THE HERALD

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 29, 1896.

PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY,

SUBSCRIPTION—$1.00 A YEAR,

JAMES McISAAC,
Editor & Proprietor.

Mr. Davies and Remedial Legislation.

ANYONE who has followed the discussion on the question of remedial legislation during the session of parliament just closed, cannot have failed to observe the dishonesty of the course pursued by the opponents of the bill, and the utter untenableness of the ground taken by them. It is really humiliating to find men, claiming to be loyal Canadians and upholders of our constitution, taking advantage of the merest subterfuges and having recourse to the most contemptible tactics to nullify the provisions of the very constitution they pretend to uphold, and to defeat the Government's honest intentions to restore to the minority in Manitoba the constitutional rights of which they have been robbed. With the opponents of remedial legislation, the hope of party advantage took precedence of everything else. Constitutional rights, the provisions of a compact solemnly entered into, honesty, justice and country itself were subordinated to this one idea. They appear to have been quite prepared to assist in smashing confederation, if thereby they could only gain a party advantage. It was party first, last and all the time; every other consideration was relegated to second place. What could be more dishonest in a member of parliament than to introduce into a discussion of this nature, matters of an extraneous nature, and to consume hours in discussions having no bearing at all on the question under consideration; discussions deliberately intended to mislead and to divert the public mind from the real issue?

No member of the House of Commons offended to a greater extent in the direction just mentioned than Mr. L. H. Davies, member for Queen's County. On March 13th he made a speech which covers no less than twenty-one pages of Hansard. Certainly his speech constitutes forty-two columns of matter as irrelevant, and argument as specious as could very well be imagined. After assuming a variety of attitudes regarding the question of remedial legislation, and "talking at it" from every point of view except the real and constitutional one, he capped the climax by attempting to justify the course pursued by the Greenway Government, by instituting a parallel between the Manitoba School Acts of 1890 and the school act which he (Mr. Davies) placed upon the Statute Books of this Province in 1877. Could there be a more specious course of reasoning? No one knows better than Mr. Davies that the conditions, as regards education, are altogether different in the respective Provinces. When Mr. Davies says that the people of this Province would not have submitted to Federal interference with his school act, and thence attempts to infer that the majority in Manitoba should not submit, he knows he is making a most illogical statement; a statement that will not bear the test of criticism. He knows very well that this Province had no recognized legal right to separate schools prior to confederation, and that there was no guarantee to that effect embodied in our compact with the Dominion when our Province entered the union. Consequently we had no stipulated legal right to appeal to the Governor-General in Council for Federal interference in matters pertaining to education. But the case of Manitoba is altogether different. Separate schools were guaranteed to the Province at the time of the union, and the minority were given the right to appeal to the Federal Government when they deemed their rights infringed upon. In the face of these facts why does Mr. Davies so far presume upon the credulity of the public as to make use of such illogical and untenable arguments?

Mr. Davies claims that a school law could be so framed by the Government of Manitoba that it would meet with the approbation of the Catholic minority. The simple answer to this is, why, in the name of all that is right and just, has such a law not been framed? What are the plain facts of the case? Mr. Greenway and his Government ruthlessly and deceitfully deprived the Catholics of Manitoba of their separate schools, and this in disregard of a solemn compact, thus trampling under foot the solemn pledges by which the Province of Manitoba was induced to enter confederation; and have repeatedly and positively refused to remedy the grievance. Yet Mr. Davies stands up in parliament and declares the Federal Government must not protect the minority; must not attempt to restore to them their constitutional rights. According to him the Federal Government must throw the mantle of its protection over the robbery and spoliation perpetrated by the majority in Manitoba. Does Mr. Davies really imagine that an intelligent electorate can be deceived by such sophistry? The greatest act of self-complaceney made by Mr. Davies during his speech is that wherein he lays the "flattering unction of his soul" that he placed on the statute books of this Province twenty years ago a school law that gives universal satisfaction. Here are his modest words: "Although there has hardly been an amendment even to the extent of dotting an "i" or crossing a "t," and although when it was passed nearly half the population were up and denouncing it. I stand here proudly, in this House, and say, that not a man can be found in Prince Edward Island to-day who will say, that a scintilla of injustice is being perpetrated upon the Roman Catholics." There, gentle reader, is the declaration of a modest man! Were Mr. Davies' characteristic recklessness less generally understood, the above quoted words might be regarded as most extraordinary. But they are so much in keeping with his usual manner of expression on public questions that few will be surprised at their utter extravagance and variance with facts. Suppose we admit, for argument sake, that every man, woman and child in this Province were perfectly satisfied with our schools, that would not, in the slightest degree affect the question of remedial legislation for Manitoba. The interjecting of such expressions as those above quoted is only intended to divert the public mind from the main issue, viz. whether or not the federal compact by which the Manitoba minority were guaranteed separate schools is to be preserved intact. It will, therefore, be abundantly evident to the humblest individual that the condition of the public schools of this Province has nothing to do with remedial legislation for Manitoba.

