CAUGHT SUSSEX DOCTORS BY LIES

Spotter Admits His Offense

Got Liquor Prescription Repeated for Same "Ailment"

Accused Physician Taken in By His Plausible Story Handed Him the Order Without Examination--Conspired with Scott Act Inspector to Catch the Medicos.

Sussex, N. B., Aug. 26—The cases of alleged violation of the Canada Temperance Act on the part of several prominent local physicians still hold the centre of attraction here today. Standing room was at a premium at both sessions before Magistrate Folkins today.

This afternoon the second case against Dr. D. H. McAlister was heard in which the evidence showed that Gjerde, not content with taking Dr. McAlister in once, returned to him a few days later and succeeded in procuring a prescription for eight ounces of whiskey.

Gjerde was the first witness called. He said that on August 12 he obtained a prescription for whiskey from Dr. McAlister without the formality of a physical examination or without saying that it was for medicinal purposes.

C. H. Fairweather told of filling the prescription with eight ounces of Scotch whiskey.

The defendant sworn, said that Gjerde had called, and as he had been there before asked him how he was feeling and received the response that he was better. Witness said that the Norwegian told him a story about going out to look over some lumber areas similar to the tale related in the case against Dr. Gilchrist this morning. "Then," said the witness, "he made a motion to me as if writing which I took to mean he wanted another prescription. Later he asked me for it. I gave it to him in consequence of a previous examination and because I thought it had done him good and that he had not abused it."

Believed He was Doing Right.

Asked by Mr. Fowler if he believed in good faith when he prescribed the ten ounces that it was the proper thing to do, witness replied, "Yes," and after the conversation he and I had in regard to his proposed travels and coupled with the fact that he had not abused the previous prescription. I would have, if I had it in the office, given him liquor even without his request."

This completed the evidence in this case. Another case against Dr. John B. Gilchrist will be heard tomorrow morning and it is expected that the arguments of the attorneys will be made in the afternoon. In the meantime the residents are awaiting with interest the result of the hearings. It is said that one of the doctors reported has paid a fine of $20 rather than have his case aired in the place court.

Conspired to Catch Doctors.

It was brought out in the evidence in the case of alleged violation of the Canada Temperance Act against Dr. John B. Gilchrist, who is charged with illegally giving prescriptions for liquor, that Anton Gjerde, the star witness for the prosecution, had traveled through Norway as a temperance lecturer and came to this part of the province to try to convict persons of violations of the act.

He also told the court of a scheme arranged between himself and W. G. Asbell, Scott Act inspector, whereby he was to represent himself to the doctors as a traveling man from Norway, who was here to look for lumber lands.

Doctor Gilchrist through his counsel, George W. Fowler, M. P., pleaded guilty to the charge. Gjerde was first on the stand and told of going into Dr. Gilchrist's office and asking for a prescription for a bottle of whiskey. "I told him I was here in the lumber business. He said he would have to be careful and not let anyone know that he had given it as it was against the law, except in cases of sickness. I did not tell him I was sick, but he gave me the prescription."

Cross-examined by Mr. Fowler, the witness said that the story he told the doctor about being in the lumber business was a lie.

A lively tilt ensued between Mr. Fowler and J. Arthur Freeze, the prosecuting attorney, in reference to having this statement taken down in the evidence, but it was finally allowed.

C. H. Fairweather, Scott Act vendor for the county, told of filling the prescription with a pint and a half bottle of whiskey, which was produced in court.

The defendant, sworn, said that Gjerde had come into his office and said he was not feeling well and was going on a long trip through the country in the quest of lumber lands and asked that an order be given him for whiskey. "I at first refused," said witness, as I said it was contrary to the law unless for sickness and I thought that those interested in the Scott Act and temperance in the town would stop at nothing short of murder to convict me.

"When he explained the nature of his proposed trip I thought a man, if he were to make such a cruise, would need a stimulant so I gave him the prescription."

