OTTAWA LETTER.

La Patrie Denounces the Opposition Leaders as Fanatics,

Because They Are Exposing Tarte's Extravagance and Anti-British Conduct in Paris and Elsewhere.

Pacaud, Mercier Laurier and the Baie des Chaleur Railway Moneys—The Dredging of Owen Sound Quite a Family Affair.

OTTAWA, June 13.—The first thing yesterday was the emergency rations once more. Dr. Borden brought down certain papers in connection with the transaction and promised some more. He is having some more analyses made of the foods sent to Africa, and also of those tested at Kingston. When these are completed he will bring down the reports. It was suggested that the minister might profitably have obtained the analysis before he bought the food. Mr. Monk asks for samples of the food sent to Africa in the original packages. Some disturbance was produced by a request of his for a copy of the order to admit the emergency rations from the United States free of duty. This was the first information that the house had that the goods were a United States product. The minister had left the impression that the rations were purchased from Dr. Devlin, and were his own product. Dr. Borden said he had not the order and the premier explained that it would be in the customs department. The minister of customs was present and was invited to tell what he knew about it. He said he knew nothing, but would enquire and report to the house, but he could not be induced to promise the paper.

As the matter stands the circumstances so far revealed appear to be these: Mr. Hatch, now of Montreal, is the inventor of these Protos. He made his original tests and experiments in Buda-Pesth, and when he had satisfied himself that he had a good thing he went to London to carry on further experiments. The facilities in England would not exactly suit the laboratory operations which he had in view, and he was advised to continue his operations in Paris. At the laboratory there he was informed that the equipment would not be at his service unless he intended to manufacture the goods in France, and for use in that country. He was then advised that McGill University had the best laboratory in the world for his purpose. So he came to Montreal and developed his process. In due time he succeeded in perfecting the preparation he desired to make of a highly condensed and concentrated food for emergency purposes in the army. Then he employed Dr. Devlin to go to the government and interest the ministers in the invention. As agent for Mr. Hatch, Dr. Devlin came to Ottawa, arranged for the tests on the soldiers at Kingston and carried through that experiment. The military branch of the department of the militia was much impressed with the results of the experiment, and it was in consequence of this test, so Dr. Borden says, that the goods were finally purchased from Dr. Devlin.

But Mr. Hatch and his invention were no longer at Dr. Devlin's disposal. The doctor had disappeared from Mr. Hatch's service, and it was as agent for another form and for another invention that he made his contract with the government. Mr. Hatch continues his manufactory in Montreal. The Vitaline which the government bought from Dr. Devlin, and which the minister says, or did say at first, is the identical goods tested at Kingston is not made in Montreal, is not made by Mr. Hatch, has not the same name as his goods, and is imported from the United States, and admitted apparently free of duty. The price is the same as would have been paid to Mr. Hatch for the genuine goods, the same as would have been paid to the inventor who first brought the preparation to the attention of the government and, at whose expense the experiment at Kingston was made. If the substituted goods were imported from the United States free of duty that concession, amounting to over $1,000, must have been a present to Dr. Devlin, who apparently has a pull. It was only when Mr. Monk disclosed the facts that any hint was given that this was a Yankee product.

The house passed on to consider the case of another man who has a pull. Mr. Theodore Burrows is a brother-in-law of Mr. Sifton, the minister of the interior. He is a member of the Manitoba legislature and has figured extensively as a party heeler in the west. Mr. Burrows has been getting some astonishing concessions in the way of timber limits. The story is this: In old times the timber limits in the west were open to any applicant who would ask for 50 square miles, and would agree to put up a mill, saw a certain quantity of lumber each year, and pay a certain rate per thousand. Under this provision many limits were applied for, but not much work was done. In 1885, eleven years before the retirement of the late government, the western country began to be settled and the practice was adopted of putting the timber limits up for competition. This wholesome rule prevailed until Mr. Sifton became minister. Mr. Sifton, in 1898, altered the regulations so as to provide that a saw mill owner might be permitted to cut over a definitely described tract of 50 square miles, on payment of 50 cents per thousand for sawn lumber, and another 50 cents in lieu of ground rent. This rule was defended on the ground that mill owners should not be shut out from a supply of lumber by speculators, who might overbid them, and hold the timber for future advances. But it appears that the concessions were guarded carefully from all persons except one or two.

