conceded by the United States to *Newfoundland,* and the value thereof."

The italics are our own. Sir William then proceeded to adduce lengthy estimates of the value of the Newfoundland fisheries. Speaking of the privilege conceded United States fishermen of catching bait, he said:—

"Surely, my learned friends do not ask this Commission to assume that American citizens will hereafter surreptitiously avail themselves of privileges which do not of right belong to them, and that, on this account, the compensation now fairly and justly claimed *on behalf of Newfoundland* should, in any way, be reduced by reason thereof."

"I have thus endeavored to state concisely the ground on which Her Majesty's Government sustains *the claim preferred on behalf of Newfoundland.* I have only to add that, when I have seen around me, the array of eminent Counsel and Attaches, as well on the part of the United States as of Canada, when I have felt that no one amongst them had but a general knowledge of that most ancient colony of the British Crown, *which I have the privilege of representing at this Commission,* and that I alone of those around me am intimately acquainted with her resources, and that *a fair and true representation of her interest and claim depended solely upon my exertions,* I must confess that I have felt a grave responsibility resting upon me."

Will Mr. Davies now say that no claim was preferred on behalf of Newfoundland, and that the Commission heard no Counsel in advocacy of such claim? The extracts which we have quoted afford the clearest evidence that not only was Newfoundland's claim presented and received, but that Sir William Whiteway was heard at length, *exclusively in support of Newfoundland's claim.* How Mr. Davies can explain his deliberate statements in this matter we are at a loss to know. Was he lying, or did his memory fail him, or was he too idle to refer to the proofs in his own possession for verification of what he said?

Why was not a claim made on behalf of Prince Edward Island at the same time? For the simple reason that Mr. Davies, whose duty it was to have made such claim, had for nearly two years previously been engaged as Counsel for the Dominion Government, and had assisted in compiling and settling the case of Great Britain, which, *he took care,* should include whatever claim Prince Edward Island had or might have. Mr. Davies says he was Counsel for Great Britain; so was Sir William Whiteway, yet, as we have shown he presented the separate claim of Newfoundland, and confined his arguments exclusively to that branch of the enquiry having reference to that Colony.

The claim of this Island was much stronger than that either of the Dominion or of Newfoundland. We had thrown open our fisheries to the Americans two years before the Washington Treaty came into force, while the Dominion Government did not ratify the Treaty till 1873, and Newfoundland till 1874. Our fisheries were also of more value to the Americans than those of Newfoundland, and used to a larger extent by them. Hence there was a far stronger reason why the Island claim should have been separately presented by the Commission than existed in the case of Newfoundland. But Mr. Davies' duty as Counsel for the Dominion was to see that no part of the award should be set aside for this Island, and that we should have no consideration whatever, notwithstanding the fact that we were a contracting party to the Washington Treaty. His duty as Premier and Attorney General was to have asked for a hearing before the Commission in support of our claim, and afterwards to have applied to the British Government for our share of the Award, at the time when a million dollars were appropriated to Newfoundland. It was here that he shamefully failed.

That it was contemplated that the Island should be represented before the Commission, as was Newfoundland, is abundantly proved in the correspondence which passed between the Local Government and the Imperial Authorities in 1871. In a Despatch of Lieut. Governor Robinson, dated 25th July of that year, he said:—

"I may add that, in the event of the acts necessary to give effect to the Treaty being passed by the Legislature of Prince Edward Island, my Government will apply to your Lordship for permission to send a representative to Halifax for the purpose of conferring with the agent of the Imperial Government, and of urging upon him the claims of this Island to a just share, proportionate to the value of our fisheries, of whatever compensation may be awarded as an equivalent for the privileges which the colonies are asked to surrender."

In reply to which Lord Granville expressed his opinion that "it would not only be permissible but highly desirable" that the Island should furnish the fullest information before the Commission as to the value of her inshore fisheries; and that, as the Treaty provided that the Commission should receive such oral or written testimony as either Government should present, it would be competent for the Island Government to send to Halifax any person who might be so selected. When the Halifax Commission sat, Mr. Davies was Premier and Attorney General of the Island, and it was his duty, in pursuance of the foregoing agreement, to have had the Island represented before the Commission. But this Mr. Davies dared not do, because he was the servant—the creature—the slave of the Dominion Government to work for their best interests and against ours.