Having thus shown how Mr. Davies exerted his utmost ingenuity to obscure the real issue before the House and speciously endeavored to divert attention from remedial legislation by introducing side issues, let us briefly examine his statement regarding the schools of this Province. He says that "not a man can be found in Prince Edward Island to-day who will say that a scintilla of injustice is being perpetrated upon the Roman Catholics of that Province." Is this assertion true? We most unhesitatingly tell Mr. Davies, as well as all others whom his reckless statement may mislead, that it is notoriously false, and, further, we believe Mr. Davies is sufficiently conversant with the affairs of our Province to know the facts to be far otherwise than he has stated. It is well known that, in this Province, hundreds and hundreds of Catholic children are educated in Catholic schools which do not receive one cent of State aid. The parents of these children are heavily taxed for the maintainance of the public schools; still they prefer in addition to pay for the education of their children in these private schools; because of the moral and religious training therein imparted, in addition to the secular education. It is true that, in the scattered country districts, for want of anything better, they have taken whatever advantages the public schools afford them; but in Charlottetown, Summerside, Souris, Tignish, Miscouche and Rustico they pay for separate education, notwithstanding that they are taxed for the support of public schools. Does this bear out Mr. Davies statement, that there is, in this Province, complete and general satisfaction with the public school system established by him; or does it indicate that not a scintilla of injustice is being done to the Catholic population of this Province? Mr. Davies knew very well that, so far as this Province is concerned, there was no right of appeal from the Provincial Legislature, in the matter of education; consequently he felt safe in making, in the House, the misleading statement already referred to. But he must remember that his indecent attempt to cheat the minority of Manitoba out of their sacred rights, by maligning a considerable portion of the people of his native Province cannot and will not be allowed to go unchallenged.

AT a meeting of the Dominion Cabinet held on Friday last, Sir Donald Smith was appointed High Commissioner for Canada in London as well as a Privy Councillor of the Dominion, but not in the Cabinet. Sir Donald proceeded to Rideau Hall Friday afternoon and he was sworn in before His Excellency the Governor General. Great satisfaction is expressed all round at the appointment. It is acknowledged that the Government have effected a master stroke by securing Sir Donald as Canadian ambassador in England. It was thought advisable to make him a Privy Councillor in view of the fact that as High Commissioner he is brought into confidential relations with the Government. He will now be practically one of themselves.

SIR MACKENZIE BOWELL resigned the Premiership on Monday afternoon, and Sir Charles Tupper, Baronet was summoned by the Governor-General to form a ministry, which commission he accepted. The personell of the new ministry is not yet known; but it is thought most of the members of the Bowell Government will have portfolios in the Tupper Cabinet. Rumor has it that the new blood in the ministry will include Chief Justice Meredith of Ontario, Lieutenant Governor Chapleau of Quebec, Hon. A. R. Angers, and Hugh John McDonald of Winnipeg, son of the late Sir John A. It is certain that Hugh John intends to contest Winnipeg in the general election.

