

Medical. Vegetine. CONDUCTORS TAKE IT. Blotches, Pimples, Humors on the Face and Neck Disappear. A Sovereign Remedy for Rheumatism!

Vegetine. Dr. Callier Surprised. VEGETINE CURED HIS DAUGHTER. CALLENDERVILLE, Ontario, Can., May 16, 1878.

Vegetine. Worked Like a Charm—Cured Salt Rheum and Erysipelas. TO CORNER ST. JOHN'S, N. B., July 10, 1878.

Vegetine. Remarkable Cure of Scrofulous Face. WARRIMONGER, Conn., June 10, 1878.

VEGETINE. PREPARED BY H. R. STEVENS, Boston, Mass., and Toronto, Ont. Vegetine is Sold by all Druggists.

HOOR BITTERS. (A Bilethecic, or Bile-Former.) CONTAINS HOOP, BECHU, MANDEKAR, DANDELION.

New Leather & Shoe Store. The Subscriber, having disposed of his business and retired from the business occupation of life, has opened a

TIN SHOP. I have now opened the well known establishment formerly occupied by the late James Gray, and with the kind assistance of former friends, and prepared to execute all work in

TIN, SHEET-IRON, GAS-FITTING. Granite Ware, Japanned Stamped and Plain.

PLOUGH, A nice assortment of Faro and Cooking Stoves, fitted with PATENT OVENS the inner shells of which draw out cleanest possible

WALL PAPER! AT THE MIRAMICHI BOOKSTORE.

BUSINESS NOTICE. The "MIRAMICHI ADVANCE" is published at Chatham, Miramichi, N. B., every Thursday morning

Miramichi Advance. CHATHAM, N. B., NOVEMBER 17, 1881.

A cup of Tea for the "Sun." The St. John Sun of last Friday, 11th inst., ventures to have "another word with the ADVANCE" on the subject of Tea Duties—said word being nearly a column and a quarter long.

About "Facts." "The truth is, Mr. Advance, your facts are as crooked as your politics, and your politics are as crooked as your facts."

A Sample of Tory Warfare. In concluding his reply to the address presented to him by the Lieut-Governor of Quebec, on the eve of his departure for Great Britain, His Excellency, the Governor-General said:

That Surplus and Taxation. It may not be too soon to ask the Finance Minister what he is going to do with his surplus? Though Parliament will not, in all probability, meet before February, the question of the disposal of the respectable amount of over \$4,000,000 is one which will require a good deal of consideration.

Quantity Collected. The "MIRAMICHI ADVANCE" having its large circulation distributed principally in the Counties of Kent, Northumberland, Gloucester and Westchester (New Brunswick), and in Bonaventure and Gaspé (Quebec), among communities engaged in Lumbering, Fishing and Agricultural pursuits, offers superior inducements to advertisers.

Quantity Collected. Makeable period; 25,568,638 \$1,146,303. "MIRAMICHI ADVANCE"; 25,967,528 1,385,177.

Quantity Collected. If the Macdonald-Tilley Government had been contented to levy duties at the rates which satisfied their predecessors, they would have collected only \$1,871,800 more than the latter did, on the imports during the two years named, that being the relative difference between their respective imports for duty computed at the Mackenzie rate, but instead of taking this \$1,871,800, they took no less than \$238,974, or an excess of \$221,063 more than would have been levied under the Mackenzie Tariff.

They would have collected only \$1,871,800 more than the latter did, on the imports during the two years named, that being the relative difference between their respective imports for duty computed at the Mackenzie rate, but instead of taking this \$1,871,800, they took no less than \$238,974, or an excess of \$221,063 more than would have been levied under the Mackenzie Tariff.

Of course, the Macdonald-Tilley Government see that they are placing burdens upon the people which cannot be borne. Sir Leonard, the author of these burdens—the gentleman who used to be a free-trader, but whose tears were bestowed in St. John upon the effects of his protective policy—having read that history repeats itself, wishes to make a pretence of wiping out the Tea duties, just as he did in 1872—the year preceding the collapse of his Government, when he "went down" with the Pacific Scandal "Ship," and "came up," with an increased salary in Government House, Fredericton. He will find, however, that though his special organ promises the repeal of those duties, and although he may carry the promise into effect, and though, in the repetition of history, his Government ship will go down as it did the year after the former pretence of Tea duty repeal, the people will not again sanction him as one who should continue to reap the fruits of his levying duties on Tea, while that enormous fiscal crime is chargeable to the late Mackenzie administration, which invented and levied those duties under the baneful influence of Mr. Snowball, who—be it remembered—was not at the time a member of Parliament. The Sun's article asserts so much, that it becomes as absurd as its source is irresponsible. It states that we have said, "Mr. Snowball did this and that and the other—things which we never thought of saying—and it mixes up Snowball's Tea duties and Snowball's slabs with a recklessness that is suggestive of something stronger than tea, having become mixed in the Sun's vicinity, and, as all events, conveys to its readers an idea of public opinion.