To the question why Prince Edward Island was not given a share of the Halifax Award, Mr. Davies replies—:

"Simply because Prince Edward Island had become part and parcel of the Dominion on 1st July, 1873, and was part and parcel of the Dominion every day of the time that the Commissioners had awarded the money for."

Why, these are the identical reasons advanced by the Dominion Government for not paying what we claim as our share of the Award, and we find Mr. Davies adopting as his only defence the same argument as the Dominion Government. What else can be inferred then that he considers these reasons equal and conclusive? Is it surprising then that Mr. Davies is so silent before the House of Commons on a subject that he was so enthusiastic about before the last General Election? In his card to the Electors after declaring that we had a just claim to a share of the Fishery Award, and deploring the negligence of our previous representatives in never submitting it to the consideration and vote of the House of Commons, he pledged himself, if elected, to do all in his power to obtain a recognition of our rights in that regard. Yet we find that upon *one* occasion only, and that late in the Session of 1884, has he ever brought this question before Parliament, and he now tries to excuse himself for his broken promises by quoting the return of Dr. Jenkins as an expression, by the people of Queen's County, of satisfaction with the conduct of the Government in the matter of the Fishery Award. This will not do, Mr. Davies! If Dr. Jenkins' return is to be interpreted as a ratification of the actions of the Government, then your course in the late session in so strenuously opposing the Administration, and in assisting in the policy of obstruction, cannot be in accordance with the wishes of your constituents, for you are both returned by the same Electorate.

Regarding the memorandum of public moneys which we published as having been absorbed by Mr. Davies during his twelve years of political life, he states that we *knew* those figures were false when we published them. On the contrary, Mr. Davies, we reiterate our belief that those figures, as nearly as can be estimated, were and are correct. Having reference to that item of $20,000 which we charged him as having received as Law Agent of the Dominion, Mr. Davies accuses us of having "lied wickedly, knowingly and maliciously and for the basest purposes." He says that we knew "the moment the present Government came into power in 1878, a return of the moneys he received as Law Agent was moved for and brought down," and he further states that the amount which he so received during all the years the Mackenzie Government was in power was only $2,400. We knew nothing whatever regarding such return but upon search, we find in the Journals of 1879 that some such return was presented, from which we discover that the whole amount paid Mr. Davies during that period was only $117.05, and yet Mr. Davies acknowledges having received $2,400. This shows the value of such a return, and of Mr. Davies' statement also. We have some knowledge of how accounts can be cooked, whether it be by the opening of suspense accounts or the covering up of payments, *or otherwise.* Mr. Davies was expert at that business, but his Grit friends in the Mackenzie Government were masters of the art. It is the simplest folly for Mr. Davies to attempt to persuade the people that his total pickings as Dominion Law Agent, and as a Solicitor in matters connected with the Dominion Government, were not more than $2,400 during the period between 1873 and 1878. We will not accuse him of deliberate lying, but he is quibbling and he knows it. Does he mean to tell us that the $2,400 he acknowledges having received, covered his fees as legal adviser to Mr. Swinyard in 1874, when he was deputed to take over the railway and open it for traffic? We have the very best authority—in fact none other than Mr. Davies himself—for the statement that the position of Dominion Law Agent in this Island is worth $4,000 a year. His definition of "Dominion Law Agent" and ours may differ, yet we repeat that, according to his own words, his pickings in that capacity approached the sum we have named.

Mr. Davies whines piteously that, because he is a Liberal and for the discharge of public duties has received sums of money, we therefore denounce him as a scoundrel. We did nothing of the kind. What we complained of was this—that Mr. Davies should pose before the people as a patriot—a philanthropist, whose whole time and talents are devoted to the service of his bleeding country, to the utter sacrifice of his private business. We quote his own words, "Politics is a jealous mistress and demands all a man's time and all his abilities," and our sole aim was to shew that watchful though the mistress might be, some of the servants managed to get good pickings. We do not object to Mr. Davies making all the money he can, and getting handsomely paid for his services whether to the public or to private individuals, but we decline to have the people deluded into the belief that his public career during the last twelve years has been pursued under other circumstances than those of large pecuniary benefit to himself. What, we ask, has been the practice of the Grit press and of Grit politicians both great and small? Has it not been to single out every Conservative who has an office or receives public money, and hold him up to scorn as "fattening at the Government crib?" We might quote columns from the Toronto *Globe* of February last in proof of what we say. To come nearer home, what do we find is the beautiful appellation applied by that high-toned journal, the *Patriot* to one of Canada's foremost statesmen—Sir Charles Tupper—but "high loafer of Canada at $40,000 a year?" But another quotation and we have done. Speaking of the Dominion Government some time ago the *Patriot* said:

"A subsidized press all over the country sounds the tom-tom of glory to drown all grumblings. Canada has still many worthy sons to boast of, and noble leaders to follow. While such men as Mackenzie and Blake and Laurier" (and Davies of course) "live there is still some hope for the future of our country. They are patriots—they seek no decorations save from Canada—their names are synonymous with honor—they stand before Canadians without a spot upon their reputation, ready to offer up any sacrifice for their country's good. Across their otherwise undecorated breasts rests the grand cordon of truth, honesty, manliness and statesmanship, making them brighter with their nobler abilities and stainless characters than the hero of the Pacific Scandal, were he decked with a royal crown."

Tell us, Mr. Davies, is not this contemptible, and yet you blubber when we say that pecuniarily you have not lost by your connection with politics.

Mr. Davies charges us with "hellish malice" in stating "that if the unfortunate man, Gillis, now standing charged with the awful crime of murder should be convicted and sentenced to death, his life will be forfeited to Mr. Davies' bloodthirsty cupidity." We said nothing of the kind. Mr. Davies knows it, and we defy him to produce any language of ours that can be so construed. Yet so as to fasten such an expression upon us, Mr. Davies is dishonest enough to place within inverted commas, words that we never used, and which we challenge him to find in any article we ever wrote. What we did say was that "it would not be too much to expect that Mr. Davies, if only for the fame it would bring, would undertake his (Gillis') case and, *though it should be impossible to prove his innocence,* at least make sure that no advantage is taken of him in his wretchedness." We then charged Mr. Davies with thirsting for gold and not for glory, and we said that "should Mr. Davies refuse his services and Gillis be convicted, we do not envy that man his feelings as he listens to the awful sentence which deprives a fellow-being of his life—a life that, but for his blood-thirsty cupidity, *might* never have been forfeited"—we did did not say *would* never have been forfeited. Where now is the "hellish malice?"

Mr. Davies accuses us of "trying to revive the style of newspaper writing which, at one time, made this Island a by-word and a reproach." Let Mr. Davies look at home and confine his moral lectures to his own organ, the *Patriot;* he will there find ample material to work upon. We made no attack upon his personal or professional character, unless charging him with thirsting for gold and not for glory can be construed into one, and this accusation we do not retract. Do we find the *Patriot* giving its political opponents credit for honesty, ability, or even common decency? Witness its every day attacks upon the public and private characters of such men as Sir John Macdonald, Sir Charles Tupper, Sir Hector Langevin, and coming home, upon Messrs. Sullivan, Ferguson, Campbell and Prowse. Our space does not permit us giving lengthy extracts, but in support of what we say we need only refer to an issue of the *Patriot,* not very long ago, when the Commissioner of Public Works was charged with appropriating the public money to the purchase of liquors for himself and his friends. This is, no doubt, high-class journalism in Mr. Davies' eyes!

We have proved from the records that, in his relation of the proceedings before the Halifax Commission, and the claim of Newfoundland, Mr. Davies either did not know what he was writing about, or deliberately attempted to deceive the people.

We have shown that, in endeavoring to excuse his own negligence before the Halifax Commission, he employs and thereby endorses the self-same arguments advanced by the Dominion Government for not paying us our share of the Fishery Award.

We have proved that where he declares he received only $2,400 for certain services, the Parliamentary return which he quotes in support of his declaration shews that he did not receive one twentieth of that sum—another instance of his ignorance or of his intention to deceive.

What reliance, we ask, can be placed upon the word of a man who makes statements so reckless and so inconsistent with the facts? Mr. Davies charges us with having lied regarding his actions—we leave it to the public to decide whether Mr. Davies has proved his indictment or we ours.

The Hon. Senator Haythorne.