Mr. Davin, who brought the matter up, read a good deal of correspondence showing how one man after another applied under this amended regulation for the right to cut. The department refused in one case, because, though the man had a mill, it was not in the neighborhood; in another because it had not been shown that the applicant was without a supply for his mill from other lands. The correspondence generally showed that the applicant was compelled to prove that he had a mill on the premises, or near them, that he intended to saw the lumber at this place, and that he had no other source of supply.

This rule allowing the right to cut timber without competition in special cases was rescinded. The department found that it was not working well. But four days after it was repealed, a permit under it was given to Theodore Burrows, M. P. P., Mr. Sifton's brother-in-law. Mr. Burrows is a mill owner, but his mill was 40 miles away, and for the purpose of this grant it might as well have been in Sweden, for he does not appear to have sawn there any of the timber cut on the limit. The fact was that Mr. Burrows wanted the timber for sale to Mackenzie and Mann, who were building the Dauphin railway in that neighborhood, and wanted ties, telegraph posts and other sticks. Now Mackenzie and Mann had Mr. Burrows for their agent in that place. Mackenzie and Mann had received a most astonishing subsidy from the provincial government, of which Mr. Sifton was then a member. Mr. Sifton, Mackenzie and Mann, and Mr. Burrows were all one brother. Mr. Burrows took off this limit $23,000 worth of railway ties alone, besides much other timber. He paid a very trifling stumpage and made a pile of money out of it.

Now the charge is that under the law Mr. Burrows should not have had that right to cut without competition. Even under the regulations which had been rescinded, he could only have taken logs to be sawn in his mill, which ought to have been in the vicinity, and to have been without other sources of supply. In any case, he ought to have paid a much larger royalty than was collected. It was shown that other men in Mr. Burrows' position were refused the concession which he obtained, and this seems to establish beyond doubt the charge of favoritism against Mr. Sifton, the object of favor being his brother-in-law.

Now what does the minister say in reply to Mr. Davin's charges? If Mr. Sutherland were an absolute fool, and he is very far from that, he could not have made a more pointless reply. He did not deny that Mr. Burrows received this concession, he did not deny that other people with saw mills had been refused it. He only could say over and over again that the public interest had not suffered, that no harm had been done to the general public, and that it was necessary for the Dauphin railway to be provided with ties. Of course all this has nothing to do with the charges. If the limits had been left to competition, as the law required, and as decency required, seeing that Mr. Burrows was a competitor, Mackenzie and Mann would still have got their ties, the country would have got a larger revenue and everybody would have had fair play.

The only other defence the acting minister put up was the charge that the late government had given out timber limits without competition. This, of course, is true, but it was done in the early days when there was no law requiring competition, and when the sale was offered freely at the same terms to everybody. Every man had an even chance then, as he would have under competition. But this system required a payment for all lumber cut and required that the applicant should build a mill. The requirements were even then apparently sufficient to meet the case, for it was not a very easy thing fifteen years ago to put up a mill in the Northwest Territories. As a matter of fact, not one in twenty of the applicants received a stick of timber. They simply forfeited what they paid, and their claims lapsed.

But what has this to do with the charge of favoritism shown by the government fourteen years after the adoption of the competitive system? Mr. Davis, who thinks it enough for him to say that the tories, did the same, read a long list of members of parliament who in the old times applied for timber limits and was loudly cheered on by the government side when Mr. Davin's name was found among them. Most of these applications were made by members on behalf of some constituent who did not know in what form to make his application, while Mr. Davin's was put in a good many years before he was first a candidate for parliament. There was a lively altercation when Dr. Macdonald charged Dr. Sproule with having obtained a timber limit for himself. Dr. Sproule had never applied for one for himself, but had simply forwarded applications for others. Dr. Macdonald refused to "take it back" after the other doctor's denial, and a lively episde occurred which continued for half an hour. The speaker had ruled that Macdonald's charge should be withdrawn and the latter refused to obey. Thereupon the speaker seemed disposed to weaken, as he too often does in a crisis, but the opposition members refused to allow Mr. Macdonald to be heard until he had withdrawn. There was a continuous uproar for nearly half a hour, which was witnessed by a gallery full of Minnesota newspaper men and women, who were here on a press excursion. This good speaker of ours has excellent intentions, but lacks authority and has a habit of pleading and arguing with the house after he has made a ruling, when he ought to issue a peremptory order. In the end, however, Dr. Macdonald had to withdraw. Otherwise the clamor would have been going on till daylight.