Sussex, N. B., Aug. 27—Every available space in the police court was occupied this afternoon when argument was presented in the cases against four local doctors, who are charged with a violation of the Canada Temperance Act by illegally giving prescriptions for liquor. The large number present listened with rapt attention to the addresses of G. W. Fowler, counsel for the defence, and J. Arthur Freeze, who is conducting the prosecution. The argument of Mr. Fowler was particularly brilliant and was mixed with some bright pieces of humor, which brought out ripples of laughter at times.

The defendants, Drs. W. H. White, D. H. McAlister, G. N. Pearson and J. B. Gilchrist, were all present in court, but the face of the star witness for the prosecution, Anton Gjerde, was not in evidence.

Mr. Fowler started the argument for the defence by reference to the section under which the defendants are being tried, which allows a physician to prescribe liquor, provided that the liquor is for medical use, and a physician who gives liquor or an order for liquor for any other than strictly medical purposes shall be liable to a penalty of $20 for the first offence and $40 for the second.

"The burden of the proof on the prosecution," said Mr. Fowler, "is to show that any of these physicians violated the law, and it is in the hands of no one else but the physician himself to judge whether he is acting within the law or not and whether or not the man actually needed the liquor.

"In cases of real sickness they must take the statements of the persons presenting themselves for treatment and diagnose the cases accordingly. In every one of the cases that have come before the court the symptoms complained of by the party asking for the prescription were such that a physical examination would not reveal the proof that the statements were true.

Four Against One.

"Four prominent citizens of your town, all men of high repute, and two of them holding the confidences of the electors, are charged with violating the law by a man who comes here as a stranger—although I will say that strangers are very often good people, but when you come to weigh the evidence of a man, about whose antecedents you know nothing, against the sworn testimony of men whom everyone in the community holds in high esteem, it seems to me that the lighter weight is not going to tip the beam, and therefore your honor must necessarily find for the defendants.

"I will compare the evidence given by this man, Gjerde, and given by the several doctors, and I would ask that you contrast them and see which is the more reasonable.

"In the case against Dr. White, Gjerde says that he asked the doctor for a prescription, got it and had it filled. Does it appear reasonable that a doctor would hand out a prescription to an utter stranger without first ascertaining if it was for medical use, when he knew what might result from his action? Dr. White goes on the stand and says that Gjerde came to his office and stated that he had just come from Norway and that his stomach was upset and that liquor was about the only thing that would relieve him. The doctor said he diagnosed the case as seasickness and as the man claimed he was going on a lumber cruise, he gave him the prescription. Now, which of these stories appears the most likely?

"Then take the Pearson case. Here Gjerde states that he asked the doctor for a prescription for liquor and was refused, but after telling Dr. Pearson that he was doing some business with Mr. White, the lumber dealer, he got the prescription. Dr. Pearson, on the other hand, states that the Norwegian asked him for a prescription and he was refused. He then said that he had come from Montreal with a party of friends and they had taken too much liquor and his stomach was upset and some liquor would do him good. The doctor said he appeared nervous and, thinking that the liquor was the only thing that would do him any good, was the sole reason why he prescribed.

"The discretion as to whether liquor is necessary in cases of this kind lies solely with the physician, but I think that some reason must be given by the applicant and I think that the reason is well shown here. The man's appearance coincided with the condition he said he was in.

"In the case of Dr. McAlister, Gjerde said he asked for a prescription for whisky. The doctor asked him if he was sick, and he said 'No,' and he got the prescription. Dr. McAlister testified that the man asked for the prescription, and that he looked sick. He took hold of his wrist and found that his heart was beating rapidly and an examination of his tongue showed that it was furry and he appeared nervous, so the doctor, in good faith, gave him the prescription. Now compare these two stories; somebody must be lying and your honor's judgment will no doubt decide that. These occurrences all happened recently so that the witnesses should have a perfect recollection of the circumstances. There is a falsehood somewhere, and I say it is on the part of the prosecution.

The Gilchrist Case.

"Here in the Gilchrist case, Gjerde said that the doctor gave him the prescription saying that he must not let anyone know that he got it, and he also said he did not tell the doctor he was sick. Dr. Gilchrist said that the Norwegian told him tha he was going into the country on a hard trip and he thought that, if the man was going on a journey such as he had described, he would need some stimulant and he gave him the order. Does it appear reasonable that Dr. Gilchrist would sit down and write a prescription for a man who was a perfect stranger to him on his bald request?