The following letter addressed to the Editor of the *Patriot,* appeared in that journal of Monday last:—

Sir,—I rarely see the *Herald,* but I am informed that the Editor of that paper has been assailing some of the more remote portions of my political career. Perhaps it might be deemed disrespectful to those I represent, if I were to treat such attacks with silent indifference, as I was at first inclined to do, therefore I ask you to insert the following few sentences:—

1st. When my connection with the second electoral district of Queen's County was about to cease, by efflux of time, certain leading men of my constituents met in Charlottetown to select a candidate in my room, and they availed themselves of that opportunity to present me with an address, expressive of their satisfaction with my conduct as their representative. No doubt some of the gentlemen then present will recollect the circumstances, and probably I can produce the original document.

2nd. When I left the Legislative Council to assume a seat in the Senate, the gentlemen of the Council, with some of whom I had sat during eight sessions, also presented me with an address, which may be read by the curious on reference to the journals of that body. These were the men, my constituents of the 2nd district, and my colleagues in the Council, I had to satisfy, and as I succeeded in doing so, I think I may disregard the strictures of the *Herald.*

R. P. Haythorne.

It is to be regretted that Mr. Haythorne does not see the Herald oftener, otherwise he would not fall into the error of saying that the Editor of this paper had been assailing any portion of his political career—recent or remote. It was Mr. Louis H. Davies whose "strictures" we quoted—those contained in a letter doubtless familiar to Mr. Haythorne, wherein Mr. Davies spoke of him as either "a political knave or a political simpleton." Having succeeded so well in satisfying his constituents and colleagues, Mr. Haythorne may well disregard Mr. Davies' impertinence. In order that the worthy Senator's mind may be disabused of the idea that we have been assailing him, we shall take the liberty of forwarding to his address copies of the Herald of last week and also of this date.

The funeral of the late Rev. Geo. W. Hodgson took place last Thursday morning from St. Peter's Church, and was attended by large numbers of all classes and creeds in the community. Six of his brother clergy bore the pall, and besides his immediate relatives and friends, the members of the Charlottetown branch of the Dominion Alliance walked as mourners. As the procession wended its way along the Kensington road, below the grounds of the Caledonia Club, the sports were stopped and silence preserved, broken only by the mournful wail of the pipes upon which McPherson, for seventeen years the piper for McPherson of Cluney Castle, Scotland, played "McIntosh's Lament."

General Grant.

The death of General Grant, which has been so long looked for, occurred at Mount McGregor, whither he had recently been removed, on Thursday morning last. His sufferings for many months have been most intense, but were endured with the fortitude as only a hero of such valor as Grant could possess. A year ago, his name was unpleasantly brought before the public in connection with the failure of the banking house of Grant & Ward, and there is little doubt that the trouble and worry of that time contributed in no small measure to the breaking up of the General's health. That he himself had anything to do with the questionable transactions of the firm cannot for a moment be believed—on the contrary his name will long be held in deepest reverence by all classes of the great Republic. His funeral is fixed for the 8th August, when he is to be buried in Central Park, New York, and there is no doubt the occasion will be seized for a magnificant demonstration of the nation's love and gratitude for their noble son. The following sketch of his life we take from an exchange:

"Ulysses Simpson Grant was born at Point Pleasant, Ohio, on April 27th, 1822. He graduated from the military academy at West Point in 1843, received his commission as second lieutenant in 1845, and served in the Mexican campaign under Generals Taylor and Scott. In 1852 he was ordered to Oregon, and in August, 1853, he became captain. He resigned his commission in July, 1854, and after a residence of four or five years in St. Louis removed in 1859 to Galena, Ill., where he engaged in business with his father and brothers. From this privacy he was drawn out by the civil war, and having acted, first as aide-de-camp to the governor of Illinois, in 1861, and afterwards as colonel of the 21st Illinois volunteers, was made a brigadier-general in July, 1861. While in command in Cairo he secured Paducah, and with it Kentucky. In November, 1861, he fought the battle of Belmont, and in January, 1862, conducted the reconnaissance to the rear of Columbus. Fort Henry fell on February 6th, and ten days after Fort Donaldson surrendered to him unconditionally, being followed by the evacuation of Columbus and Bowling Green. He was made commander of the district of West Tennessee, and his forces advanced up that river to Pittsburg Landing, and fought, April 6th and 7th, the battle of Shiloh, at which the Confederate general A. S. Johnston lost his life. Grant was second in command to Gen. Halleck during the seige of Corinth, and when the latter was ordered to Washington, Grant was appointed to take command of the department of Tennessee. He captured Vicksburg, on the Mississippi, July 4th, 1863, and after the partial defeat of the Union troops, under Gen. Rosecrans, at Chickamanga, Tenn., in September, he was assigned to the command of the largely reinforced army, and in November defeated Gen. Bragg at Chattanooga, close by. In March, 1864, President Lincoln appointed him lieutenant-general, and conferred on him the powers of general-in-chief of the vast armies in the field.