THE trade returns for nine months, which were issued by the Customs Department on Friday last, are of the most satisfactory character. The exports show an increase of $5,821,000 over the same period last year, while the imports are increased by $5,705.764. Mr. Foster will undoubtedly be gratified with the steady increase in the revenue from this latter source. For the nine months it is $2,185,000 better than for the same period last year.

THE Federal Parllament was dissolved on Friday. June 16th. will be Nomination day, and polling will take place on the 23rd. It will thus be seen that the general elections are less than two months off. The fight will likely be hot.

Dominion Parliament.

(Condensed from Halifax Herald's Report.)

Most of the time of the House of Commons, on Monday the 20th., was consumed by Grit obstruction, and very little business was done. On Tuesday Mr. Bergeron asked if the government had come to any decision with regard to the request of the Montreal deputation for a grant towards the international exhibition in Montreal next year. Mr. Foster replied that the government had given the matter every consideration. It was not possible, however, that any money grant could be initiated and carried through this session. But the government, he could say, was very favorably disposed towards the project of holding an international exhibition in Canada, and accordingly proposed that a committee of promoters of that exhibition be appointed to confer with the government in order that a solid basis might be arrived at for future action. Mr. McShane followed. "We, the people of Montreal," as he put it, have long enough put up with promises and neglect at the hands of the government, now they wanted the cold cash. He threatened the government with the political consequences of not complying with this request for a grant of half a million dollars at once. Hon. Mr. Ives remarked that Mr. McShane was misrepresenting the citizens of Montreal collectively as a pooh bah, being willing to accept cold cash by way of a solatium for fancied insults. He himself knew the people of Montreal too well to take them at Mr. McShane's estimate, too well to believe that the large delegation which was here on Saturday came to point a pistol at the head of the government and demand that half a million dollars was to be paid immediately. If anything could justify the suspicion that the delegation had politics in view it was the oration of Mr. McShane.

The house went into committee on the resolution authorizing the government to raise three million dollars for the purpose of securing better arms and equipment for the militia. Hon. Mr. Foster explained the reasons which had induced the government to ask for this sum. After careful consideration and investigation the government had decided on the Lee-Enfield rifle as the weapon to place in the hands of the militia. Forty thousand stand would be procured as well as two thousand three hundred Lee-Enfield magazine carbines for the cavalry. Four batteries of six twelve-pounder guns would also be procured. The decision reached by the government was after consultation with the imperial authorities. The arms and ammunition were to be supplied at the very lowest price, and in order to secure them at the smallest cost the government had undertaken to pay for them promptly. One million dollars was due before July first. The government had contracted altogether for two millions for arms and ammunition. The other million asked for would be expended after consultation with the home authorities. Mr. Mills—Is the whole liability with the war office? Hon. Mr. Foster replied that the obligation with the war office already amounted to $1,844 000 The arms and ammunition were being supplied at cost, plus a commission of five per cent only for inspection and handling. Sir Richard Cartwright—What is the cost? Hon. Mr. Foster—Some of the rifles are made in the government factories, others by private individuals, but all are approved for the government. For the rifles procured from the trade we pay £4 each. for the bayonets and scabbards 13s 6d; for the carbines, 2 300 altogether, £8,000. For the rifles made in the government factories the price is £3 10s each. The four batteries will cost £24,000. Hon. Mr. Dickey said it was originally intended to purchase fifty Maxim guns, but Lord Wolseley advised that the money would be better spent in extra artillery. The cost of the Maxim guns was $3,000 each. All details have been arranged by Col. Lake without interference from Ottawa. The country was deeply indebted to Gen. Gascoigne for his moderate estimates. Many imperial officers would have run to great extravagance, but Gen Gascoigne had kept in view the conditions of the country. Mr. Casey complained that the authority of parliament had not been asked for the expenditure and protested against this expenditure having been undertaken without the advice of a royal commission. Mr. Mills declared the proceeding was wholly unconstitutional, and Mr. Laurier supported this contention. Col. Prior, replying to Messrs. Mills and Casey said that the former had impressed him as a man wrapped up in his books. His speech in favor of a rifle that would inflict terrible wounds seemed to mark him as a "most blood-thirsty ruffian," to use the phrase in its parliamentary sense. Modern military science favored a rifle throwing a small bullet at high velocity, one that would place an enemy hors de combat without killing him. As for Mr. Casey, he could tell that honorable gentleman that the Canadian militia should be armed with the very best class of magazine rifle. Even the moral effect of going into action with an inferior weapon was not to be lightly regarded. Mr. Sutherland favored the purchase of the best class of rifle, but criticized the manner of the purchase. Messrs. MuMullen and Lister protested against this expenditure. Hon Mr. Foster remarked that the resolution had been three hours under discussion and if the opposition intended to block this business something else might be taken up In December last year circumstances arose which, while they might now be considered as tail twisting, were not so considered here or in England. The government deemed itself bound to be prepared for the emergency. As to the government not taking parliament into its confidence, the government had done so in the speech from the throne, and in the debate upon it. Not one hon. gentleman had demurred from the proposed expenditure. Again in the budget he had outlined the expenditure and members of the opposition distinctly stated their determination not to oppose any reasonable expenditure for defence. The same spirit had been manifested in the debate upon the resolution regarding the mother country. And now would the opposition place the government in the position of repudiating an obligation undertaken to put the country in a state of defence called for by the circumstances of the time? If so, it was a strange commentary upon the expressions evoked in England at the splendid outburst of imperial loyalty in the Canadian parliament. He appealed to the leader of the opposition to say whether this vote should go through or not. Frankly the government was in this matter in the hands of the opposition. This had the desired effect, and after a brief protest by Sir Richard Cartwright and Mr. Davies the resolution was adopted and reported. At ten minntes past one the house got into committee of of supply. The supplementary estimates were taken up, but no progress was made, the first item, one of $180 as a retiring allowance to the late secretary of the agricultural departement being discussed until the house adjourned at 1.40 a. m.