"The doctors have all sworn that they gave these prescriptions in good faith. The makers of the law have recognized the necessity for the use of liquor under certain conditions, and these conditions are in the hands of the doctors to judge and it is up to them to say when the circumstances warrant the giving of a prescription for liquor.

A Confessed Liar.

"You have heard the evidence of both Gjerde and the doctors. The interests are practically the same in both cases. His usefulness hereafter depends on the success of his work while here. Do you think that one of these doctors, for the sake of saving $20, would come into this court and take a false oath? When you have put up to you the naked evidence of a man coming from God knows where, as against the testimony of four such worthy professional men of Sussex, if you are to believe the evidence of these four men, then the other is a perjurer. He has admitted on the stand that he is a liar. The whole prosecution has been conceived in falsehood.

"I do not believe that these men would abuse the power that has been placed in their hands by law and let me say to your honor and to this community that whoever is behind this move would do a great deal more good if they would direct their energies to the closing out of these so-called 'jug taverns' rather than the persecution of these doctors, and I might say that I have personally heard many expressions from people who are generally in favor of the temperance movement, condemning the methods used in this case.

"I do not blame Inspector Asbell. Behind him are some very indiscreet people who have caused him to persecute, rather than prosecute. No doubt your honor feels the responsibility, and I believe that your mind is strong enough to weigh this matter coldly, calmly, dispassionately, and not allow the sympathy which I know you entertain for the temperance cause to sway your judgment in these cases.

"This matter has been attracting considerable attention. The evidence has been published far and wide, and the eyes of a great many people are upon your honor. I hope you will consider the cases carefully and I will leave the matter in your hands to judge as you think best."

Prosecutor's Plea.

J. Arthur Freeze, the prosecuting attorney, first moved for a conviction of the accused, Drs. White, Pearson, McAlister and Gilchrist.

"Mr. Fowler," he said, "has put your honor on the horns of a dilemma in asking you to either believe the doctors and not believe Gjerde, or vice versa. I will make no mention whatever of the evidence of this young man, as I do not know him. He was brought here to do detective work and, as you know, the basic principles of this work is making things appear as they are not, and it was for this reason that the stories were violations. Gjerde may be a descendent of a Ananias for all I care—I will not use his evidence in my argument.

"The law is clear and states that a doctor who gives a prescription for other than medical purposes is liable to a penalty. Usually when a person goes to a doctor he is suffering from a disease and the doctor prescribes for him. In these cases it seems to be just the opposite. I will take each case separately, as my learned friend has done, and make this point clear.

"In the case of Dr. White the man asked for a prescription for whiskey and the doctor thought he was suffering from seasickness, but did the doctor enquire if he was seasick on the way over from Norway?

"The only case in which there was any attempt at a physical examination was that of Dr. McAlister, but here also the man prescribed the remedy and the doctor made the illness to fit it. And also in the case of Dr. Pearson he refers to a nervousness which appeared to be from the effect of drunkenness, but he gave him a prescription for a bottle of liquor.

"I think Dr. Gilchrist's evidence in his first case gives him absolutely away. He is prescribing liquor for something that may happen in the future. The man says to the doctor: 'I want a prescription and I need it.' The doctor said that the man seemed nervous and he gave the prescription. This fact should have put the doctor on his guard and he should not have given it to him. I cannot see that there was any medical purpose in connection with this case whatever.

"The circumstances in the Dr. McAlister's second case are about the same as in the previous one of Dr. Gilchrist's. But note carefully, your honor, that in the second case of Dr. Gilchrist the doctor says that Gjerde asked him how much whiskey ten ounces would be and he replied: 'About three drinks.' I have never heard tell of medicine being prescribed 'by the drink' and the doctor should have known that the liquor was not for medicinal purposes.

