

OTTAWA LETTER.

Senate Will Investigate Cook's Charges Against the Government.

The Debate on Hon. Mr. Fielding's Budget Speech,

Shows up the Government's Pledge Breaking and Extravagance; Also the Danger of a Financial Crisis.

OTTAWA, March 14.—Canada's cup of shame is fast filling. Yesterday she was branded by a man who has spent a lifetime in her service, as a country that was fast taking into itself the title of the most corrupt in the world. Under liberal rule the national pride of the dominion seems to be falling into the background. With all the advantages that have been here throughout the years of peace, Canada has sunk to a level which is deplorable in the eyes of all self-respecting citizens. But this is not the worst feature. Scandals have arisen on every hand, and the government holds the reins of power as firmly refused to pass judgment on those of its tools who have been connected with some of the disgraceful situations, which it has been the painful necessity of Canadians to face, during the past few years.

Just now, the capital is busily engaged in discussing the senate's proposal to investigate the charges, preferred by Mr. H. H. Cook against the liberal government, in connection with the sale of a senatorship for \$10,000. The facts connected with this remarkable transaction are still fresh in the mind of the public. It will be remembered that Mr. Cook made a solemn affidavit that he had been asked to pay \$10,000 in return for a seat then vacant in the senate. At first Mr. Cook gave to the public a simple statement of fact, but on this being contradicted by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, he made oath that the facts were substantially as he had announced them. It would have been in accordance with public sentiment, if the premier had then demanded full investigation into the charges. Instead of doing this, he contented himself with a simple denial, and on the strength of this Mr. Cook was blackguarded by the liberal press from one end of the country to the other. Systematic effort was made to ruin him and the grifts agents have not yet ceased their work in that respect.

Since Sir Mackenzie Bowell gave notice that he would move for a committee of the senate to investigate the charges, he has had his hands full. Every obstacle has been placed in his way and the government has dictated a course for the liberal senators to follow which would mean an end to impartial enquiry into the case. Yesterday the liberal senators, who would take in order to frustrate the efforts of the conservatives to do justice to Mr. Cook. A caucus is an unusual thing on the senate's side, but the liberal senators on this occasion were present almost to a man, and it was decided to vote against Sir Mackenzie Bowell's motion on straight party lines.

When compared with the policy of the conservative party when charges were preferred against the members of the government or the commons, the action of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his followers must be strongly condemned. Under Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir John S. D. Thompson and Sir John Abbott, members of the conservative party were brought to task where offences against parliamentary usage were alleged. Not only were these persons arraigned, but they were convicted and either expelled from the house or imprisoned. It was felt by the conservative leaders that such actions could not be tolerated in any self-respecting party or by any self-respecting country. Not so with the liberal administration. When Mr. Borden, the leader of the opposition, moved for an investigation into the West Vuxton and Brockton election scandals, the government after being prodded for weeks and months, decided to investigate, but they adopted a course which not only protected the criminals, but resulted in their reward. The outcome of the inquiry was the selling of the whole transaction, and Canada will probably never be much the wiser as to what the Preston machine actually did in Ontario.

When the emergency food rations were sent to Africa, and Canadian troops were sacrificed in order that grift feeders might profit, nothing but a little whitewash was used on that occasion to clear up the outrage. Whitewash is a useful article in the hands of the liberal government, but when it cannot be used the artists have recourse to interest. In either case the dirt is covered up. To hide the objectionable features of the Cook affair is evidently the object of the senators who are working tooth and nail against Sir Mackenzie Bowell. Although the commonsense was quite willing to grant Mr. Borden's request for an investigation into this election charges without that gentleman making specific charges against the alleged wrongdoers, the senate was prepared to treat Sir Mackenzie Bowell's proposition as if it were a mere suggestion. The conservative leader of the senate was met by a suggestion that he should be prepared to state positively that Mr. Cook was justified in making his charges in connection with the senatorship and that the commonsense should try the case. That is, the min-

ister of justice and his following wanted Sir Mackenzie Bowell to play the part of a detective, magistrate and prosecuting attorney, and in this contention the minister was supported by every liberal senator with one exception. Senator Parquet was the one solitary liberal senator who did not turn up for the trial. But a vote was pumped, and by a narrow majority of four it was decided to give Mr. Cook a chance to prove that he is telling the truth or that the government is innocent of the charges he made against them.

