

The Use Of

Such an aperient is found in Ayer's Pills, which, while through in action, strengthen as well as stimulate the bowels and increase the appetite.

Ayer's Pills,

which, while through in action, strengthen as well as stimulate the bowels and increase the appetite.

Effective

than any other pill ever took. - Mrs. R. C. Grant, Burlington, Vt.

Ayer's Pills,

Dr. J. C. Ayer & Co., Lowell, Mass. Sold by all Dealers in Medicine.

THE EVENING GAZETTE

is published every evening (Sunday excepted) at No. 21 Catherine street, by JOHN A. HAYES.

Subscription prices: For One Year, \$1.00; For Six Months, \$0.60; For Three Months, \$0.40.

Advertisements: For one week, 10 cents; for one month, 30 cents; for three months, 80 cents.

General advertising: \$1.00 per inch for first insertion, and 50 cents per inch for continuations.

ST. JOHN, N. B., THURSDAY, FEB. 19, 1891.

For the Latest Telegraphic News look on the First Page.



Liberal-Conservative NOMINATIONS.

FOR THE CITY, HON. E. McLEOD, Q. C.

FOR THE CITY AND COUNTY, HON. C. N. SKINNER, Q. C. J. DOUGLAS HAZEN, Esq.

A WORD TO HONEST AND LOYAL LIBERALS.

There are plenty of honest and loyal Liberals in St. John who are really pained as to their duty at the coming election.

But there is another reason equally as good as those already mentioned, why such men should not support the present Liberal candidates.

It has been conclusively proved that men high in the councils of the Liberal party have been in communication with statesmen at Washington with a view to modifying the policy and control the destinies of the Dominion in accordance with the interests of the people of the United States.

It has been shown that Mr. Farrer, the editor of the Toronto Globe, the leading Liberal organ of Canada, has been guilty of the scandalous and treasonable act of giving advice to statesmen at Washington as to how they could best secure Canada into annexation.

There is too much reason to fear that Messrs Cartwright and Laurier were privy to this advice, and considering their recent intimate relations with Mr. Wiman we doubt that this whole agitation for unrestricted reciprocity is but a part of an infamous plot on their part to drive Canada into annexation.

As to the honest and loyal Liberals of St. John prepared for this? If not their duty is clear, they must decline to vote for Mr. Ellis and his two colleagues who are pledged to unrestricted reciprocity.

THIS IS WHAT THE LIBERAL PLATFORM SAYS: - [Resolution of Feb. 11th, 1891.]

That we, the Liberal party, most emphatically repudiate the base and slanderous charge of disloyalty; and earnestly deprecate any line of action that would lead to the annexation of the Dominion from the mother country.

THIS IS WHAT THE LIBERAL CANDIDATE, J. V. ELLIS, SAYS: - [Globe editorial, Dec. 14th, 1887.]

There is one simple way by which the whole trouble over the fisheries and all other troubles on this continent between Great Britain and the United States can be settled.

We invite Mr. Chamberlain's attention to it as being simpler than reciprocity, restricted or unrestricted, than commercial union, than anything else that can be proposed, and that is by a political union of Canada and the United States.

By this union of this kind, all the great interests of the American nation and the British colony will become one to the immense benefit of the mother country.

Independent either through union with the United States or with a national union of its own, would be a great advance upon the existing conditions.

It would throw the people upon themselves; it would teach them their higher destinies, and it would end all the tendencies which exist in Canada to pay court to systems which can never have an abiding place here.

There seems here to be something of a difference between the Liberal platform and the Liberal candidate.

The Liberal party professes to be loyal, Mr. Ellis professes to be an annexationist and yet he is nominated by a convention of men who profess themselves loyal just five weeks after he advised his readers to hand down the British flag.

But the Liberator which is now supporting Ellis has always recognized the fact that he is an annexationist as the following extract from its editorial, written by Mr. J. V. E. McCreedy its present editor, will show: -

"We are not a party of annexationists. The Liberal party is second to none in its devotion to the throne of Great Britain. If so, then the Liberal party must disown Mr. J. V. Ellis who has openly and avowedly advocated annexation."

"How much longer will this blatant advocacy of disloyalty, Ellis, be tolerated in our midst?"

"The Liberal party must not be under the reproach that it openly renounces the cause of the British flag. It is a party which will not support Mr. J. V. Ellis as one of its representatives."

At St. John the Liberator are again in a large measure of this kind, and it is somewhat surprising that they are not more open in their avowed support of Mr. J. V. E. McCreedy's editorial.