On Wednesday fair progress was made in committee of supply on the supplementary estimates. The supplementary estimates were passed on Thursday forenoon. Before the house rose Hon Mr. Foster urged that the main estimates for three months be allowed to pass in order to avoid, if possible, the necessity for parliament meeting in July, which would be expensive and inconvenient. Sir Richard Cartwright said it was utterly impossible to accede to the request; it was most unreasonable. Therewith the matter dropped. At three o'clock the house re-assembled and at once proceeded to concur in the supplementary estimates. On the item of 1,000,000 for arms and ammunition, Mr. Rinfret, seconded by Mr. Legris, moved in amendment that the item be not concurred in, but that "this house regrets that the government, without the authority of parliament, has entered into contracts for the purchase of arms and equipments to the amount of nearly two million." The house divided on the amendment, which was defeated by 67 nays to 35 yeas. Messrs. McCarthy and Stubbs voted with the opposition, Mr. Wallace with the government. On the item of $20,000 for enlarging the Lachine canal Mr. McShane raised all sorts of objections, claiming that the amount was unnecessary. Sir Donald Smith made an urgent appeal to have the vote put through, but Mr. McShane was obstinate, and being backed up by Mr. Laurier, the vote was reduced to $10,000. The remainder of the supplementaries were concurred and the supply bill passed at six o'clock. Sir Richard Cartwright wanted to know about the next meeting of parliament, and was informed by Sir Charles Tupper that it was the intention to have the new parliament about the middle of July, to which Sir Richard rejoined that the elections should have been brought on a week earlier, as the government would have trouble enough getting on without supplies in the meantime. At the evening session five private bills, including the Chignecto ship railway bill were, withdrawn and the fees ordered to be repaid. Business over, Mr. Bergeron brought up the matter of the commutation of the sentence of Valentine Shortis upon which Mr. Tarte is making his campaign in Beauharnois. The deputy speaker, to place himself right with his constituents, reviewed the whole circumstances of the case and read letters to show that he was anything but favorable to the commutation, although Mr. Tarte was endeavoring to prove to the contrary in Beauharnois. Mr. Laurier made a reply by attacking the government for having gone back upon their position taken in regard to the sentence of Reil. Hon Mr. Dickey pointed out the inconsistency of both, accusing the government of failing in their duty by not advising his excellency and charging the government with the responsibility for his excellency's action. The responsibility was one, however, which the government fully accepted. While Mr. Davies was on his feet attacking the government with might and main, rap went the black rod's gravel on the door, and the sergeant-at-arms stepped forward to announce him. But Mr. Davies kept on talking. He was bound to be in the last work and would have succeeded, but that his remarks were replied to briefly by the minister of justice, against whom they were directed. Then came the summons of the senate, when the final scenes of the sixth session of the seventh parliament were enacted.