"If there is any conviction made in these cases, it will be made on the evidence of the doctors themselves. One of the doctors testified that he told Gjerde that he was becoming suspicious of him. Why should he become suspicious if the liquor was for medical use? The fact that the man wanted a whole bottle of whiskey should have been sufficient to put the doctors on their guard. There was little or no physical examination and there was no time or manner stated on the prescription in which the medicine was to be taken. I think that these points are sufficient to show that these doctors are as guilty as the druggist who took change over his counter for liquor and has since felt the strength of the law and I cannot see that your honor can do anything other than to convict the defendants."

Magistrate Folkins complimented the counsel on their clever addresses and said that he realized the feeling that was centered upon the case.

"I feel myself loaded with the responsibility of the decision in these cases and it would be asking too much, I think to expect me to give a decision today and I would like a little time to look over the evidence and weigh it carefully."

It was therefore decided to adjourn until Wednesday afternoon, Sept. 3. In the meantime the residents will await with interest the magistrate's decision.

Spotter Worked in St. John.

"I worked for twelve days in the Algonquin Hotel, St. Andrews, and later was employed as cook in Wanamaker's restaurant, St. John, for three weeks," said Anton Gjerde, the Norwegian, who is testifying in the Scott Act cases against the several local doctors in answer to questions put by G. W. Fowler.

Evidence was taken this morning in a second case against Dr. John B. Gilchrist, charged with illegally giving a prescription for liquor. Gjerde testified that he approached Dr. Gilchrist and asked for a prescription and it was given to him.

"We had some conversation," he said, "about keeping it quiet, as the doctor said he might be fined. He asked me if ten ounces would do and I said I wanted more than that. I wanted a bottle. He made no physical examination."

C. H. Fairweather testified to filling the prescriptions.

Gjerde was recalled and, cross-examined by Mr. Fowler, he told of working in St. Andrews and St. John, after which he said he went to Moncton, where he went to Chief Rideout and was employed for five days in the same work as he carried on here. He said that information was laid as a result of his work in Moncton. Asked by Mr. Fowler if it was for the money or his desire to do good that he carried on this work, witness replied, "both together."

He said that Rideout sent him to Sussex with a letter of recommendation to the chief of police.

Dr. Gilchrist (sworn) said Gjerde came to his office on the second visit and told him he had just returned from cruising some lumber and he wanted a prescription as he intended going out on another trip in the morning. "I told him," the witness said, "that I thought he could get along without it but after some more talk in reference to his trip I asked him if ten ounces would be enough and he said he wanted more so I gave him a prescription for a pint and a half firmly believing that it was necessary for a trip such as he had mentioned." Witness said that a couple of days afterward he met Gjerde on the street and told him he heard he was a spotter which Gjerde emphatically denied.

"You know," said the witness, "what happened after that."

It has been agreed between the counsel that one argument will suffice for all the cases and it will be heard this afternoon.

In the report of Dr. Gilchrist's case yesterday it was said that the doctor pleaded guilty. This should have read "Not guilty."

WATT REPRIEVED IN SHADOW OF GALLOWS

Execution Stayed Three Weeks

Amherst Murderer Was to Have Been Hanged Early This Morning — Officials and People Relieved at the Outcome — Believe Now That Death Sentence Will Be Commuted.

Amherst, N. S., Aug. 27—Just as the final arrangements were being completed tonight for the execution of Charles R. Watt at 6 o'clock tomorrow morning, a telegram was received from Ottawa, signed by the minister of justice, ordering a postponement of the execution for three weeks from tomorrow.

The gallows had been erected in the precincts of the courtyard and could be plainly seen from the principal street of the town. Sheriff Davidson had all arrangements completed to bring the last sad chapter of Watt's career to a close, and the officials in charge were this evening making some final tests on the ghastly structure when a telegram of reprieve was received.

It is hardly possible to imagine the general feeling of relief that swept over the town as the word passed from mouth to mouth, as it is now felt that the sentence will be commuted to life, or a long term of imprisonment.

It is not maudlin sympathy for the prisoner that has brought about a marked change in his favor. All during his imprisonment he has been a model prisoner. He had apparently little thought for himself but was much exercised over the grief and sorrow of his aged father and other members of the family.