It is impossible to follow the Sun's article all through its crazy sentences of unfounded assertions and lame conclusions, for there is neither method nor argument in it from first to last. Taking, however, an average of it we find that it labors to have its readers believe that the ADVANCE knows nothing about the history of the Tea duties, that the Macdonald-Tilley Government did not tax Tea, that the Mackenzie Government and Mr. Snowball did tax Tea and that tax Tea was a crime prior to 1878, but a different kind of thing under the beneficent N. P. The ADVANCE stated last week that the Macdonald-Tilley Government made taxation of Tea a part of their fiscal policy just after Confederation. The Sun dodges this fact and points to the repeal of the Tea duties in 1872, forgetting, however, the substitution therefor of the differential duties on Tea coming from the United States. It may be a waste of space and time to discuss the subject on its merits with the Sun, but in order that our readers may be in a position to judge for themselves as to which of the two Governments made the people of Canada pay the most in the way of duties for their Tea, we will submit the facts as shown by the Trade Returns of the Dominion for ten or eleven years, beginning with 1869.

It is well known that the Macdonald-Tilley Government was in power from the time of Confederation until November, 1873 and that until its partial abolition of the Tea duties it levied 34 cents per lb. and 15 per cent, ad valorem, on black Tea, and 7 cents a pound and 15 per cent, ad valorem, on Green and Japan Tea. This was equal to over seven cents per pound for black and nearly 12 cents per pound for green Tea. And yet the Sun would have us believe that the Good Conservatives did not tax Tea.

But let us look at what the Trade Returns tell us in reference to the amount of the Tea duties imposed by the two Governments. The Mackenzie Government was in power five years, so we will compare what Canadians paid for Tea duties during that regime with the five years immediately preceding, under the Macdonald-Tilley administration. For the two periods the quantities and duties were as follows—

Table with 3 columns: Year, Stp. fls., and Quantity. Data for years 1877-1881.

As we stated on 3rd inst., the vessels were about the same average tonnage each year. The reputation of a national flag of fully 80% for Chatham lumber trade.

Now, if the Sun's readers will compare that paper's statement of the vast increase this year of our lumber trade with the "facts" as shown by the correct official records they will be better enabled to appreciate the sublime impertinence of the paragraph we have quoted. The reputation of a national flag in the matter of "facts" is about equal to that of Sir Charles Tupper and of "theories" it is painfully like that good old "prophetic son" Sir Leonard Tilley. There is, however, a display of ingenuity and ability about Sir Charles's mis-statements, and a vein of sincerity pervading Sir Leonard's theoretic gymnastics which are entirely wanting in the Sun. So much for the great organ's posturing lecturer on "facts" and "theories."

That Surplus and Taxation. It may not be too soon to ask the Finance Minister what he is going to do with his surplus? Though Parliament will not, in all probability, meet before February, the question of the disposal of the respectable amount of over \$4,000,000 is one which will require a good deal of consideration.

But, says the Sun, "the Grits taxed tea just as soon as they got into power." We admitted that last week and said the extravagant obligations to which the Conservatives had committed the country demanded that the taxing policy which the Macdonald-Tilley Administration introduced should be continued. However, changed the mode of levying the duties, which lowered them all round. Now, if the taxing of tea is a political sin, and if it is original sin chargeable to the "Grits," why is it that when the tea-tax-abhorring Macdonald and Tilley returned to power they did not repeal the Tea duties? Perhaps the Sun will explain how it happens that the Trade Returns show, not only that those knighted lovers of the workingman continued to impose duties on Tea, but actually changed the mode of levying so as to restore their own old style and impose more pounds than was paid under the Mackenzie Government's Tariff. The latest available returns cover only two years under the Sun's pet administration, so we will compare them with the last two years of the Mackenzie regime.