It is somewhat surprising that they are not more open in their avowed support of Mr. J. V. E. McCreedy's editorial.

It is somewhat surprising that they are not more open in their avowed support of Mr. J. V. E. McCreedy's editorial.

It is somewhat surprising that they are not more open in their avowed support of Mr. J. V. E. McCreedy's editorial.

of singularly acute natural powers. The Liberator of Canada honored and trusted these men, and there was no part of Canada in which they were more honored and trusted than in the city and county of St. John.

What is the attitude of Messrs. Mackenzie and Blake towards this new and unrestricted reciprocity and discrimination against the mother country?

Neither of them is willing to accept it, both of them distinctly repudiate it. Hon. Alex. Mackenzie announced long ago that he would not accept unrestricted reciprocity and Hon. Mr. Blake has withdrawn from public life rather than advocate a doctrine so monstrous.

Among the leaders of the Liberal party its advocacy has been left to such men as Cartwright, who admits that he wishes to make Boston the winter port of Canada, and Laurier who wished he had been with Ellis to fight on the side of the rebels on the Saskatchewan.

Are these two persons the kind of leaders honest and loyal Liberals in St. John should exchange for such men as Mackenzie and Blake?

The Liberator of St. John at their general meeting of the evening passed a resolution repudiating the charge of disloyalty, and earnestly deprecating any line of action that would tend to a severance of the Dominion from the mother country.

That was a very proper resolution to pass, but how did their subsequent actions agree with it? Their very next act at the meeting was to nominate Mr. John V. Ellis, an open and avowed annexationist, to be their representative for the city of St. John.

If any man doubts that Mr. Ellis is an annexationist let him read the editorial from the Globe which we republish to-day in another part of this paper.

Indeed Mr. Ellis, to do him justice, does not attempt to deny that he is an annexationist, yet the Liberator of St. John has nominated him as its fit and proper person to represent them and this city at Ottawa.

Merely to point out this fact is to show its absurdity, and the improbability of any honest and loyal Liberal voting for such a man.

The Liberator of St. John have no particular reason for desiring to destroy the trade of this city, indeed the most of them are identified with its interests.

Why then should they vote for a policy that will ruin St. John as a centre of the wholesale trade and which will also destroy its manufacturing industries?

That unrestricted reciprocity would utterly destroy the wholesale trade of St. John can be proved by the case of Portland, Me., which has now no wholesale business whatever, and which last year only imported \$800,000 worth of foreign goods for home consumption, or less than one-seventh of the amount imported into this city.

As to our manufacturing industries we can read in the destruction of the New England iron industry what the fate of our manufacturing would be under unrestricted reciprocity.

Nor would our cotton mills be able to compete with the cheap negro labor of the South where the cotton is grown.

These are all good reasons against whom we refer, have not yet made up their minds what to do are greatly disturbed in consequence of this. They do not like the idea of deserting their old party, neither do they like the idea of voting for disloyal men.

Unrestricted reciprocity is a principle which they believe to be wrong, yet there seems to be no middle course short of entirely abandoning their functions as electors.

To these men the remarks which follow are addressed in all earnest seriousness and with the hope that they will see their way clear to do what is right and to reconcile their duty with their conscience.

Gentlemen, in years gone by, when the Liberator was strong in this city and county, they held to set of principles of which they were proud and which no one could misunderstand. They believed in the doctrine of free trade established and established by the Liberator of England, but recognizing the fact that a revenue must be raised and that our people were unaccustomed to direct taxation, they held to free trade in a modified form which was embodied in the expression "a tariff for revenue only." If any Liberal had suggested at that time that we should abandon our own low tariff of 17 1/2 per cent. and adopt the 50 or 60 per cent. tariff of the United States, he would have been regarded as no Liberal but an enemy in disguise.

But if in addition to this he had proposed that this high tariff be raised against the products of the mother country, and that all the products of the United States should be allowed to enter Canada free of duty he would have been regarded not only as an enemy of the Liberator but of British connection and of the British flag.

Yet such are the proposals which certain so-called Liberal leaders have forced the party to subscribe on their banners today. We ask honest and loyal Liberals in St. John can they accept them? Do they feel free to vote for such a disloyal, ungrateful and absurd policy simply because Messrs. Laurier and Cartwright have proposed it?