Sir Mackenzie Bowell's principal object in demanding an investigation is to clear the senate from the disgrace which has fallen upon it. Senator Prowse sees no reason, if Mr. Cook is offered the chance to purchase a seat in the upper house, why the other gentlemen who have received senatorships should not have been expected to pay up also. That feature of the case will suggest itself to many of the electors who have been watching it with such intense interest. The conclusion of the opinion that no self-respecting body will endure being placed under suspicion for any length of time. The liberals, on the other hand, do not seem to mind this in the least. They are evidently afraid to offend the public, and would protect the government at any cost. The committee as it now stands is a most representative and intelligent one, and the evidence offered by Mr. Cook will be handled in a judicial manner, and the decision granted will be without doubt a just one.

Mr. Fielding and the other gentlemen of the house who kept their seats a year ago, when God Save the Queen was sung, and who have not since been relegated to the more quiet life of private citizenship, acted quite differently the other night when the national anthem, for the second time, answered Mr. Bourassa's fanatical appeal to parliament in behalf of England's enemies. After Sir John Bourne had announced that Mr. Bourassa had been snuffed under by a vote of 144 to 3, Mr. Logan, the member for Cumberland, was the person to suggest that God Save the King should be rendered, and it was sung in a manner that must have carried conviction to the hearts of Messrs. Bourassa, Anger, Monet, and Ebb, all of whom remained seated while the volume of song filled every portion of the chamber. True, there was an opinion among those who were present that the scene that Sir Wilfrid Laurier was highly displeased with Mr. Logan's action. It was hardly politic for the government to place itself in a position which had caused them so much anxiety a year ago.

On June 7th, 1900, it will be remembered, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, in moving an address to Her Majesty the Queen, was answered by Mr. Bourassa in language which was met with cries of "shame." The member for Label heaped insult upon the people of the Empire, of which he acknowledged himself to be a unit. Dr. Montague met his arguments with the request to the house to join in singing God Save the Queen. All the members with the exception of Mr. Fielding, Ardie Campbell, who has since been defeated, Bourassa, Monet, and one or two others rose and took part in the chorus. When the minister of finance and some others were reproached with their conduct they excused themselves by saying that Dr. Montague had been out of order. Well, if Dr. Montague was out of order on that occasion, certainly Mr. Logan was out of order on Tuesday night. He had no more privilege than Dr. Montague had. But the premier and his colleagues have evidently learned a lesson that will serve them as long as they remain in power, and although it must be said that they were rather inclined to discourage any such exhibition of loyalty they had to submit to the inevitable, humiliate themselves and vindictive Dr. Montague in the eyes of the Canadian people. Such a come down was only possible under the elastic policy which enables the government to go to the right about whenever it is thought proper.

OTTAWA, March 15.—The minister of finance, in his budget speech yesterday, congratulated himself upon having made one of the most interesting financial announcements ever placed before the people of Canada. He congratulated himself, congratulated his colleagues, and congratulated the citizens who paid the taxes, but after lauding himself and everybody else to the skies, he uttered an apology which showed that the liberal government was soon to reap the harvest which has resulted from their extravagance during the past four years. Mr. Fielding's speech so far as style, form and language is concerned, would have done credit to any man. In delivering it, he was above everything, brief. The charts which it has been customary to place before parliament for some years past, showing the increase in the various departments in expenditure and revenue, were not produced on this occasion. Instead, Mr. Fielding had lengthy tables prepared, covering periods of five years and showing the increases in the different services, savings banks, chartered banks, etc., etc. This was mere blue book rubbish; matter which might be expected in a party election campaign sheet for the use of stump speakers on the hustings. It was a vain-glorious method of calling attention to what had been done in the past, and its evident object was to produce upon the minds of Mr. Fielding's auditors an unfavorable impression of the government as existing under conservative rule. He left much information that would have been desired by the people buried in his departmental documents and although he was quite willing to quote trade statistics where he thought he might make a point, he refused to produce anything that might be of disadvantage to liberal cause.