Table with 3 columns: Quantity, lbs., and Duty collected. Data for years 1877-1881.

Quantity Collected. If the Macdonald-Tilley Government had been contented to levy duties at the rates which satisfied their predecessors, they would have collected only \$1,871,800 more than the latter did, on the imports during the two years named, that being the relative difference between their respective imports for duty computed at the Mackenzie rate, but instead of taking this \$1,871,800, they took no less than \$238,974, or an excess of \$221,063 more than would have been levied under the Mackenzie Tariff.

Of course, the Macdonald-Tilley Government see that they are placing burdens upon the people which cannot be borne. Sir Leonard, the author of these burdens—the gentleman who used to be a free-trader, but whose tears were bestowed in St. John upon the effects of his protective policy—having read that history repeats itself, wishes to make a pretence of wiping out the Tea duties, just as he did in 1872—the year preceding the collapse of his Government, when he "went down" with the Pacific Scandal "Ship," and "came up," with an increased salary in Government House, Fredericton. He will find, however, that though his special organ promises the repeal of those duties, and although he may carry the promise into effect, and though, in the repetition of history, his Government ship will go down as it did the year after the former pretence of Tea duty repeal, the people will not again sanction him as one who should continue to reap the fruits of his levying duties on Tea, while that enormous fiscal crime is chargeable to the late Mackenzie administration, which invented and levied those duties under the baneful influence of Mr. Snowball, who—be it remembered—was not at the time a member of Parliament. The Sun's article asserts so much, that it becomes as absurd as its source is irresponsible. It states that we have said, "Mr. Snowball did this and that and the other—things which we never thought of saying—and it mixes up Snowball's Tea duties and Snowball's slabs with a recklessness that is suggestive of something stronger than tea, having become mixed in the Sun's vicinity, and, as all events, conveys to its readers an idea of public opinion.

It is impossible to follow the Sun's article all through its crazy sentences of unfounded assertions and lame conclusions, for there is neither method nor argument in it from first to last. Taking, however, an average of it we find that it labors to have its readers believe that the ADVANCE knows nothing about the history of the Tea duties, that the Macdonald-Tilley Government did not tax Tea, that the Mackenzie Government and Mr. Snowball did tax Tea and that tax Tea was a crime prior to 1878, but a different kind of thing under the beneficent N. P. The ADVANCE stated last week that the Macdonald-Tilley Government made taxation of Tea a part of their fiscal policy just after Confederation. The Sun dodges this fact and points to the repeal of the Tea duties in 1872, forgetting, however, the substitution therefor of the differential duties on Tea coming from the United States. It may be a waste of space and time to discuss the subject on its merits with the Sun, but in order that our readers may be in a position to judge for themselves as to which of the two Governments made the people of Canada pay the most in the way of duties for their Tea, we will submit the facts as shown by the Trade Returns of the Dominion for ten or eleven years, beginning with 1869.

It is well known that the Macdonald-Tilley Government was in power from the time of Confederation until November, 1873 and that until its partial abolition of the Tea duties it levied 34 cents per lb. and 15 per cent, ad valorem, on black Tea, and 7 cents a pound and 15 per cent, ad valorem, on Green and Japan Tea. This was equal to over seven cents per pound for black and nearly 12 cents per pound for green Tea. And yet the Sun would have us believe that the Good Conservatives did not tax Tea.

But let us look at what the Trade Returns tell us in reference to the amount of the Tea duties imposed by the two Governments. The Mackenzie Government was in power five years, so we will compare what Canadians paid for Tea duties during that regime with the five years immediately preceding, under the Macdonald-Tilley administration. For the two periods the quantities and duties were as follows—

Table with 3 columns: Year, Stp. fls., and Quantity. Data for years 1877-1881.

They would have collected only \$1,871,800 more than the latter did, on the imports during the two years named, that being the relative difference between their respective imports for duty computed at the Mackenzie rate, but instead of taking this \$1,871,800, they took no less than \$238,974, or an excess of \$221,063 more than would have been levied under the Mackenzie Tariff.