In 1878 the Liberator had for their leader Hon. Alex. Mackenzie, an honest, brave man, whom every body could respect. In 1882 Mr. Blake was their leader, an able lawyer, a brilliant orator and a man

of singularly acute natural powers. The Liberator of Canada honored and trusted these men, and there was no part of Canada in which they were more honored and trusted than in the city and county of St. John.

What is the attitude of Messrs. Mackenzie and Blake towards this new and unrestricted reciprocity and discrimination against the mother country?

Neither of them is willing to accept it, both of them distinctly repudiate it. Hon. Alex. Mackenzie announced long ago that he would not accept unrestricted reciprocity and Hon. Mr. Blake has withdrawn from public life rather than advocate a doctrine so monstrous.

Among the leaders of the Liberal party its advocacy has been left to such men as Cartwright, who admits that he wishes to make Boston the winter port of Canada, and Laurier who wished he had been with Ellis to fight on the side of the rebels on the Saskatchewan.

Are these two persons the kind of leaders honest and loyal Liberals in St. John should exchange for such men as Mackenzie and Blake?

The Liberator of St. John at their general meeting of the evening passed a resolution repudiating the charge of disloyalty, and earnestly deprecating any line of action that would tend to a severance of the Dominion from the mother country.

That was a very proper resolution to pass, but how did their subsequent actions agree with it? Their very next act at the meeting was to nominate Mr. John V. Ellis, an open and avowed annexationist, to be their representative for the city of St. John.

If any man doubts that Mr. Ellis is an annexationist let him read the editorial from the Globe which we republish to-day in another part of this paper.

Indeed Mr. Ellis, to do him justice, does not attempt to deny that he is an annexationist, yet the Liberator of St. John has nominated him as its fit and proper person to represent them and this city at Ottawa.

Merely to point out this fact is to show its absurdity, and the improbability of any honest and loyal Liberal voting for such a man.

The Liberator of St. John have no particular reason for desiring to destroy the trade of this city, indeed the most of them are identified with its interests.

Why then should they vote for a policy that will ruin St. John as a centre of the wholesale trade and which will also destroy its manufacturing industries?

That unrestricted reciprocity would utterly destroy the wholesale trade of St. John can be proved by the case of Portland, Me., which has now no wholesale business whatever, and which last year only imported \$800,000 worth of foreign goods for home consumption, or less than one-seventh of the amount imported into this city.

As to our manufacturing industries we can read in the destruction of the New England iron industry what the fate of our manufacturing would be under unrestricted reciprocity.

Nor would our cotton mills be able to compete with the cheap negro labor of the South where the cotton is grown.

These are all good reasons against whom we refer, have not yet made up their minds what to do are greatly disturbed in consequence of this. They do not like the idea of deserting their old party, neither do they like the idea of voting for disloyal men.

Unrestricted reciprocity is a principle which they believe to be wrong, yet there seems to be no middle course short of entirely abandoning their functions as electors.

To these men the remarks which follow are addressed in all earnest seriousness and with the hope that they will see their way clear to do what is right and to reconcile their duty with their conscience.

Gentlemen, in years gone by, when the Liberator was strong in this city and county, they held to set of principles of which they were proud and which no one could misunderstand. They believed in the doctrine of free trade established and established by the Liberator of England, but recognizing the fact that a revenue must be raised and that our people were unaccustomed to direct taxation, they held to free trade in a modified form which was embodied in the expression "a tariff for revenue only." If any Liberal had suggested at that time that we should abandon our own low tariff of 17 1/2 per cent. and adopt the 50 or 60 per cent. tariff of the United States, he would have been regarded as no Liberal but an enemy in disguise.

But if in addition to this he had proposed that this high tariff be raised against the products of the mother country, and that all the products of the United States should be allowed to enter Canada free of duty he would have been regarded not only as an enemy of the Liberator but of British connection and of the British flag.

Yet such are the proposals which certain so-called Liberal leaders have forced the party to subscribe on their banners today. We ask honest and loyal Liberals in St. John can they accept them? Do they feel free to vote for such a disloyal, ungrateful and absurd policy simply because Messrs. Laurier and Cartwright have proposed it?

In 1878 the Liberator had for their leader Hon. Alex. Mackenzie, an honest, brave man, whom every body could respect. In 1882 Mr. Blake was their leader, an able lawyer, a brilliant orator and a man

of singularly acute natural powers. The Liberator of Canada honored and trusted these men, and there was no part of Canada in which they were more honored and trusted than in the city and county of St. John.