Much also was made on the government side out of the Rykert case, in which it was charged that the late Charles Rykert, as a member of the house, had made use of his influence in securing timber limits. This is rather a poor defence in view of the fact that Dr. Rykert was condemned by the chamber on the motion of Sir John Thompson, then leader of the house, and was virtually expelled from public life. It seems that an offence which, when the conservatives were in power, was sufficient to expel a member is good enough now to be a precedent for a liberal minister or member. At all events the house by a party majority has justified the Burrows deal.

S. D. S.

OTTAWA, June 14.—At the time of writing Mr. Monk has not got any "forrader" with his investigation about the emergency rations. Dr. Borden a week ago was in a great hurry to have the charges made. Three days ago the solicitor general was defying Mr. Monk to make a specific charge. Yesterday Mr. Monk was on hand with his statement, the ministers were on hand also with dilatory proceedings. After all their defiance and after Mr. Monk's statement in the house, and Mr. Foster's private intimations to the premier that the charges were to be brought in yesterday, Sir Wilfrid suddenly took the ground that this was not a matter of privilege and that he must have proper notice. It is hard to conceive of anything that comes more completely and definitely within the class of privileged questions than this. If it is a question of privilege no notice is required, but it is usual for a member about to proceed in this way to give private notice to the leader of the government. This is a courtesy, and it was shown to the premier by Mr. Monk. However, the delay is obtained, but the matter will probably be settled one way or the other before this letter is printed.

Sir Charles Hibbert finds himself headed off in his efforts to get the papers concerning Mr. Tarte's friend, Mr. Charleson, who has been building telegraph lines and roads and other public conveniences in the Yukon. Mr. Charleson, like his patron, proceeds with a lofy disregard for ordinary rules and usages. The restrictions that bind officers and contractors to give value for their money do not affect him. He buys wire and other equipment from his son, who keeps shop in Ottawa, and dispenses with tenders or other form of competition. The prices are said to be quite lofty and the quantities extravagant. Sir Charles Hibbert understands that Mr. Charleson has been buying a prodigious quantity of telegraph poles which are piled up rotting along the river while the wires are strung along on live trees. He also hears that Mr. Charleson has been employing men at salaries different from those authorized and has purchased supplies through a son of his on the Pacific coast, who bags a five per cent. rake-off from the transaction. Sir Charles Hibbert is making a brave struggle to obtain the reports and accounts. Sir Wilfrid is standing upon formality, but was reminded yesterday that he would get no supply for the Yukon until he furnished the information required.

Probably we shall learn from the Tarte organs that this is in some way an attack on the French-Canadians. All criticism and all the proceedings of the opposition are so described in La Patrie. According to Mr. Tarte's journal, which Mr. Greenshields bought for him, the demonstration of the house against Mr. Bourassa's recent disloyal speech was the work of tory fanatics all because Mr. Bourassa is a Frenchman. It is also charged that the cheers for the Queen and the singing of the national anthem was an anti-French demonstration. Mr. Bergeron is censured by the government organ because, being a Frenchman, he joins in these proceedings against Mr. Bourassa.

But that is not all. Dr. Montague the other day objected to the extravagant expenditure for the Paris exhibition. La Patrie rises to the occasion and says: "It is hatred of France which inspires this fanatical colleague of Sir Charles Tupper." And again: "In 1889 we committed the error of staying home, and the good tory Montague wants us to repeat the same stupidity in 1900. All this was because the exposition takes place in France." Most people in Canada will find it hard to discover any loss suffered by Canada through its failure to spend half a million dollars at Paris in 1889.

The Ottawa correspondent of La Patrie attacks the tory fanatics in this way: "It is evident that the fanatic and intolerant of the tory party cast an evil eye at the participation of Canada at the Exposition in Paris. Their sentiment of hostility is well known for all that touches France directly or indirectly, and was manifested in an unmistakeable manner when the question came up of the additional vote of $30,000 asked for by Mr. Fisher."

La Patrie goes on to say that Mr. Foster criticized the vote last year and wanted to know what good the appropriation would do. Then it proceeds: "Messrs. Montague, Wallace and Sproule follow Foster's example and seriously affirmed that Canada would get no advantage from the Exposition." But the main purpose of La Patrie is to make it hard for a conservative to be elected in Quebec, and it goes on to say: "It is not surprising that Mr. Bergeron should follow his faithful allies in Ontario and make complaint in company with the Wallaces, the Sproules and the Montagues, who belong to the faction which is the most intolerant, the most detestable and the most fanatical in the tory party."