Of course, the Macdonald-Tilley Government see that they are placing burdens upon the people which cannot be borne. Sir Leonard, the author of these burdens—the gentleman who used to be a free-trader, but whose tears were bestowed in St. John upon the effects of his protective policy—having read that history repeats itself, wishes to make a pretence of wiping out the Tea duties, just as he did in 1872—the year preceding the collapse of his Government, when he "went down" with the Pacific Scandal "Ship," and "came up," with an increased salary in Government House, Fredericton. He will find, however, that though his special organ promises the repeal of those duties, and although he may carry the promise into effect, and though, in the repetition of history, his Government ship will go down as it did the year after the former pretence of Tea duty repeal, the people will not again sanction him as one who should continue to reap the fruits of his levying duties on Tea, while that enormous fiscal crime is chargeable to the late Mackenzie administration, which invented and levied those duties under the baneful influence of Mr. Snowball, who—be it remembered—was not at the time a member of Parliament. The Sun's article asserts so much, that it becomes as absurd as its source is irresponsible. It states that we have said, "Mr. Snowball did this and that and the other—things which we never thought of saying—and it mixes up Snowball's Tea duties and Snowball's slabs with a recklessness that is suggestive of something stronger than tea, having become mixed in the Sun's vicinity, and, as all events, conveys to its readers an idea of public opinion.

It is impossible to follow the Sun's article all through its crazy sentences of unfounded assertions and lame conclusions, for there is neither method nor argument in it from first to last. Taking, however, an average of it we find that it labors to have its readers believe that the ADVANCE knows nothing about the history of the Tea duties, that the Macdonald-Tilley Government did not tax Tea, that the Mackenzie Government and Mr. Snowball did tax Tea and that tax Tea was a crime prior to 1878, but a different kind of thing under the beneficent N. P. The ADVANCE stated last week that the Macdonald-Tilley Government made taxation of Tea a part of their fiscal policy just after Confederation. The Sun dodges this fact and points to the repeal of the Tea duties in 1872, forgetting, however, the substitution therefor of the differential duties on Tea coming from the United States. It may be a waste of space and time to discuss the subject on its merits with the Sun, but in order that our readers may be in a position to judge for themselves as to which of the two Governments made the people of Canada pay the most in the way of duties for their Tea, we will submit the facts as shown by the Trade Returns of the Dominion for ten or eleven years, beginning with 1869.

It is well known that the Macdonald-Tilley Government was in power from the time of Confederation until November, 1873 and that until its partial abolition of the Tea duties it levied 34 cents per lb. and 15 per cent, ad valorem, on black Tea, and 7 cents a pound and 15 per cent, ad valorem, on Green and Japan Tea. This was equal to over seven cents per pound for black and nearly 12 cents per pound for green Tea. And yet the Sun would have us believe that the Good Conservatives did not tax Tea.

But let us look at what the Trade Returns tell us in reference to the amount of the Tea duties imposed by the two Governments. The Mackenzie Government was in power five years, so we will compare what Canadians paid for Tea duties during that regime with the five years immediately preceding, under the Macdonald-Tilley administration. For the two periods the quantities and duties were as follows—

Table with 3 columns: Year, Stp. fls., and Quantity. Data for years 1877-1881.

As we stated on 3rd inst., the vessels were about the same average tonnage each year. The reputation of a national flag of fully 80% for Chatham lumber trade.

Now, if the Sun's readers will compare that paper's statement of the vast increase this year of our lumber trade with the "facts" as shown by the correct official records they will be better enabled to appreciate the sublime impertinence of the paragraph we have quoted. The reputation of a national flag in the matter of "facts" is about equal to that of Sir Charles Tupper and of "theories" it is painfully like that good old "prophetic son" Sir Leonard Tilley. There is, however, a display of ingenuity and ability about Sir Charles's mis-statements, and a vein of sincerity pervading Sir Leonard's theoretic gymnastics which are entirely wanting in the Sun. So much for the great organ's posturing lecturer on "facts" and "theories."

That Surplus and Taxation. It may not be too soon to ask the Finance Minister what he is going to do with his surplus? Though Parliament will not, in all probability, meet before February, the question of the disposal of the respectable amount of over \$4,000,000 is one which will require a good deal of consideration.

But, says the Sun, "the Grits taxed tea just as soon as they got into power." We admitted that last week and said the extravagant obligations to which the Conservatives had committed the country demanded that the taxing policy which the Macdonald-Tilley Administration introduced should be continued. However, changed the mode of levying the duties, which lowered them all round. Now, if the taxing of tea is a political sin, and if it is original sin chargeable to the "Grits," why is it that when the tea-tax-abhorring Macdonald and Tilley returned to power they did not repeal the Tea duties? Perhaps the Sun will explain how it happens that the Trade Returns show, not only that those knighted lovers of the workingman continued to impose duties on Tea, but actually changed the mode of levying so as to restore their own old style and impose more pounds than was paid under the Mackenzie Government's Tariff. The latest available returns cover only two years under the Sun's pet administration, so we will compare them with the last two years of the Mackenzie regime.