Invested with this authority, and having reorganized the army of the east, and arranged with General W. T. Sherman, commander of the army of the west, to move against General J. E. Johnston at the same time that he moved against Gen. Lee, he prepared for a vigorous and protracted campaign. The two armies moved early in May, and after a series of hard fought battles, alternating with repeated flanking movements, which the skill and tact of Gen. Lee rendered abortive, Gen. Grant crossed the James River between the 12th and 15th of June, 1864, and proceeded to lay siege to Richmond and Petersburg from the north and northeast, while a very considerable army was cutting off their supplies and destroying their railroads at the south and south-west. At length, one railroad after another having been cut, and the two cities of Richmond and Petersburg reduced to great straits, while the army of Gen. Lee was rapidly diminishing, the last line was broken on April 2nd, 1865, and Lee and the remnant of his army fled westward pursued by Grant. On the 9th of April, 1865, Lee surrendered, with his entire command to Grant, at Appomattox court house, Virginia. The surrender of the other armies in North Carolina, Alabama, and Texas followed soon after and the war ended.

After the close of the war, the gratitude of the people to General Grant found expression in numerous and valuable gifts. On July 25th, 1866, Congress having created the grade of "general of the army," hitherto unknown in the army of the United States, he was commissioned general the same day. He was elected President in November, 1868, receiving 214 out of the 294 electoral votes of the 26 states, then recognized as belonging to the Union. He was inaugurated March 4th, 1869. His administration was upon the whole, satisfactory, and in 1872 he was nominated for a second term of four years by the Republican National Convention. But in the meantime dissatisfaction had grown up among some prominent members of the Republican party. These taking the name of "Liberal Republicans" nominated for President Mr. Horace Greeley, the editor of the New York *Tribune.* The Democratic National Convention also nominated Mr. Greeley, although he had always been a strong opponent of the Democratic party. At the presidential election, held in November, 1872, Grant received 268 electoral votes and Greeley 80, though his popular majority was only 762,991 out of a total vote cast of 6,431,149. Mr. Greeley died on Nov. 29, 1872, just after the result of the election was evident. During the second administration of President Grant grave difficulties arose, growing mainly out of financial questions and the disturbed condition of the south. The election held in the autumn of 1874 resulted generally in favor of the Democratic party, who secured a majority in the congressional house of representatives, which convened in December, 1875, while the hitherto large Republican majority in the senate was greatly diminished. Though a number of the leaders and a considerable portion of the Republican party desired Grant's re-nomination in 1876, public opinion, in advance of the convention, was so emphatic against violating the well settled limitation to two terms that his name was not formally presented.

Immediately upon the expiration of his term of office, March 4, 1877, Gen. Grant set out upon an extensive tour around the world, which lasted until the spring of 1880. Though no longer anything more than a private citizen of the republic, he was everywhere received with the utmost consideration and distinction due to the eminent civil and military positions he had held. At the Republican National Convention of 1880, his political adherents once more endeavored to secure his nomination, claiming that the custom established by Washington applied only to three consecutive terms and hence would not be violated if the nomination were again given to General Grant after a break in the continuity of his office. They did not succeed, however, and the nomination was given to Gen. Garfield. After his return from Europe General Grant resided chiefly in New York city.

The following persons have been appointed wharfingers by the Dominion Government, for the undermentioned piers: Pier at Murray Harbor South Benjamin Sossabaugh; Mink River Pier, Edward Henderson; St. Mary's Bay Pier, C. H. Llewellyn; Georgetown Pier, Capt. James Bourke; Lambert's Pier, Montague, John A. McDonald; Lewis' Point Pier, Cardigan, James E. McDonald; Pier at North Cardigan, Donald McIntyre; Annandale Pier, James Taylor; Pier at Victoria, Crapaud, Percy Palmer.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

The gentlemen who are arranging for the celebration of Bishop McIntyre's Silver Jubilee are making extensive preparations for the event, which takes place on the 12th prox.