His excellency, having taken his seat on the throne, read the following speech:

Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate:
Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I am glad to be able to relieve you from further attendance in parliament. I desire to express my regret that the commission which my government recently despatched to confer with the local authorities of Manitoba has been unproductive of any immediate result and the question relating to schools in that province still awaits settlement.

I thank you for the appropriation which you have made towards proceeding for the better arming and equipment of the militia forces of the country. The powers with which you have endowed the commissioners appointed under the Behring sea claims convention will, I trust, facilitate the investigation of that tribunal and hasten a just settlement of these long standing claims.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I have to thank you for the supplementary provision you have made for carrying on the services of the current year.

Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate:
Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

As inasmuch as in the opinion of my advisors, it is desirable that the judgment of the people upon the questions which now engage public attention, should be obtained at an early day, I have to announce my intention to cause this parliament to be immediately dissolved.

The guns boomed once more from Nepean Point and the seventh parliament of the dominion was at an end.

Provincial Legislature.

THURSDAY, April 16.

Mr. Shaw followed Mr. Bell. He expressed his gratification at the fact that after two years the views of the hon-member for Bedeque regarding taxes had changed and are now the same as those held by the Opposition. The opposition contended when the land taxation measure was introduced that it was unfair, and argued in favor of competent valuators being appointed to go through the Island and in each of the school districts take a medium farm and in this way get an equalization. Under the Davies Assessment Act, three men were appointed for each district; but as these men had no means of learning the exact value, a great inequality existed. But the hon. member for Bedeque went against the Opposition, and supported every act of the Government. taxing the living and the property of the dead. He was glad, however, to see that he now shows signs of repentence. Mr. Bell rose to a point of order and claimed that he voted against the system of land tax proposed by the Government. Mr. Shaw, however, claimed, that the evidence was against the hon. member, that whilst he talked against the measure he actually voted for it. He pointed out that there was only one instance in the scriptures of redemption in consequence of repentance at the eleventh hour, but he (Mr. Shaw) sincerely hoped that even at this late hour the hon. member for Bedeque would receive justification. The hon. member reminded him of the ferryman who looked one way and pulled another; he talked against the Government and supported all their obnoxious measures. The hon. member from Bedeque intimated that the farmers of this province were dishonest in regard to the valuation of their lands for assessment purposes. But the assertion is false, and he (Mr. Shaw) hurled it back in the teeth of the hon. member or any one else who might express himself in a similar manner. The hon. member is a lawyer, and it is well known that these gentlemen have a scale of charges. But nothing of this sort is true of the farmers in regard to the valuation of their land. He was glad indeed to observe that the hon. member was disposed to repent his past conduct, and hoped that he would see his way clear to back up his statements by his vote. When the present Goverement was in Opposition, the burden of their song was that revenue and expenditure should be made to meet. In fact they made the night hideous with their cries along this line. That was their declaration, and they nailed their colors to the mast and went to the country on that policy. The hon. member for West River, the hon member for Bedeque, and other hon members now either in the Government or supporters thereof are on record in the Parliamentary Reporter as strongly advocating the policy of making ends meet. Yet how are they acting? What have they to say for themselves? They are going back on their promises most shamefully. Instead of making ends meet they are piling up a debt at the banks and issuing debentures. In the session of 1889, the following resolution was passed:—Resolved. That in the opinion of this House the present financial state of the Province demands an immediate and judicious policy of retrenchment in the expenses of legislation and other departments of the public service, in order that the annual expenditure be kept within the limits of the ordinary revenue. Mr. Shaw had just concluded the reading of the resolution when six o'clock arrived, and the House adjourned until 10 o'clock on Friday.