Table with 3 columns: Quantity, lbs., and Duty collected. Data for years 1877-1881.

Quantity Collected. If the Macdonald-Tilley Government had been contented to levy duties at the rates which satisfied their predecessors, they would have collected only \$1,871,800 more than the latter did, on the imports during the two years named, that being the relative difference between their respective imports for duty computed at the Mackenzie rate, but instead of taking this \$1,871,800, they took no less than \$238,974, or an excess of \$221,063 more than would have been levied under the Mackenzie Tariff.

Of course, the Macdonald-Tilley Government see that they are placing burdens upon the people which cannot be borne. Sir Leonard, the author of these burdens—the gentleman who used to be a free-trader, but whose tears were bestowed in St. John upon the effects of his protective policy—having read that history repeats itself, wishes to make a pretence of wiping out the Tea duties, just as he did in 1872—the year preceding the collapse of his Government, when he "went down" with the Pacific Scandal "Ship," and "came up," with an increased salary in Government House, Fredericton. He will find, however, that though his special organ promises the repeal of those duties, and although he may carry the promise into effect, and though, in the repetition of history, his Government ship will go down as it did the year after the former pretence of Tea duty repeal, the people will not again sanction him as one who should continue to reap the fruits of his levying duties on Tea, while that enormous fiscal crime is chargeable to the late Mackenzie administration, which invented and levied those duties under the baneful influence of Mr. Snowball, who—be it remembered—was not at the time a member of Parliament. The Sun's article asserts so much, that it becomes as absurd as its source is irresponsible. It states that we have said, "Mr. Snowball did this and that and the other—things which we never thought of saying—and it mixes up Snowball's Tea duties and Snowball's slabs with a recklessness that is suggestive of something stronger than tea, having become mixed in the Sun's vicinity, and, as all events, conveys to its readers an idea of public opinion.

It is impossible to follow the Sun's article all through its crazy sentences of unfounded assertions and lame conclusions, for there is neither method nor argument in it from first to last. Taking, however, an average of it we find that it labors to have its readers believe that the ADVANCE knows nothing about the history of the Tea duties, that the Macdonald-Tilley Government did not tax Tea, that the Mackenzie Government and Mr. Snowball did tax Tea and that tax Tea was a crime prior to 1878, but a different kind of thing under the beneficent N. P. The ADVANCE stated last week that the Macdonald-Tilley Government made taxation of Tea a part of their fiscal policy just after Confederation. The Sun dodges this fact and points to the repeal of the Tea duties in 1872, forgetting, however, the substitution therefor of the differential duties on Tea coming from the United States. It may be a waste of space and time to discuss the subject on its merits with the Sun, but in order that our readers may be in a position to judge for themselves as to which of the two Governments made the people of Canada pay the most in the way of duties for their Tea, we will submit the facts as shown by the Trade Returns of the Dominion for ten or eleven years, beginning with 1869.

It is well known that the Macdonald-Tilley Government was in power from the time of Confederation until November, 1873 and that until its partial abolition of the Tea duties it levied 34 cents per lb. and 15 per cent, ad valorem, on black Tea, and 7 cents a pound and 15 per cent, ad valorem, on Green and Japan Tea. This was equal to over seven cents per pound for black and nearly 12 cents per pound for green Tea. And yet the Sun would have us believe that the Good Conservatives did not tax Tea.

But let us look at what the Trade Returns tell us in reference to the amount of the Tea duties imposed by the two Governments. The Mackenzie Government was in power five years, so we will compare what Canadians paid for Tea duties during that regime with the five years immediately preceding, under the Macdonald-Tilley administration. For the two periods the quantities and duties were as follows—

Table with 3 columns: Year, Stp. fls., and Quantity. Data for years 1877-1881.

They would have collected only \$1,871,800 more than the latter did, on the imports during the two years named, that being the relative difference between their respective imports for duty computed at the Mackenzie rate, but instead of taking this \$1,871,800, they took no less than \$238,974, or an excess of \$221,063 more than would have been levied under the Mackenzie Tariff.