It has been said that Mr. Fielding offered an apology to the country. This may be taken as a governor of disastrous consequences following on the policy inaugurated by the Laurier administration and so vigorously opposed by the conservative party. Mr. Fielding obtained alleged results from mere juggling with accounts. In 1900 he estimated his surplus for the

current year at \$7,250,000. But at the end of the year he finds that it was \$3,054,714, the largest ever in the history of the country. He also finds that his total revenue was \$51,023,994. Mr. Fielding provided for expenditures amounting to \$52,717,466 and discovers that the above mentioned surplus was the result. What excellent book-keeping! If any business man were to run his affairs on a similar basis, he would find himself in such a tangle at the end of a few years, that the sheriff or some other representative of the law would have him in hand, but Mr. Fielding is well protected and has no fear of sheriffs. Thus he is able to turn an actual deficit of \$1,687,472 into a surplus of \$3,054,714. If it is borne in mind that this alleged surplus contains capital accounts, expenditures including over \$1,500,000 spent by Mr. Blair for maintenance account on the I. C. R., it will be seen that figures have been called upon to lie. However, they are truthful sort of things and even Mr. Fielding's eloquence and persuasive ways cannot lead intelligent men astray.

Mr. Fielding says to the farmer, the business man, the mechanic, "here is a way to get rich. You receive so much salary or take so much money from your business, each year. It costs you so much to live. Now mark what I do in my department at Ottawa. I take my living expenses, put them in the bank, mortgage my property and with the money so raised pay my living expenses. The money, fellow countrymen, I have raised by mortgage, is my income, and the amount of my actual earnings, which I have safely placed away, is my surplus. Just how I top my creditors will be willing to advance me money on this line of doing business is a matter of doubt, but I will pursue the policy just so long as I am able to, despite the fact that I know it leads to inevitable ruin. Follow my example and you will be able to become rich by other visit to the London money market. They will be paid in the same way as a railway subsidy or a charge for public works. In the past it has been the practice to meet such engagements from the revenue of the country, and in doing so nothing was added to the national debt, but charges on this service; but the time will have come on July 1st next when this policy will have been rendered impossible. According to Mr. Fielding's own story he will then have his hands full to meet his obligations. He will be fighting with a money market of his own creation, and must use the weapons now in his hands. No reinforcements have been expected in those dark days. It will prove a tax on the best of Mr. Fielding's abilities to meet the situation and hide it over. Already he looks back with regret at the days when he might have prepared for the approaching rainy day. The millions that were thrown to right and left without thought of the morrow would now prove excellent support in the day of need. But it is too late now; the opportunity is past, and all we have is the humble apology offered in parliament yesterday. It is with the hope that it may be fully understood that it is conveyed to the public on behalf of the head of the finance department.

OTTAWA, March 16.—The debate on Mr. Fielding's speech is showing up the broken promises of the government, its reckless extravagance and the danger of a financial crisis at almost any time. Yesterday, Sir Richard Cartwright spoke in defence of the policy of the late conservative government, as adopted by the Laurier administration. There was a time when Sir Richard was inclined to attack protection, but \$7,000 a year and a seat in the government benches have proved an effective balm for his conscience and he is now able to support those things which he formerly considered his duty to denounce. One might sit in the house for a session and be absolutely sure that one would not hear the manufacturers of the country referred to as thieves and robbers by the knight from Oxford. Yesterday he defended these persons in connection with whom he had so many hard things to say for so many years. He did not say anything new, and what he did say, was said in much poorer form, so old parliamentarians say, than he had ever been known to assume in the past. It was the same spirit which has been delivered by the member for Oxford during the years he has been on the government benches, and as it has been frequently read before, it is not necessary to repeat it on this occasion. It will be sufficient to say that Sir Richard endorsed every extravagance which he so strongly condemned previous to 1896. He defends the present policy as a re-