FRIDAY, April 17.

Mr. Shaw resumed the debate on the motion to go into committee of supply. He pointed out that when the House adjourned at 6 o'clock last evening he was quoting a resolution introduced in 1889 by Hon. Mr. Yeo, in which it was stated that the time had arrived when revenue and expenditure should be made to meet. He had also quoted from the recorded utterances of several hon. members of the house along the same line—utterances which he had no doubt they would be going back upon when in a few weeks they would be in the midst of a Dominion election campaign. But, fortunately, we have the Parliamentary Reporter to confront them with—the Reporter which the present administration had abolished. Mr. Shaw then proceeded to quote from the Parliamentary Reporter the utterances of various members of the Governmen with respect to the matter of making revenue and expenditure meet. In 1889 the hon. member for West River had deprecated deficits and promised to save at least $25,000 of public money by reducing the salaries of the officials. How has he kept this promise? The Government of which he is a member has incressed the salaries of the officials and added to their number, and instead of a reduction of expenses there has been an increase. The hon. member from Springton in the same session had also expressed himself as being opposed to the policy of deficits and in favor of making revenue and expenditure meet. The public accounts show how they have kept their promise. The hon. member had said that there could be only one result of having a deficit each year, and that was the financial ruin of the Province. Yet he sits in his seat to-day with these words ringing in his ears, and the blush of shame does not mantle his brow. In 1891, according to the same Parliamentary Reporter, similar declarations were made regarding the meeting of revenue and expenditure. In 1891, when the present Government obtained power, they submitted a statement of the debt and liabilities on the 24th of April, showing that $171,931 was due at that time. In order to make up the amount they charged their predecessors with $33,060 of the unearned subsidy. Proceeding, he showed how the present administration had $47,000 to begin work with on that date. He also showed how, in that year, they promised to make ends meet. The hon. member had said that the accounts would be squared, and that no government was justified in adding to and increasing the public debt every year. Yet year after year, huge deficits have been rolled up. How can the honorable member justify his conduct in remaining in a government which has not kept its promises? The hon. member for West River had also been heard from He said no business men would remain in a government that would allow the business of the country to get into the conditions in which they found it. How could he, as a business man, remain in a government which pursued such a ruinous policy? He thought it was high time that both the hon member for West River and the hon. member for Springton should fold their tents, and, like the arab, steal silently away. The Leader of the Government, the bright and particular star around which the statelites revolve, is also on record as promising to take steps for abolishing the deficits and making ends meet. He kept his promise by having a big deficit each year. If ever there was a political failure it is the Leader of the present Government. The hon. member for East Point is also on record on this matter of making ends meet. He said that unless this were done, national bankruptcy stared us in the face. Although nothing was done to meet the views he then expressed, we find him to-day one of the most servile followers of the present Government. The hon. member for Fort Augustus had also expressed himself as opposed to deficits, He said he considered it a great mistake to roll up deficit after deficit. No doubt he was sincere. But evil associations had evidently corrupted him and he was in the same political slough as the other supporters of the administration. In 1891 they endeavored to equalize revenue and expenditure by giving discounts in the Land Office. In consequence they demoralized that department to such an extent that two leaves are now sufficient for the Commissioner's report, in spite of the fact that it is the only revenue yielding department in the public service. They first gave discounts to their friends, but later on some of their opponents were similarly favored. In 1891 they obtained $72,878 from the Land Office, and yet they had a deficit of upwards of $30,000. The interest paid yearly is a sure indication of the debt of a country. The Leader of the Government in his budget speech took great credit for a reduction in the amount paid for interest. He said that if the late government had remained in power and had increased the debt to the same extent they would have to pay $20,000 interest instead of $14 000. Taking up this statement, Mr. Shaw proceeded to prove that the present Government had largely increased, rather than decreased, the amount paid for interest. In 1890, the last year of the late Government, they paid out $2,697, and the present Government, during the first year of their power, paid the enormous sum of $7,075. Still the Leader brazenly says they curtailed the public debt. But he knows better than that. In 1892, as shown by the Parliamentary Reporter, the Leader whined considerably in his budget speech, and when taxed with another deficit of $30,000, he blamed it on the Tories, because they had charge for a part of 1891. But next year he was determined that the expenditures should be made to meet, and he brought in a debenture bill by means of which he proposed to liquidate the debt of the Province. In this way they fastened a permanent debt on this country. He said they came in to get the country out of debt, and that was the way they did it. Although the present Government fully controlled affairs during 1892 the result was another deficit of $37,651. In that year also they paid $6,649 in interest. How does this compare with a little over $2,000 during the control of the late Government. In 1893 the Leader was again ready to repeat his promises. In his Budget Speech he said revenue and expenditure would certainly be made to meet. In that year they took in only $19,021 in the in the Land Office, for the simple reason that the resources of that arm of the public service were almost exhausted in consequence of their policy. Their deficit in that year was not $10,000 or $20,000. The enormous deficit of $119,945 was rolled up, although the public works had been allowed to go to destruction. Did the Leader curtail the interest that year? It was actually $10,000. So much for 1893. Even by accident they failed to redeem their promises. There has been no official reporter since 1893. But fortunately we have the Patriot newspaper—the Bible of the Grits—and they bow down and worship it In that paper in the report of the Leader's Budget Speech he is on record as again declaiming against the terrible result of deficits and again pledging himself to make revenue and expenditure meet. He said the time had come when the policy of drift must be abandoned and some scheme adopted by which the revenue will be augmented and ends made to meet. But now did the Leader keep the promise he made? He passed the land tax bill and instituted an army of tax collectors to enforce it. We opposed the measure and claimed that it should not have been passed without consulting the people. Besides the land tax they also passed the income and commercial travellers taxes, and in this way they swelled the revenue. They also taxed insurance companies, and the pre-