Of course, the Macdonald-Tilley Government see that they are placing burdens upon the people which cannot be borne. Sir Leonard, the author of these burdens—the gentleman who used to be a free-trader, but whose tears were bestowed in St. John upon the effects of his protective policy—having read that history repeats itself, wishes to make a pretence of wiping out the Tea duties, just as he did in 1872—the year preceding the collapse of his Government, when he "went down" with the Pacific Scandal "Ship," and "came up," with an increased salary in Government House, Fredericton. He will find, however, that though his special organ promises the repeal of those duties, and although he may carry the promise into effect, and though, in the repetition of history, his Government ship will go down as it did the year after the former pretence of Tea duty repeal, the people will not again sanction him as one who should continue to reap the fruits of his levying duties on Tea, while that enormous fiscal crime is chargeable to the late Mackenzie administration, which invented and levied those duties under the baneful influence of Mr. Snowball, who—be it remembered—was not at the time a member of Parliament. The Sun's article asserts so much, that it becomes as absurd as its source is irresponsible. It states that we have said, "Mr. Snowball did this and that and the other—things which we never thought of saying—and it mixes up Snowball's Tea duties and Snowball's slabs with a recklessness that is suggestive of something stronger than tea, having become mixed in the Sun's vicinity, and, as all events, conveys to its readers an idea of public opinion.

It is impossible to follow the Sun's article all through its crazy sentences of unfounded assertions and lame conclusions, for there is neither method nor argument in it from first to last. Taking, however, an average of it we find that it labors to have its readers believe that the ADVANCE knows nothing about the history of the Tea duties, that the Macdonald-Tilley Government did not tax Tea, that the Mackenzie Government and Mr. Snowball did tax Tea and that tax Tea was a crime prior to 1878, but a different kind of thing under the beneficent N. P. The ADVANCE stated last week that the Macdonald-Tilley Government made taxation of Tea a part of their fiscal policy just after Confederation. The Sun dodges this fact and points to the repeal of the Tea duties in 1872, forgetting, however, the substitution therefor of the differential duties on Tea coming from the United States. It may be a waste of space and time to discuss the subject on its merits with the Sun, but in order that our readers may be in a position to judge for themselves as to which of the two Governments made the people of Canada pay the most in the way of duties for their Tea, we will submit the facts as shown by the Trade Returns of the Dominion for ten or eleven years, beginning with 1869.

It is well known that the Macdonald-Tilley Government was in power from the time of Confederation until November, 1873 and that until its partial abolition of the Tea duties it levied 34 cents per lb. and 15 per cent, ad valorem, on black Tea, and 7 cents a pound and 15 per cent, ad valorem, on Green and Japan Tea. This was equal to over seven cents per pound for black and nearly 12 cents per pound for green Tea. And yet the Sun would have us believe that the Good Conservatives did not tax Tea.

But let us look at what the Trade Returns tell us in reference to the amount of the Tea duties imposed by the two Governments. The Mackenzie Government was in power five years, so we will compare what Canadians paid for Tea duties during that regime with the five years immediately preceding, under the Macdonald-Tilley administration. For the two periods the quantities and duties were as follows—

Table with 3 columns: Year, Stp. fls., and Quantity. Data for years 1877-1881.

As we stated on 3rd inst., the vessels were about the same average tonnage each year. The reputation of a national flag of fully 80% for Chatham lumber trade.

Now, if the Sun's readers will compare that paper's statement of the vast increase this year of our lumber trade with the "facts" as shown by the correct official records they will be better enabled to appreciate the sublime impertinence of the paragraph we have quoted. The reputation of a national flag in the matter of "facts" is about equal to that of Sir Charles Tupper and of "theories" it is painfully like that good old "prophetic son" Sir Leonard Tilley. There is, however, a display of ingenuity and ability about Sir Charles's mis-statements, and a vein of sincerity pervading Sir Leonard's theoretic gymnastics which are entirely wanting in the Sun. So much for the great organ's posturing lecturer on "facts" and "theories."

That Surplus and Taxation. It may not be too soon to ask the Finance Minister what he is going to do with his surplus? Though Parliament will not, in all probability, meet before February, the question of the disposal of the respectable amount of over \$4,000,000 is one which will require a good deal of consideration.