This is not the worst that the tories have been doing. Mr. Foster and some other members have been asking why Mr. Tarte should be running all around Europe, lecturing, holding receptions and making a show of himself, when he is too ill to be in Ottawa explaining his expenditures. It was pointed out that Mr. Tarte's friends had announced that he was now going to Belgium to deliver a series of lectures on Canada, and the premier was asked whether Mr. Tarte had not other business to perform. Now La Patrie is furious about this, and praises the Belgian people as good colonists, hopes that Mr. Tarte may bring a lot of them here, and then goes on to hold up the tory fanatics to the hatred of its own readers. For instance, it says: "But the Belgian colonists talk French. It is not astonishing then to hear Montague, Sproule, Wallace, et al bitterly reproaching Mr. Tarte because he wants to bring them to our shores. According to the Wallaces, the Montagues, and the Sproules, the government should look for no other immigrants than English, Scotch and Irish."

But the count of crimes goes on. We read that "Dr. Sproule denounced Mr. Tarte as a traitor and accused him for his conduct on the occasion of President Loubet's visit to the Canadian section."

Concerning this La Patrie says: "Mr. Tarte insisted that the president of the French republic should make a special visit to the Canadian section. The secretary of the British section had decided not to ask the president to make more than one visit. If this proposal had been carried out, Canada would have been denied the honor of receiving officially as a nation the chief of the French people. The minister of public works energetically vindicated the rights of Canada. Our land, it is true, is part of the Empire, but it is a free land, governing itself and enjoying independent institutions. As such it had a right to be considered a nation distinct from the British Empire, and there will not be one voice among enlightened Canadian people who have national pride, except to congratulate Mr. Tarte for having caused the British commission and the French government to understand our position."

There are still other offences. La Patrie assails Mr. Monk, a conservative French-Canadian member who is now trying to find out the truth about the emergency rations. Mr. Monk remarked the other day that as Canada was embarking in a larger military career it became necessary to watch more closely the expenditure of the militia department. This remark has called down on him the scorn of La Patrie, which charges that he is coming out in support of the imperialists and declares that Mr. Monk really believes that the sending of troops to Africa was not an accidental or occasional occurrence but the commencement of a new military era. In the same paragraph it falls foul of Mr. Henderson, whose offence is that he asked for an increase of drill pay from a dollar to $1.50 per day. It will be seen that La Patrie is piling up a pretty heavy list of offences against the tory fanatics and those unfortunate French conservatives who support the opposition.

Speaking of the exposition, there appears to be a conflict of opinion between Mr. Fisher and the secretary of state as to the cost of it. The minister of agriculture expressed the hope that the whole cost would not exceed $300,000. Mr. Scott scouted the idea that it would cost as much as Sir Mackenzie Bowell suggested, and placed the whole expenditure under a quarter of a million. But already the bills have run up to $175,000, and it seems to be quite certain that Mr. Fisher's estimate will be far short of the mark.

The senate has not passed the Gaspe Short Line bill. This measure was discussed on several occasions in the house, and provides for the construction of a railway partly parallel to the Baie des Chaleur, where there is not business for one road. It contains provisions for purchasing the Baie des Chaleur road, and is opposed by the creditors of that line. In the discussion yesterday Senator Dandurand took occasion to attack Mr. C. N. Armstrong of the Baie des Chaleur road, who has not been able to pay his creditors and who according to the senator would hardly dare to show his face in sme districts. Senator Landry pointed out that Mr. Armstrong would have been in a better position if he had not been obliged to pay Mr. Pacaud and the other hangers on of the late Count Mercier and Sir Wilfrid Laurier $100,000 at a time.

It will be remembered that the Quebec government appropriated $175,000 for the payment of claims on the Baie des Chaleur line. Mr. Armstrong was to have received the money, but only got it on condition that he should be content with $75,000, while the rest went to the boodlers. It was charged that this sum was stolen from the treasury, and a subsequent Quebec government undertook to recover it. But the court seems to have decided that the money was properly payable to Mr. Armstrong. Mr. Pacaud has since claimed that he was vindicated by this decision and that Mr. Armstrong had a perfect right to do what he liked with his own. Mr. Armstrong testified that he had to pay the $100,000 in order to get the $75,000 out of the $175,000 that was due him, and he does not look like a man who gives away $100,000 carelessly. Mr. Pacaud has declared that he spent the whole of the money in the campaign of 1891, at which time Sir Wilfrid Laurier made great headway in his own province. However that may be, it does not seem fair for the party which stole $100,000 from the Baie des Chaleur creditors to be hounding Mr. Armstrong because he is not now able to pay the claims.