We regret to say that the Potato Bug has made its appearance in several places near the city, and also in some parts of the country. Our farmers must be on the alert, and nip the pestilence in the bud.

Mr. Peter McNally, of Fort Augustus, lost fourteen sheep last week, worried to death by dogs. Why do not the people enforce the Dog Law—it is in their own interest and for their own protection. We fear it is too much like the Scott Act.

The Gathering of the Clans.

The Gathering of the Clans on Thursday last was a grand success. The weather was all that could be desired, and immense crowds of people from all parts of the Island, as well as a large representation from Nova Scotia, thronged the grounds. The proceedings were highly enjoyable, and the strictest order was preserved through the entire day. The games were enthusiastically engaged in and, after the close, the following were declared the successful competitors —

HEAVY STONE.

1st, J. A. McDougall, Blue Mountain, N. S., 34 ft. 11 in.
2nd, D. A. Stewart, Brudenell, 32 ft. 7.
3rd, D. Cameron, Peters' Road, 32 ft. 6.

LIGHT STONE.

1st. J. A. McDougall, Blue Mountain, N. S., 42 ft. 11 in.
2nd, D. A. Stewart, Brudenell, 41 ft. 9.
3rd, R. F. Stewart, Brudenell, 40 ft. 8.

RUNNING HIGH LEAP.

1st, R. F. Stewart, Brudenell, 4 ft. 11 in.
2nd, Neil McLeod, Springton, 4 ft. 10 in.

HOP, STEP AND JUMP.

1st, R. F. Stewart, Brudenell, 40 ft.
2nd, D. J. McDonald, Charlottetown, 39 ft. 2 in.

HEAVY HAMMER.

1st, J. A. McDougall, Blue Mountain, 94 feet.
2nd, D. A. Stewart, Brudenell, 87 ft. 6.
3rd, R. F. Stewart, Brudenell, 83 ft. 9.

LIGHT HAMMER.

1st, D. A. Stewart, Brudenell, 108 ft.
2nd, J. A. McDougall, Blue Mountain, 107 ft. 8 in.
3rd, R. F. Stewart, Brudenell, 95 ft. 5.

VAULTING.

1st, N. J. McLeod, Springton, 9ft. 3 in.
2nd, Jas. McEachern, Ch'town, 9 ft.

TOSSING CABER.

1st, P. McFayden, West River, 40 ft. 11 in.
2nd, D. K. McKenzie and John Walker, North River, equal, 40 ft.

SACK RACE.

1st and 2nd, Malcolm Stewart, Springton; D K. McKenzie, do, equal; 3rd, J. McEachern, Charlottetown.

LONG JUMP.

1st, R. F. Stewart, Brudenell, 19 ft. 3 in; 2nd, D. Cameron, St. Peter's Road, 18 ft. 7 in.

FLAT RACE.

1st, D. J. McDonald, Charlottetown; 2nd, R. F. Stewart, Brudenell; 3rd, D. Cummings, Ross Valley.

DANCING "GILLIES CALLUM."

1st, E. B. McLeod, Charlottetown; 2nd, C. A. McDonald, West River; 3rd, D. Lamont, Springton.

PIPE MUSIC.

1st, Peter Ferguson, Charlottetown; 2nd. C. Stewart, Pictou; 3rd, J. A. McMillan, Wood Islands.

BOYS' RACE.

1st, C. Clarke, Charlottetown; 2nd, M. Nicholson, Springton; 3rd, A. Nicholson, do.

HURDLE RACE.

1st, D. J. McDonald, Charlottetown; 2nd, R. F. Stewart, Brudenell; 3rd, J. McEachern, Charlottetown.

HIGHLAND COSTUME—MEN.

1st, James McLeod, Charlottetown; 2nd, C. Stewart, Pictou.

HIGHLAND COSTUME—BOYS.

1st, E. B. McLeod, Charlottetown; 2nd, Harry McLeod, do.

Mr. James McLeod, of Charlottetown, was on the ground with seven sons, all in full Highland Costume.

St. Vincent de Paul Society.