But, says the Sun, "the Grits taxed tea just as soon as they got into power." We admitted that last week and said the extravagant obligations to which the Conservatives had committed the country demanded that the taxing policy which the Macdonald-Tilley Administration introduced should be continued. However, changed the mode of levying the duties, which lowered them all round. Now, if the taxing of tea is a political sin, and if it is original sin chargeable to the "Grits," why is it that when the tea-tax-abhorring Macdonald and Tilley returned to power they did not repeal the Tea duties? Perhaps the Sun will explain how it happens that the Trade Returns show, not only that those knighted lovers of the workingman continued to impose duties on Tea, but actually changed the mode of levying so as to restore their own old style and impose more pounds than was paid under the Mackenzie Government's Tariff. The latest available returns cover only two years under the Sun's pet administration, so we will compare them with the last two years of the Mackenzie regime.

Table with 3 columns: Quantity, lbs., and Duty collected. Data for years 1877-1881.

Quantity Collected. If the Macdonald-Tilley Government had been contented to levy duties at the rates which satisfied their predecessors, they would have collected only \$1,871,800 more than the latter did, on the imports during the two years named, that being the relative difference between their respective imports for duty computed at the Mackenzie rate, but instead of taking this \$1,871,800, they took no less than \$238,974, or an excess of \$221,063 more than would have been levied under the Mackenzie Tariff.

Of course, the Macdonald-Tilley Government see that they are placing burdens upon the people which cannot be borne. Sir Leonard, the author of these burdens—the gentleman who used to be a free-trader, but whose tears were bestowed in St. John upon the effects of his protective policy—having read that history repeats itself, wishes to make a pretence of wiping out the Tea duties, just as he did in 1872—the year preceding the collapse of his Government, when he "went down" with the Pacific Scandal "Ship," and "came up," with an increased salary in Government House, Fredericton. He will find, however, that though his special organ promises the repeal of those duties, and although he may carry the promise into effect, and though, in the repetition of history, his Government ship will go down as it did the year after the former pretence of Tea duty repeal, the people will not again sanction him as one who should continue to reap the fruits of his levying duties on Tea, while that enormous fiscal crime is chargeable to the late Mackenzie administration, which invented and levied those duties under the baneful influence of Mr. Snowball, who—be it remembered—was not at the time a member of Parliament. The Sun's article asserts so much, that it becomes as absurd as its source is irresponsible. It states that we have said, "Mr. Snowball did this and that and the other—things which we never thought of saying—and it mixes up Snowball's Tea duties and Snowball's slabs with a recklessness that is suggestive of something stronger than tea, having become mixed in the Sun's vicinity, and, as all events, conveys to its readers an idea of public opinion.

It is impossible to follow the Sun's article all through its crazy sentences of unfounded assertions and lame conclusions, for there is neither method nor argument in it from first to last. Taking, however, an average of it we find that it labors to have its readers believe that the ADVANCE knows nothing about the history of the Tea duties, that the Macdonald-Tilley Government did not tax Tea, that the Mackenzie Government and Mr. Snowball did tax Tea and that tax Tea was a crime prior to 1878, but a different kind of thing under the beneficent N. P. The ADVANCE stated last week that the Macdonald-Tilley Government made taxation of Tea a part of their fiscal policy just after Confederation. The Sun dodges this fact and points to the repeal of the Tea duties in 1872, forgetting, however, the substitution therefor of the differential duties on Tea coming from the United States. It may be a waste of space and time to discuss the subject on its merits with the Sun, but in order that our readers may be in a position to judge for themselves as to which of the two Governments made the people of Canada pay the most in the way of duties for their Tea, we will submit the facts as shown by the Trade Returns of the Dominion for ten or eleven years, beginning with 1869.

It is well known that the Macdonald-Tilley Government was in power from the time of Confederation until November, 1873 and that until its partial abolition of the Tea duties it levied 34 cents per lb. and 15 per cent, ad valorem, on black Tea, and 7 cents a pound and 15 per cent, ad valorem, on Green and Japan Tea. This was equal to over seven cents per pound for black and nearly 12 cents per pound for green Tea. And yet the Sun would have us believe that the Good Conservatives did not tax Tea.

But let us look at what the Trade Returns tell us in reference to the amount of the Tea duties imposed by the two Governments. The Mackenzie Government was in power five years, so we will compare what Canadians paid for Tea duties during that regime with the five years immediately preceding, under the Macdonald-Tilley administration. For the two periods the quantities and duties were as follows—

Table with 3 columns: Year, Stp. fls., and Quantity. Data for years 1877-1881.