Grand Opening

OF NEW

Spring Goods

:o:

Everything that is new and fashionable in Mantles, Millinery and Dress Goods, is now being shown by us.

We Personally

Visit the European markets twice a year, and are in a position to offer you all the staples and novelties that are worn for the spring and summer season of 1896.

Our prices are as low as any in the trade, and the quality of our goods the highest.

Our 50c. Black Cashmere

IS THE BEST ON P. E. ISLAND.

STANLEY BROS.

REMEMBER

—THAT IN—

FURNITURE

VALUES THAT TELL
PRICES THAT SELL

—ARE FOUND AT—

Mark Wright & Co., Ltd.

Who sell at Selling Prices

75c.

for a CANE SEATED CHAIR is not extravagant—the cane put in by hand at that. We have two lines we are selling at 75 cents. A little while ago we thought $1.00 cheap for these chairs, but dull times demand reduced prices, and we must keep trade moving,

Mark Wright & Co., Ltd.

Who sell at Selling Prices.

Millmen's Hardware.

Rotary Saws, Belts. Lace Leather, Swages, and all Mill Tools and Oils.

Farmers Hardware.

Axes, Shovels, Nails and all small Hardware.

Sporting Hardware.

Gunpowder, Shot, Caps, &c., &c.

Painters Hardware.

Paints and Oils, and all kinds of Gold Leaf, Bronze, and Campbell's Stock of Brushes.

House Keepers Hardware.

Jewel Stoves and Everything wanted in the kitchen.

All the public admit that our prices are below all others.

To save money you must trade with us.

R. B. NORTON & CO.

City Hardware Store, Charlottetown.

PATON & CO.

Thousands of yards of

OILCLOTH

—AND—

New Carpets

JAS. PATON & CO.

Men's Suits

—AND—

Spring Overcoats

OVERALLS and

Waterproof Coats,

—AT—

JAS. PATON & CO'S.

PATON & CO. PATON & CO.