must give an account of their stewardship. Glancing back over the past five years it will be found that although some thirty millions of dollars have been quietly taken from the pockets of the people, not one cent of it has been used to reduce the debt of the country. There seems to be no head to the men who control the revenues, which have been placed in the trust of the liberal party. Mr. Blair has borrowed right and left in order that he might make an attempt to throw the dust of a bogus \$100,000 surplus in the eyes of the people. Mr. Tarte does as he likes, and the other ministers also do as Mr. Tarte likes. The present year will see an estimated expenditure of \$46,400,000 from the consolidated fund and \$10,700,000 on capital account, or a grand total of \$57,100,000. This means that the deficit next year will reach the considerable proportions of \$4,350,000, and not \$1,000,000 as suggested by Mr. Fielding. So far the capital expenditure has been larger than in any corresponding period of any year since confederation, and the total outlay from capital account this year will be some millions greater than has been ever estimated by any minister of finance in this country. It is indeed a growing time, but the growth is unfortunate, inasmuch as it is larger in one way than the other. Its growth is on the wrong side of the ledger, and its effects must be felt sooner or later.

Mr. Fielding was to be pitied when it came to the fiscal year commencing July 1st, 1901. With the opening of that period he will be called upon to meet a total of \$1,000,000 in iron counties, which have to be handed over to the Dominion Iron and Steel Company. Nor is he sure that this will be all. He has placed the estimate of the bounties at the lowest possible figure, and anticipates to meet from his other visit to the London money market. They will be paid in the same way as a railway subsidy or a charge for public works. In the past it has been the practice to meet such engagements from the revenue of the country, and in doing so nothing was added to the national debt, but charges on this service; but the time will have come on July 1st next when this policy will have been rendered impossible. According to Mr. Fielding's own story he will then have his hands full to meet his obligations. He will be fighting with a money market of his own creation, and must use the weapons now in his hands. No reinforcements have been expected in those dark days. It will prove a tax on the best of Mr. Fielding's abilities to meet the situation and hide it over. Already he looks back with regret at the days when he might have prepared for the approaching rainy day. The millions that were thrown to right and left without thought of the morrow would now prove excellent support in the day of need. But it is too late now; the opportunity is past, and all we have is the humble apology offered in parliament yesterday. It is with the hope that it may be fully understood that it is conveyed to the public on behalf of the head of the finance department.

venue tariff, and asks the house to be decided when the caucus is held to interpret the meanings of the different terms being applied to the government policy.

Mr. Charlton, the member for North Norfolk, in concluding a speech in his own constituency, told an audience that the liberal party when in power would stop going into debt. Mr. Charlton was almost as strong in his denunciation of extravagant expenditure as Sir Richard Cartwright. He told electors that the grift government would adopt principles of honesty and economy; that they would cut down the annual expenditure by four or five millions of dollars; and they would have the same code of public and private morals. This is almost too much. It sounds well and no doubt it has had certain effects on the minds of those who listened to it, but in the face of the ruinous expenditure that has been carried on during the past four years it is certainly highly amusing. Mr. Charlton has not received a job worth \$7,000 a year, but he is prepared to go to certain lengths in supporting the Laurier administration. Not that he is as bold as Sir Richard, but then Mr. Charlton expected a cabinet position and it has been somewhat disappointing to him that he did not receive it. But he is doing fairly good work in trying to clear the skirts of the government, and perhaps it will be a consolation to the administration to know there is at least an attempt being made to still lead the public by their double barreled policy.

Mr. Clancy, who followed Mr. Osler on Thursday night, endeavored to interpret the meaning of all this, for the benefit of the house. It means that the liberal party went to the country crying out against protection, Sir Richard Cartwright was shouting for protection. But Sir Richard says, "No! not by any means." He considers that he is not a protectionist, but a supporter of the revenue tariff. When he says a revenue tariff he qualifies it by stating that it is a supporter of a tariff in which an increase of taxation above 20 per cent should not be tolerated. Well, in this case, the first minister of the day, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, he did the minister of trade and commerce a gross injustice. Sir Richard has said one thing and Sir Wilfrid another, and Mr. Clancy says they will have to settle the question as to whether the term as applied to the present government's policy, shall be revenue or protection.

But let us consider Sir Richard in 1896. We find that in those days his views as indicated by his own speeches were something on the line: "I say our protective system was a huge mistake, in so far as it was honest at all, and in so far as it was not honest, it was a huge scheme of robbery. A small ring clique of capitalists and protected manufacturers have, as I have told you, been permitted for years to make a prize and plunder of the people of Canada. I stand by the proclamation I have made that protection is nothing more or less than deliberate, legalized and organized robbery, and more than that, if you do not stamp it out, it is the very high road to political slavery first and industrial slavery afterwards. Our policy from first to last has been to destroy the villainous system by free trade, revenue tariff or continental free trade."