Prepared to Die.

When the news was brought Watt of the extension of time, his wonderful control and composure was broken down. He had prepared himself for the end and would sooner go through the ordeal tomorrow than have the day of execution postponed if it had to come. For the past few weeks the prisoner has devoted almost his entire time to a study of the Bible and other religious works and writing letters of farewell to his friends, urging them to lead better lives. He also wrote a few verses and a letter of farewell to the jailer and his wife.

The letter to Mr. and Mrs. Simpson follows:

August 26, 1913.

"To Mr. and Mrs. Simpson:

"Dear Friends,—I wish you to understand that it is impossible for me to express my feelings at this hour, but I must say that I thank you both from the bottom of my heart for your kindness during the past few trying months—kindness to me both in word and deed. May the blessing of God rest on you and yours forever and may it be His blessed will that you continue to live in good health for years to come. I will now say good-bye. May we meet in heaven. God's will be done.

(Sgd.) "CHARLES R. WATT."

He also wrote a short ode of four verses on an English sparrow. This is probably the best of his verses and for a man of little education it is wonderful.

The following is a copy of the telegram received from the minister of justice:

Ottawa, Aug. 27, 1913.

"To Sheriff Cumberland Co., Amherst (N. S.)

"I'm commanded to inform you that his excellency administrator of the government has been pleased to order a respite of sentence of the court in the capital case of Charles R. Watt for three weeks, that is, until the 18th of September. Report back immediately upon receipt. Letter confirming follows tomorrow."

The letter below was received by Jailor Simpson late this afternoon and had been mailed but a few minutes previous to the receipt of the reprieve:

"To Mr. Simpson:

"I'm sending you this warning. If you don't give Charles Watt a chance to escape from this awful end you will be shot dead. In the name of God do this to save yourself and him."

Discouraging to the Jingoes.

(Tacoma Tribune).

An officer in the Japanese navy has contributed an article, with the permission of his superior officers, to a Tokio magazine in which he presents some facts and arguments that must be discouraging to the jingoes in Japan who have been clamoring for war with the United States and insisting that the Japanese must take prompt action to secure control of the Pacific. The officer makes it plain that Japan is in no position to meet the United States in a naval war, as our strength is nearly double that of Japan.

A very careful review of the naval strength of the two nations is made by this officer, who pays the highest tribute to the efficiency of the American officers and men, and he urges that Japan should increase her naval strength by at least fifty per cent. in order to maintain her standing among the world powers and command the respect to which she feels entitled. There is no occasion for Japan and the United States engaging in any such rivalry in the building of battleships as that now in progress between England and Germany. So far as the Pacific is concerned, the United States wants to dominate it only in commerce.

SCHOOL HYGIENE CONGRESS MEETS

Notable Gathering of Educators and Scientists at Buffalo

TIME FOR A CHANGE

President C. W. Eliot Advocates Teaching Children Things Hitherto Withheld from Them—Social Vice Menaces the Human Race, He Declares.

Buffalo, Aug. 27—Scientists and educators of world-wide fame at the fourth International Congress on School Hygiene, in a special session today, agreed with practical unanimity that the time had come when the attitude of the world's educational insitutes toward sex hygiene should be revolutionized.

They saw in the silence of the past on the subject a growing and real menace to the future of the race that must be combated by a system of education without exaggeration or morbid suggestions. Public opinion, they maintained, has already reached the point where this revolution is demanded.

Dr. Charles W. Eliot, president of the congress; the Rev. Richard J. Tierney, S. J., of Woodstock College, Maryland, Dr. Hugh Abott, Miss Laura B. Barrett, of New York, and other prominent delegates spoke on the subject at a symposium attended by the entire congress and a large number of citizens at Elmwood Music Hall this afternoon. Dr. Eliot presided.

"A remarkable change in public opinion has taken place in regard to sex hygiene," Dr. Eliot said, "using the term in its broadest sense. The policy of silence was almost universal. Medical discoveries have contributed to the shift in public opinion which also has been moved by the many signs of physical deterioration, consequent on the rush to city life. Fathers and mothers feel a new duty toward their children. Churches take a new interest.