The Charlottetown Conference of the St Vincent de Paul Society, which, since its establishment by the late lamented Father McGillivray, has been quietly and unostentatiously doing so much good in our midst, held its semi-annual public meeting last Sunday evening in St. Patrick's Hall. The attendance was not so large as we anticipated. Professor Caven, the President of the Conference, occupied the chair. The Rev. Father Burke was on the platform. The meeting was opened, as usual, with prayer and spiritual reading, after which the Secretary read the minutes of the last public meeting. The Treasurer, His Honor the Lieut. Governor, and the Secretary, Mr. Henry FitzGerald, then presented their semi-annual statements, from which we glean the following:—

DISBURSEMENTS FOR HALF YEAR.

Provisions, etc., to the value of	$121.00
Cash, amounting to	113.50
Funeral Expenses	13.50
Total	$248.12

RECEIPTS.

Balance on hand per last report	$ 1.69
Collections at meetings	72.75
Collections in the Cathedral on St. Patrick's Day	72.80
From Cathedral Poor Boxes	38.72
From St. Vincent's Nursery	16.75
Donations	27.00
	$229.70
Balance on hand	$1.67

In addition to the regular disbursements the Conference distributed about thirty-eight tons coal, donated by Owen Connolly, Esq.

At the close, the Rev. Father Burke made a few appropriate remarks laudatory of the St. Vincent de Paul Society, which was, he said, the leading lay society of the church, and he encouraged the members to go on with their good work, in which he would at all times be most happy to assist them.

The Benevolent Irish Society Picnic.

The Benevolent Irish Society's Picnic takes place to-morrow week, 6th August, on suitable grounds adjoining McEwen's Wharf, West River. The committee in charge are sparing no pains to make this the most enjoyable picnic ever held under their auspices. Several games, such as running, wheelbarrow and sack races, high leaping, etc., will be provided, and a well-stocked saloon will dispense refreshments at moderate prices. The Society will meet at their Hall at 8 o'clock, sharp, on the morning of Picnic, and will march to the wharf in regalia, preceded by Worth's Cornet Band. The steamer Southport will make two trips each way, leaving Ferry Wharf at 8.30 a. m., and at 1.30 p. m., returning at 4.30 and 7 p. m. Further particulars can be obtained on reference to advertisement and handbills.

The Citizens' Meeting in the Market Hall on Friday evening last was largely attended. The proposal to build a new City Hall, etc., was voted down almost unanimously.

Successful Islanders.

To the Editor of the Herald:

From time to time I notice in your columns accounts of successful Islanders abroad—in the United States, North-West, etc.—but I seldom see anything about those who have taken up their residences in the Provinces of Nova Scotia or New Brunswick. It has been my lot, during the past few months to travel through Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and I cannot call to mind a city, town or village of any importance that does not contain an Islander—a successful Islander. In the first place we take the city of Halifax. Among the clergy we find Archbishop O'Brien, Rev. W. H. Simpson, of the Anglican Church, Rev. Allan Simpson, of the Presbyterian Church, and Rev. Ralph Brecken, of the Methodist Church. All successful men, and among the first lights of the clerical element of the city. Here are all denominations represented by Island clergymen in the one city. Then we find Professor Schurman, of Dalhousie College, perhaps the most highly educated man in the Provinces to-day—a thorough master of his work and a credit not only to little P. E. Island, but to the whole Dominion. In the Law Courts we find Judge Weatherbe, another Islander, who has achieved name and fame in this Province. In every profession, trade or calling in the city we find Islanders. As business men they are shrewd, as tradesmen they excel. In the town of Truro we find W. B. Alley, the editor and proprietor of the Colchester *Sun,* one of the first weekly papers in Nova Scotia. Mr. Alley served his apprenticeship in the *Islander* office. Here I met our friend James Dover, of the firm of Robertson & Dover. His trade is extensive and we hope, remunerative. Moncton is full of Islanders; Paul Lea, Benj. Toombs and others are doing good business. James Stanley, at one time a printer in the Herald office, is on the daily *Times,* he has held a position on that paper for over ten years. Away up in Chatham, on the Miramichi, I met Robert Minard, formerly in the employ of Alex McKenzie, confectioner, Charlottetown; he is doing a large confectionery and baking business there, and is well thought of by the people. In St. John we find scores of "the boys" nearly all doing well. Mal. McLeod, formerly with W. D. Stewart, has a good position in the Post Office. W. D. Tanton, who learned his trade in the Herald office, and recently connected with the *Union News,* is now publisher of the Annapolis *Spectator.* Angus McLeod, a native