What a contrast this makes with the statements of Sir Wilfrid in regard to Sir Richard's earliest, or 1874 policy. This "deliberate legalized and organized robbery" which Sir Richard described so vigorously in 1896, yielded the present government about \$2,000,000 last year. Never in the history of the conservative party were the robbers so expert that they secured this amount. Sir Richard Cartwright and his fellow conspirators (as we use this term in the same sense that Sir Richard himself did some ten years ago) have evidently come from a good school. Last year they gathered some \$3,000,000 over and above their actual needs and they intend, if anything, to commit more of this "deliberate legalized and organized robbery" during the current year.

And what a sad spectacle Sir Richard Cartwright presented between 1896 and 1898. This was the period when the first minister says more particularly of him "he bore the brunt of all the obloquy and never whispered a word." What a picture that was. Imagined a man who was compelled by his own colleagues to bear everything in silence and was prevented from acting on the dictates of his own conscience! But such was the sacrifice that Sir Richard was compelled to make during the four years when he was considered as being more useful with a gag in his mouth. But what was the result? Has the liberal party rewarded this heroic conduct of the hon. minister of trade and commerce? Mr. Clancy says they have not, but instead of doing so, they have made Sir Richard sit at the feet of the present minister of finance, Hon. Mr. Fielding; and the reason of this seems to have been that Sir Richard had some notions as to free trade. But surely Sir Wilfrid Laurier did not treat the minister of trade and commerce fairly in this matter. The previous year that he fully appreciated Sir Richard's interests in the welfare of the country and was cognizant of his strong views in favor of revenue tariff. Therefore it does not seem right that he should be made to sit at the feet of the member for South Oxford, the premier should give him a back seat. Somebody has been prevaricating in

the grift camp, but whether it is Sir Wilfrid or Sir Richard, will have to be decided when the caucus is held to interpret the meanings of the different terms being applied to the government policy.

Mr. Charlton, the member for North Norfolk, in concluding a speech in his own constituency, told an audience that the liberal party when in power would stop going into debt. Mr. Charlton was almost as strong in his denunciation of extravagant expenditure as Sir Richard Cartwright. He told electors that the grift government would adopt principles of honesty and economy; that they would cut down the annual expenditure by four or five millions of dollars; and they would have the same code of public and private morals. This is almost too much. It sounds well and no doubt it has had certain effects on the minds of those who listened to it, but in the face of the ruinous expenditure that has been carried on during the past four years it is certainly highly amusing. Mr. Charlton has not received a job worth \$7,000 a year, but he is prepared to go to certain lengths in supporting the Laurier administration. Not that he is as bold as Sir Richard, but then Mr. Charlton expected a cabinet position and it has been somewhat disappointing to him that he did not receive it. But he is doing fairly good work in trying to clear the skirts of the government, and perhaps it will be a consolation to the administration to know there is at least an attempt being made to still lead the public by their double barreled policy.

Mr. Clancy, who followed Mr. Osler on Thursday night, endeavored to interpret the meaning of all this, for the benefit of the house. It means that the liberal party went to the country crying out against protection, Sir Richard Cartwright was shouting for protection. But Sir Richard says, "No! not by any means." He considers that he is not a protectionist, but a supporter of the revenue tariff. When he says a revenue tariff he qualifies it by stating that it is a supporter of a tariff in which an increase of taxation above 20 per cent should not be tolerated. Well, in this case, the first minister of the day, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, he did the minister of trade and commerce a gross injustice. Sir Richard has said one thing and Sir Wilfrid another, and Mr. Clancy says they will have to settle the question as to whether the term as applied to the present government's policy, shall be revenue or protection.