An interesting episode occurred in connection with the controversy between Dr. Macdonald and Dr. Sproule. The doctor from Huron made a mistake when he charged that Dr. Sproule had received or applied for timber limits for himself fifteen years ago, though it might have been right for a member of parliament to have done so, since there was no favor in the matter. It is quite different with the dredging of Owen Sound. This dredging has not been given out to tender, but was let at private contract, and the dredge which is doing the work has been paid $80 a day for the last three years. This is a pretty good price for the kind of dredge, and it is said that under competition $50 a day would pay for the work. It appears also that when this work was taken a new class of individuals suddenly developed into contractors. The dredging is done by four partners. One of them is A. G. McKay, a lawyer and crown attorney under the Ontario government. He began his experience as a dredger then here, and this government contract was available. Another of the quartette is Dr. E. A. H. Horsey, a physician, who began his operations as a contractor at the same time. The other dredgers are ladies. One is Mrs. Lelia A. Horsey and the other is Miss Maggie Macdonald. Perhaps it has nothing to do with the case, but it appears that Miss Maggie Macdonald is a daughter of Dr. Macdonald, M. P. for Huron, and is a young lady who did not set up business for herself until this occasion. Mrs. Horsey is another daughter of Dr. Macdonald's, and Dr. Horsey is her husband. It will be seen that this is quite a family affair. Perhaps it is not necessary to observe that Dr. Macdonald supports Mr. Tarte, who gives the Coteau dredging, without tender, at excessive prices, to his son's father-in-law, a retired merchant tailor, and the dredging at Berthier, at private rates and very high cnes, to his own son-in-law, a carpet dealer.

S. D. S.

OTTAWA, June 15.—Yesterday's discussion of the election frauds enquiry was rather technical in some respects, and was largely an amplification of previous debates. The main points of Mr. Borden's request for the enlargement of the commission are these:

In the first place he wants the enquiry sufficiently general to expose and convict not only the personal participants in the offences but those who engaged the agents and paid them or were in any way implicated in the transaction. The ministers claim that this is provided for in the commission. But the point is doubtful, and it is urged that the provincial commission in Ontario failed on the ground that it could not pursue the silent partner in the game.

The next difficulty which Mr. Borden brings forward is the matter of witnesses. The opposition asks that the commission shall be allowed to give an absolute pardon to certain witnesses, while the government only allows the usual immunities from the use of their own evidence against them. Mr. Blair, who was chief spokesman for the government yesterday, contended that it was not right to let a man off in this way, and cited Sir John Thompson's act in favor of the narrower immunity. Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper pointed out that Mr. Blake in providing for cases like this thought it necessary to hold out the larger inducements, and in this Mr. Blake was following the imperial law. Sir John Thompson was framing an ordinary statute for ordinary enquiries and had not in view such an investigation as this, in which the only hope of obtaining the facts is from the testimony and confession of some of the guilty parties.

Thirdly, Mr. Borden, Sir Charles Hibbert and Mr. Powell ask that the government should give the commission authority to procure not only counsel to conduct the case but also legal assistance to enquire into circumstances and ascertain facts upon which charges may be made. They also asked the privilege for any counsel to bring a matter or charge before the commission and produce evidence in support of it. They point out that Premier Ross's commission shut out such independent counsel and thus limited the enquiry. On this point Mr. Blair argues that commissioners have ample authority. He also maintains that the promise to vote the money necessary is sufficient, and that it is not necessary to place the money in the control of the commissioners. There is a decided difference of opinion on this point.

Now, the next point is one to which greater importance is attached. Mr. Borden urges strongly, as Sir Charles Tupper did before him, that in this enquiry electors shall be allowed to testify how they voted. He points out that this evidence might not be necessary in a court which seeks to determine what man is elected, and that in general the secrecy of the ballot should be maintained. But in a case of this kind, which is entirely out of the common way, and which purports to be an effort to get at the very bottom of the thing, the ordinary rules do not apply. It is a disputed question in any case whether under existing law such evidence may be taken, and Mr. Borden asks that in this matter the doubt be removed and absolute authority be given to take this testimony. Mr. Blair and Dr. Russell contend that no new rules should be made for this enquiry, but that the ordinary course be followed. They seem to be very anxious that the right of a man to vote secretly should not be taken away from him. This matter was discussed in a previous letter, where it was pointed out that the evidence brought forward to prove that the votes were stolen was offered voluntarily by the men who complained of the robbery, and the government is not acting in the interests of the men whose votes are stolen, but against their interests and in the interests of the robbers when it refuses them the privilege of testifying to their losses.