What is the attitude of Messrs. Mackenzie and Blake towards this new and unrestricted reciprocity and discrimination against the mother country?

Neither of them is willing to accept it, both of them distinctly repudiate it. Hon. Alex. Mackenzie announced long ago that he would not accept unrestricted reciprocity and Hon. Mr. Blake has withdrawn from public life rather than advocate a doctrine so monstrous.

Among the leaders of the Liberal party its advocacy has been left to such men as Cartwright, who admits that he wishes to make Boston the winter port of Canada, and Laurier who wished he had been with Ellis to fight on the side of the rebels on the Saskatchewan.

Are these two persons the kind of leaders honest and loyal Liberals in St. John should exchange for such men as Mackenzie and Blake?

The Liberator of St. John at their general meeting of the evening passed a resolution repudiating the charge of disloyalty, and earnestly deprecating any line of action that would tend to a severance of the Dominion from the mother country.

That was a very proper resolution to pass, but how did their subsequent actions agree with it? Their very next act at the meeting was to nominate Mr. John V. Ellis, an open and avowed annexationist, to be their representative for the city of St. John.

If any man doubts that Mr. Ellis is an annexationist let him read the editorial from the Globe which we republish to-day in another part of this paper.

Indeed Mr. Ellis, to do him justice, does not attempt to deny that he is an annexationist, yet the Liberator of St. John has nominated him as its fit and proper person to represent them and this city at Ottawa.

Merely to point out this fact is to show its absurdity, and the improbability of any honest and loyal Liberal voting for such a man.

The Liberator of St. John have no particular reason for desiring to destroy the trade of this city, indeed the most of them are identified with its interests.

Why then should they vote for a policy that will ruin St. John as a centre of the wholesale trade and which will also destroy its manufacturing industries?

That unrestricted reciprocity would utterly destroy the wholesale trade of St. John can be proved by the case of Portland, Me., which has now no wholesale business whatever, and which last year only imported \$800,000 worth of foreign goods for home consumption, or less than one-seventh of the amount imported into this city.

As to our manufacturing industries we can read in the destruction of the New England iron industry what the fate of our manufacturing would be under unrestricted reciprocity.

Nor would our cotton mills be able to compete with the cheap negro labor of the South where the cotton is grown.

These are all good reasons against whom we refer, have not yet made up their minds what to do are greatly disturbed in consequence of this. They do not like the idea of deserting their old party, neither do they like the idea of voting for disloyal men.

Unrestricted reciprocity is a principle which they believe to be wrong, yet there seems to be no middle course short of entirely abandoning their functions as electors.

To these men the remarks which follow are addressed in all earnest seriousness and with the hope that they will see their way clear to do what is right and to reconcile their duty with their conscience.

Gentlemen, in years gone by, when the Liberator was strong in this city and county, they held to set of principles of which they were proud and which no one could misunderstand. They believed in the doctrine of free trade established and established by the Liberator of England, but recognizing the fact that a revenue must be raised and that our people were unaccustomed to direct taxation, they held to free trade in a modified form which was embodied in the expression "a tariff for revenue only." If any Liberal had suggested at that time that we should abandon our own low tariff of 17 1/2 per cent. and adopt the 50 or 60 per cent. tariff of the United States, he would have been regarded as no Liberal but an enemy in disguise.

But if in addition to this he had proposed that this high tariff be raised against the products of the mother country, and that all the products of the United States should be allowed to enter Canada free of duty he would have been regarded not only as an enemy of the Liberator but of British connection and of the British flag.

Yet such are the proposals which certain so-called Liberal leaders have forced the party to subscribe on their banners today. We ask honest and loyal Liberals in St. John can they accept them? Do they feel free to vote for such a disloyal, ungrateful and absurd policy simply because Messrs. Laurier and Cartwright have proposed it?

In 1878 the Liberator had for their leader Hon. Alex. Mackenzie, an honest, brave man, whom every body could respect. In 1882 Mr. Blake was their leader, an able lawyer, a brilliant orator and a man

of singularly acute natural powers. The Liberator of Canada honored and trusted these men, and there was no part of Canada in which they were more honored and trusted than in the city and county of St. John.

What is the attitude of Messrs. Mackenzie and Blake towards this new and unrestricted reciprocity and discrimination against the mother country?

Neither of them is willing to accept it, both of them distinctly repudiate it. Hon. Alex. Mackenzie announced long ago that he would not accept unrestricted reciprocity and Hon. Mr. Blake has withdrawn from public life rather than advocate a doctrine so monstrous.