But let us consider Sir Richard in 1896. We find that in those days his views as indicated by his own speeches were something on the line: "I say our protective system was a huge mistake, in so far as it was honest at all, and in so far as it was not honest, it was a huge scheme of robbery. A small ring clique of capitalists and protected manufacturers have, as I have told you, been permitted for years to make a prize and plunder of the people of Canada. I stand by the proclamation I have made that protection is nothing more or less than deliberate, legalized and organized robbery, and more than that, if you do not stamp it out, it is the very high road to political slavery first and industrial slavery afterwards. Our policy from first to last has been to destroy the villainous system by free trade, revenue tariff or continental free trade."

What a contrast this makes with the statements of Sir Wilfrid in regard to Sir Richard's earliest, or 1874 policy. This "deliberate legalized and organized robbery" which Sir Richard described so vigorously in 1896, yielded the present government about \$2,000,000 last year. Never in the history of the conservative party were the robbers so expert that they secured this amount. Sir Richard Cartwright and his fellow conspirators (as we use this term in the same sense that Sir Richard himself did some ten years ago) have evidently come from a good school. Last year they gathered some \$3,000,000 over and above their actual needs and they intend, if anything, to commit more of this "deliberate legalized and organized robbery" during the current year.

And what a sad spectacle Sir Richard Cartwright presented between 1896 and 1898. This was the period when the first minister says more particularly of him "he bore the brunt of all the obloquy and never whispered a word." What a picture that was. Imagined a man who was compelled by his own colleagues to bear everything in silence and was prevented from acting on the dictates of his own conscience! But such was the sacrifice that Sir Richard was compelled to make during the four years when he was considered as being more useful with a gag in his mouth. But what was the result? Has the liberal party rewarded this heroic conduct of the hon. minister of trade and commerce? Mr. Clancy says they have not, but instead of doing so, they have made Sir Richard sit at the feet of the present minister of finance, Hon. Mr. Fielding; and the reason of this seems to have been that Sir Richard had some notions as to free trade. But surely Sir Wilfrid Laurier did not treat the minister of trade and commerce fairly in this matter. The previous year that he fully appreciated Sir Richard's interests in the welfare of the country and was cognizant of his strong views in favor of revenue tariff. Therefore it does not seem right that he should be made to sit at the feet of the member for South Oxford, the premier should give him a back seat. Somebody has been prevaricating in



Ask the girl who has tested it. Ask any one who has used Surprise Soap if it is not a pure, hard soap; the most satisfactory soap and most economical. Those who try Surprise always continue to use it. SURPRISE is a pure hard Soap.

the grift camp, but whether it is Sir Wilfrid or Sir Richard, will have to be decided when the caucus is held to interpret the meanings of the different terms being applied to the government policy.

Mr. Charlton, the member for North Norfolk, in concluding a speech in his own constituency, told an audience that the liberal party when in power would stop going into debt. Mr. Charlton was almost as strong in his denunciation of extravagant expenditure as Sir Richard Cartwright. He told electors that the grift government would adopt principles of honesty and economy; that they would cut down the annual expenditure by four or five millions of dollars; and they would have the same code of public and private morals. This is almost too much. It sounds well and no doubt it has had certain effects on the minds of those who listened to it, but in the face of the ruinous expenditure that has been carried on during the past four years it is certainly highly amusing. Mr. Charlton has not received a job worth \$7,000 a year, but he is prepared to go to certain lengths in supporting the Laurier administration. Not that he is as bold as Sir Richard, but then Mr. Charlton expected a cabinet position and it has been somewhat disappointing to him that he did not receive it. But he is doing fairly good work in trying to clear the skirts of the government, and perhaps it will be a consolation to the administration to know there is at least an attempt being made to still lead the public by their double barreled policy.

Children Cry for CASTORIA.

MUST WEAR UNIFORM OR COURT DRESS. LONDON, March 20.—At St. James palace, this afternoon, King Edward, wearing a field marshal's uniform, received between forty and fifty deputations from various parts of the kingdom, bearing addresses of condolence and congratulations. His Majesty made an acknowledgment to the general body, but made separate replies to the deputation from Trinity College, Dublin. The Duke of Connaught presented the Freeman's address.