The next point of dispute is the use of the evidence taken by the committee. Mr. Blair and Dr. Russell are both strong in the contention that this evidence shall not be used. Mr. Blair gives the case away, when he says that the evidence taken by the committee would not be admissible in a court of law. He said the other day that the majority of the committee allowed men to testify how they voted and admitted other evidence not because they thought it was properly admissible, but because they were afraid of public opinion. Mr. Blair's explanation sheds a flood of light on the whole situation. The committee was finding out too much, and therefore it had to be stopped. It was stopped in the middle, after it had cost $10,000 and had examined a hundred witnesses, and after it had established the stealing of one seat. This would never do, and therefore the proceedings were stopped. Again public opinion alarmed the ministers and they provided a substitute. But they take care that the evidence which exposed the crime before the committee shall not be used in the new enquiry, and refuse to give the commission scope to take the same class of evidence for itself. Here certainly is a narrowing down of the enquiry and an impairment of its capacity to get at the facts. Sir Wilfrid Laurier may not thank his minister of railways for exposing the trick. But it is now clear that the whole scheme is an attempt to escape exposure and also escape public opinion.

Now comes an equally serious objection. The government absolutely refuses to have the commissioners instructed to begin with the Brockville and Huron cases. These cases were promised prompt investigation a year ago by Sir Wilfrid Laurier. They have been before the committee and are partly tried. The premier, when he choked off the committee, offered this commission as a substitute. He will not now take steps to have precedence given to these cases. Mr. Blair and Dr. Russell both intimate that the commission may begin with the elections of 1896 and take up these half proved cases later. Sir Wilfrid claims that the Brockville and Huron cases may not be the first ones where votes were stolen. Mr. Borden, in reply, observes that they are the first ones in which charges were made in this house, the first in which the premier promised an immediate investigation, the first that were referred to a committee, the first in which investigation was begun, the first and only invesigation that ever was taken from a privileges commitee after it had been begun. If this does not entitle the Huron affair to precedence it is hard to say what would. The government is, however, obdurate, and refuses to do anything to ensure the enquiry into these particular scandals within a reasonable time. Sir Charles Hibbert and Mr. Powell compared with great effect the strong promise which Sir Wilfrid gave of a thorough, searching and far-reaching investigation with this half-hearted and weak fulfilment.

We have the promise of one more commission of enquiry. This time it is to be the Chinese and Japanese question. Four years ago, when the campaign was going on, Mr. McLagan of Vancouver telegraphed to his leader, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and asked what his attitude was on Chinese immigration. Sir Wilfrid replied promptly that the question was entirely a western one and that he would carry out absolutely the wishes of the British Columbia people. Ever since then the British Columbia people, who want to keep the Chinese and Japanese out, have been trying to get Sir Wilfrid to keep his pledge. The absurdity of such an attempt has not yet struck them all, for they still make representations. Perhaps they do so from a wild western sense of humor. In the east the people have entirely given up any thought of expecting Sir Wilfrid to do anything that he said he would do. The premier cannot give the British Columbia people the exclusion of Chinese, which they want, but he offers them a commission. This is much after the style of the fond mother who refused to take her boy to the circus, but offered to take him to the cemetery to see his grandmother's grave.

S. D. S.

Get your Job Printing at Daily Sun Job Rooms.

SURPRISE MAKES EVERYTHING WHITE.

BILL BOARD

That Snowy Whiteness

can come to your linens and cottons only by the use of SURPRISE Soap which has peculiar and remarkable qualities for washing clothes.

SURPRISE is a pure hard Soap.

ST. CROIX SOAP MFG. CO.
St. Stephen, N.B.

The Gold Medal Prize Treatise.

Only 25 Cents.

The Science of Life, or Self-Preservation. 365 pages, with engravings. 25 cents, in paper covers; cloth, full gilt, $1.00; by mail, sealed. A book for every man, young, middle-aged, or old. A million copies sold. Address the Peabody Medical Institute, No. 4 Bulfinch St., Boston, Mass., the oldest and best Institute in America. Prospectus Vade Mecum free. Six cents for postage. Write to-day for these books. They are the keys to health.