Among the leaders of the Liberal party its advocacy has been left to such men as Cartwright, who admits that he wishes to make Boston the winter port of Canada, and Laurier who wished he had been with Ellis to fight on the side of the rebels on the Saskatchewan.

Are these two persons the kind of leaders honest and loyal Liberals in St. John should exchange for such men as Mackenzie and Blake?

The Liberator of St. John at their general meeting of the evening passed a resolution repudiating the charge of disloyalty, and earnestly deprecating any line of action that would tend to a severance of the Dominion from the mother country.

That was a very proper resolution to pass, but how did their subsequent actions agree with it? Their very next act at the meeting was to nominate Mr. John V. Ellis, an open and avowed annexationist, to be their representative for the city of St. John.

If any man doubts that Mr. Ellis is an annexationist let him read the editorial from the Globe which we republish to-day in another part of this paper.

Indeed Mr. Ellis, to do him justice, does not attempt to deny that he is an annexationist, yet the Liberator of St. John has nominated him as its fit and proper person to represent them and this city at Ottawa.

Merely to point out this fact is to show its absurdity, and the improbability of any honest and loyal Liberal voting for such a man.

The Liberator of St. John have no particular reason for desiring to destroy the trade of this city, indeed the most of them are identified with its interests.

Why then should they vote for a policy that will ruin St. John as a centre of the wholesale trade and which will also destroy its manufacturing industries?

That unrestricted reciprocity would utterly destroy the wholesale trade of St. John can be proved by the case of Portland, Me., which has now no wholesale business whatever, and which last year only imported \$800,000 worth of foreign goods for home consumption, or less than one-seventh of the amount imported into this city.

As to our manufacturing industries we can read in the destruction of the New England iron industry what the fate of our manufacturing would be under unrestricted reciprocity.

Nor would our cotton mills be able to compete with the cheap negro labor of the South where the cotton is grown.

These are all good reasons against whom we refer, have not yet made up their minds what to do are greatly disturbed in consequence of this. They do not like the idea of deserting their old party, neither do they like the idea of voting for disloyal men.

Unrestricted reciprocity is a principle which they believe to be wrong, yet there seems to be no middle course short of entirely abandoning their functions as electors.

To these men the remarks which follow are addressed in all earnest seriousness and with the hope that they will see their way clear to do what is right and to reconcile their duty with their conscience.

gentlemen, in years gone by, when the Liberator was strong in this city and county, they held to set of principles of which they were proud and which no one could misunderstand. They believed in the doctrine of free trade established and established by the Liberator of England, but recognizing the fact that a revenue must be raised and that our people were unaccustomed to direct taxation, they held to free trade in a modified form which was embodied in the expression "a tariff for revenue only." If any Liberal had suggested at that time that we should abandon our own low tariff of 17 1/2 per cent. and adopt the 50 or 60 per cent. tariff of the United States, he would have been regarded as no Liberal but an enemy in disguise.

But if in addition to this he had proposed that this high tariff be raised against the products of the mother country, and that all the products of the United States should be allowed to enter Canada free of duty he would have been regarded not only as an enemy of the Liberator but of British connection and of the British flag.

Yet such are the proposals which certain so-called Liberal leaders have forced the party to subscribe on their banners today. We ask honest and loyal Liberals in St. John can they accept them? Do they feel free to vote for such a disloyal, ungrateful and absurd policy simply because Messrs. Laurier and Cartwright have proposed it?

In 1878 the Liberator had for their leader Hon. Alex. Mackenzie, an honest, brave man, whom every body could respect. In 1882 Mr. Blake was their leader, an able lawyer, a brilliant orator and a man

of singularly acute natural powers. The Liberator of Canada honored and trusted these men, and there was no part of Canada in which they were more honored and trusted than in the city and county of St. John.

What is the attitude of Messrs. Mackenzie and Blake towards this new and unrestricted reciprocity and discrimination against the mother country?

Neither of them is willing to accept it, both of them distinctly repudiate it. Hon. Alex. Mackenzie announced long ago that he would not accept unrestricted reciprocity and Hon. Mr. Blake has withdrawn from public life rather than advocate a doctrine so monstrous.

Among the leaders of the Liberal party its advocacy has been left to such men as Cartwright, who admits that he wishes to make Boston the winter port of Canada, and Laurier who wished he had been with Ellis to fight on the side of the rebels on the Saskatchewan.