FREE. We give this for selling only 3 dozen. Buy 12 boxes at the same price. Buy 24 boxes at the same price. Buy 36 boxes at the same price. Buy 48 boxes at the same price. Buy 60 boxes at the same price. Buy 72 boxes at the same price. Buy 84 boxes at the same price. Buy 96 boxes at the same price. Buy 108 boxes at the same price. Buy 120 boxes at the same price. Buy 132 boxes at the same price. Buy 144 boxes at the same price. Buy 156 boxes at the same price. Buy 168 boxes at the same price. Buy 180 boxes at the same price. Buy 192 boxes at the same price. Buy 204 boxes at the same price. Buy 216 boxes at the same price. Buy 228 boxes at the same price. Buy 240 boxes at the same price. Buy 252 boxes at the same price. Buy 264 boxes at the same price. Buy 276 boxes at the same price. Buy 288 boxes at the same price. Buy 300 boxes at the same price.

FREE. Simply send us your name and address, and we will send you any of the following goods to suit you. You have said \$2.00 worth, and we will send you this elegant Silver Nickel Watch FREE, guaranteed to be a good time keeper. The goods we want you to sell are: our Gold Plated Bureaus, Colliery Bureaus, which sell at 10c. or 15c. per station. Pens, which sell at 10c. per packet. our Ink Powder, which makes a packet of Needles, sold for 10c. or 15c. per station. Tamblin, with a packet of Needles, sold for 10c. or 15c. per station. Do not forget to send us your name and address at once. Watch for selling \$2.00 worth of goods. We also give Violins, Accordions, and many other goods. NATIONAL TRADING CO., Toronto

AGENTS WANTED. Men and women, of all ages, to sell our goods in all parts of the world. Particulars free. Write today. THE F. C. KERN CO., 132 Victoria Street, Toronto, Canada.

TWEEDIE'S

And the Estlin Present

The Government ing

And Also About On Sum Received Extension

FREDERICTON, house met at 3 o'clock. Mr. Lawson presided. The municipal clerk, Mr. A. J. present. The Diocesan Synod against the bill and School Act. Mr. Purdy gave a suspend rule 19 to question of a bill of St. John to make inquiry into the matter. Mr. Purdy introduced the bill to authorize the city to ply heat, light and steam to the railway. Mr. Copp introduced the bill to incorporate the Dorchester and the Moncton third time.

The bill providing for the sale of the demise of the crown committee with amendments provides a number of officers who do official taken the oath. The House separated at 8:30 p. m., when laid on the table the year, as follows:

Table with columns: RECEIPT, Dominion subsidies, Interest on loan, Territorial extension, Fees, provincial secret, Private and local taxes, Incorporated co, Succession duties, Queen's printer, Licitor licenses, Miscellaneous receipts, Refund from Dominion on fishery leases.

Table with columns: EXPENDITURE, Administration of Justice, Agriculture, Boys' Industrial Home, Contingencies, Debt and Public Education, Elections, Executive government, Fisheries protection, Fish fair, Campobello, Free Grants Act, Game protection, Government bonds, Immigration, Legislature, Lunatic Asylums, Mining, Natural History Society, N. B. Historical Society, Protection, crown lands, Public health, Public works, Public printing, Public works, Refunds, crown lands, Surveys and railway, Fish fair, Campobello, Unforeseen expenses, Aid to sufferers from cancer, Imperial Institute, Tourist Associations.

Table with columns: RECEIPT, Estimated receipts, Estimated expenditure, Balance.

THE BUDGET

Hon. Mr. Tweedie made his budget last year. I stated had exceeded the allowance for all this year. This year if we were to have an ordinary expenditure year, it would have been an and has entailed. The principal was count. Early in 1900, there was a motion that there be a break in Restigouche. Messrs. Messer and get it under control. Penalties were in of health of these responsible and we should take it over. break in Restigouche. Northumberland had out, there was a smallpox in West. outbreak was caused by who came from had the smallpox here. The board most energetically, but the cost to the no way responsible \$5,000 to the South was another extra. I do not anyone in New condemn the gov. Public opinion have justified a than that which a

THEM BRIDGE and the prolonged expense of \$10,484 the opposition act in budgeting it on, worth the money showed facts that before. There were other classes as extra Grant to E. Har Mrs. Rand, \$500; an agent, London, \$1,000; making a total of \$1,500. We have \$751,728. \$758,988.66 for rec balance of \$7,360.35. Since the audit