They would have collected only \$1,871,800 more than the latter did, on the imports during the two years named, that being the relative difference between their respective imports for duty computed at the Mackenzie rate, but instead of taking this \$1,871,800, they took no less than \$238,974, or an excess of \$221,063 more than would have been levied under the Mackenzie Tariff.

Of course, the Macdonald-Tilley Government see that they are placing burdens upon the people which cannot be borne. Sir Leonard, the author of these burdens—the gentleman who used to be a free-trader, but whose tears were bestowed in St. John upon the effects of his protective policy—having read that history repeats itself, wishes to make a pretence of wiping out the Tea duties, just as he did in 1872—the year preceding the collapse of his Government, when he "went down" with the Pacific Scandal "Ship," and "came up," with an increased salary in Government House, Fredericton. He will find, however, that though his special organ promises the repeal of those duties, and although he may carry the promise into effect, and though, in the repetition of history, his Government ship will go down as it did the year after the former pretence of Tea duty repeal, the people will not again sanction him as one who should continue to reap the fruits of his levying duties on Tea, while that enormous fiscal crime is chargeable to the late Mackenzie administration, which invented and levied those duties under the baneful influence of Mr. Snowball, who—be it remembered—was not at the time a member of Parliament. The Sun's article asserts so much, that it becomes as absurd as its source is irresponsible. It states that we have said, "Mr. Snowball did this and that and the other—things which we never thought of saying—and it mixes up Snowball's Tea duties and Snowball's slabs with a recklessness that is suggestive of something stronger than tea, having become mixed in the Sun's vicinity, and, as all events, conveys to its readers an idea of public opinion.

It is impossible to follow the Sun's article all through its crazy sentences of unfounded assertions and lame conclusions, for there is neither method nor argument in it from first to last. Taking, however, an average of it we find that it labors to have its readers believe that the ADVANCE knows nothing about the history of the Tea duties, that the Macdonald-Tilley Government did not tax Tea, that the Mackenzie Government and Mr. Snowball did tax Tea and that tax Tea was a crime prior to 1878, but a different kind of thing under the beneficent N. P. The ADVANCE stated last week that the Macdonald-Tilley Government made taxation of Tea a part of their fiscal policy just after Confederation. The Sun dodges this fact and points to the repeal of the Tea duties in 1872, forgetting, however, the substitution therefor of the differential duties on Tea coming from the United States. It may be a waste of space and time to discuss the subject on its merits with the Sun, but in order that our readers may be in a position to judge for themselves as to which of the two Governments made the people of Canada pay the most in the way of duties for their Tea, we will submit the facts as shown by the Trade Returns of the Dominion for ten or eleven years, beginning with 1869.

It is well known that the Macdonald-Tilley Government was in power from the time of Confederation until November, 1873 and that until its partial abolition of the Tea duties it levied 34 cents per lb. and 15 per cent, ad valorem, on black Tea, and 7 cents a pound and 15 per cent, ad valorem, on Green and Japan Tea. This was equal to over seven cents per pound for black and nearly 12 cents per pound for green Tea. And yet the Sun would have us believe that the Good Conservatives did not tax Tea.

But let us look at what the Trade Returns tell us in reference to the amount of the Tea duties imposed by the two Governments. The Mackenzie Government was in power five years, so we will compare what Canadians paid for Tea duties during that regime with the five years immediately preceding, under the Macdonald-Tilley administration. For the two periods the quantities and duties were as follows—

Table with 3 columns: Year, Stp. fls., and Quantity. Data for years 1877-1881.

As we stated on 3rd inst., the vessels were about the same average tonnage each year. The reputation of a national flag of fully 80% for Chatham lumber trade.

Now, if the Sun's readers will compare that paper's statement of the vast increase this year of our lumber trade with the "facts" as shown by the correct official records they will be better enabled to appreciate the sublime impertinence of the paragraph we have quoted. The reputation of a national flag in the matter of "facts" is about equal to that of Sir Charles Tupper and of "theories" it is painfully like that good old "prophetic son" Sir Leonard Tilley. There is, however, a display of ingenuity and ability about Sir Charles's mis-statements, and a vein of sincerity pervading Sir Leonard's theoretic gymn