Are these two persons the kind of leaders honest and loyal Liberals in St. John should exchange for such men as Mackenzie and Blake?

The Liberator of St. John at their general meeting of the evening passed a resolution repudiating the charge of disloyalty, and earnestly deprecating any line of action that would tend to a severance of the Dominion from the mother country.

That was a very proper resolution to pass, but how did their subsequent actions agree with it? Their very next act at the meeting was to nominate Mr. John V. Ellis, an open and avowed annexationist, to be their representative for the city of St. John.

If any man doubts that Mr. Ellis is an annexationist let him read the editorial from the Globe which we republish to-day in another part of this paper.

Indeed Mr. Ellis, to do him justice, does not attempt to deny that he is an annexationist, yet the Liberator of St. John has nominated him as its fit and proper person to represent them and this city at Ottawa.

Merely to point out this fact is to show its absurdity, and the improbability of any honest and loyal Liberal voting for such a man.

The Liberator of St. John have no particular reason for desiring to destroy the trade of this city, indeed the most of them are identified with its interests.

Why then should they vote for a policy that will ruin St. John as a centre of the wholesale trade and which will also destroy its manufacturing industries?

That unrestricted reciprocity would utterly destroy the wholesale trade of St. John can be proved by the case of Portland, Me., which has now no wholesale business whatever, and which last year only imported \$800,000 worth of foreign goods for home consumption, or less than one-seventh of the amount imported into this city.

As to our manufacturing industries we can read in the destruction of the New England iron industry what the fate of our manufacturing would be under unrestricted reciprocity.

Nor would our cotton mills be able to compete with the cheap negro labor of the South where the cotton is grown.

These are all good reasons against whom we refer, have not yet made up their minds what to do are greatly disturbed in consequence of this. They do not like the idea of deserting their old party, neither do they like the idea of voting for disloyal men.

Unrestricted reciprocity is a principle which they believe to be wrong, yet there seems to be no middle course short of entirely abandoning their functions as electors.

To these men the remarks which follow are addressed in all earnest seriousness and with the hope that they will see their way clear to do what is right and to reconcile their duty with their conscience.

Gentlemen, in years gone by, when the Liberator was strong in this city and county, they held to set of principles of which they were proud and which no one could misunderstand. They believed in the doctrine of free trade established and established by the Liberator of England, but recognizing the fact that a revenue must be raised and that our people were unaccustomed to direct taxation, they held to free trade in a modified form which was embodied in the expression "a tariff for revenue only." If any Liberal had suggested at that time that we should abandon our own low tariff of 17 1/2 per cent. and adopt the 50 or 60 per cent. tariff of the United States, he would have been regarded as no Liberal but an enemy in disguise.

But if in addition to this he had proposed that this high tariff be raised against the products of the mother country, and that all the products of the United States should be allowed to enter Canada free of duty he would have been regarded not only as an enemy of the Liberator but of British connection and of the British flag.

Yet such are the proposals which certain so-called Liberal leaders have forced the party to subscribe on their banners today. We ask honest and loyal Liberals in St. John can they accept them? Do they feel free to vote for such a disloyal, ungrateful and absurd policy simply because Messrs. Laurier and Cartwright have proposed it?

In 1878 the Liberator had for their leader Hon. Alex. Mackenzie, an honest, brave man, whom every body could respect. In 1882 Mr. Blake was their leader, an able lawyer, a brilliant orator and a man

of singularly acute natural powers. The Liberator of Canada honored and trusted these men, and there was no part of Canada in which they were more honored and trusted than in the city and county of St. John.

What is the attitude of Messrs. Mackenzie and Blake towards this new and unrestricted reciprocity and discrimination against the mother country?

Neither of them is willing to accept it, both of them distinctly repudiate it. Hon. Alex. Mackenzie announced long ago that he would not accept unrestricted reciprocity and Hon. Mr. Blake has withdrawn from public life rather than advocate a doctrine so monstrous.

Among the leaders of the Liberal party its advocacy has been left to such men as Cartwright, who admits that he wishes to make Boston the winter port of Canada, and Laurier who wished he had been with Ellis to fight on the side of the rebels on the Saskatchewan.

Are these two persons the kind of leaders honest and loyal Liberals in St. John should exchange for such men as Mackenzie and Blake?

The Liberator of St. John at their general meeting of the evening passed a resolution repudiating the charge of disloyalty, and earnestly deprecating any line of action that would tend to