Evils Which Menace the Human Race.

"The most important question is:

"What force can now be put in play against the formidable evils, which gravely threaten the very life of the race? No one force or agency can be completely relied upon."

This attack, he said, must be made against the three principal causes of the present evil:

First, lust in men; second, complete lack of moral principle in certain classes of women, and, third, depravity of those who make a commerce of these two.

Commercialized vice should be attacked in all its forms by all the powers of the law. The ancient policies of toleration and licensed segregation and regulation must be uprooted. Segregation has nowhere been successful. Regulation is a confessed failure. The laws against undesirable marriages need to be revised.

"Public progress in regard to sex hygiene and eugenics is to be procured chiefly through educational methods. The work must be done delicately and without interference with parental rights or religious convictions."

Rev. Richard Tierney said his convictions were not favorable to the movement in all its details; neither were they adverse. "Eliminate the details of sex hygiene; train character; teach that purity is noble and possible; that vice is vile and carries its own punishment; that marriage is inviolable; that the family is sacred. Knowledge is not moral power. Christ, not hygiene, will cleanse the world," was his advice.

He also urged the abolition of "animal dances," and the discontinuance of coeducational institutions for senior students.

In an address before another section of the congress, Dr. Edward C. Spitzka, of New York, declared that New York City in its classification and care of defective and abnormal children stands on no higher level than a country village.

SET OF FALSE TEETH MAY SOLVE SYDNEY MYSTERY

Found Near Where Atkinson Was Killed, But Dentist is Doubtful if They Belonged to Victim.

Sydney, N. S., Aug. 26—The only new developments in the Atkinson case consist in the finding of a set of false teeth, and a copy of the July (first half) number of the Popular Magazine, near where the body was discovered.

The teeth, so far as the dentist who supplied Mr. Atkinson with a set can tell, are not those which belonged to the dead man. The magazine has a name written on it, but only a few letters are legible. The name ends in "son."

A story is current today of a man who resided here some years ago and who is said to have threatened Mr. Atkinson's life. It is reported that the man was in the city at the time the alleged crime was committed, but nothing definite has been learned about this so far.

When making lemonade, dissolve the sugar in a little hot water. This prevents the sugar from sinking to the bottom of the pitcher and will sweeten it more quickly.

Nothing helps tired feet more than a regular rubbing with vaseline or mutton tallow. Soldiers are said to grease their feet every night when on the march.

IMPERIAL NATURALIZATION

(Montreal Herald.)

To the Editor of The Herald:

Sir,—In the leading article in Saturday's Herald, on Imperial Naturalization, you make the following statement:

"The qualifying condition to naturalization is said to be 'five years' residence in the Empire and the 'last year of the five in the United Kingdom.' Taken literally this means that the only way in which a Canadian, for instance, can qualify for the full rights of British citizenship is to spend four years in Canada, or some other of the overseas dominions, and then go to the United Kingdom and spend a year there, an arrangement which would be quite useless so far as the average Canadian is concerned."

This is not correct.

Any person born within the allegiance of the Crown is a British subject. Persons born within the allegiance of the Crown include:

(1) Everyone who is born within the Dominions of the Crown whatever may be the nationality of either or both of his parents; unless he is either (a) a child of a foreign sovereign or any foreign state's ambassador, or, possibly, of any other foreign diplomatic agent; or (b) a child born in British territory of alient parents, if the territory was in the occupation of a foreign army at the time of his birth.

The dominions of the Crown include:

(a) The United Kingdom and any colony, plantation, island, territory, or settlement within His Majesty's dominions and not within the United Kingdom.

(b) Places situated within the territory of a prince, who is subject to the Crown of England in respect of such territory.

(c) British ships of war and other public vessels.

(d) British merchantmen on the high seas, and probably even if in the territorial waters of a foreign country.

(2) The children of the King or of a British ambassador or possibly, other diplomatic agent, even though such children are born abroad; but not the children born abroad of other persons in the service of the Crown.

(3) Any person whose father or paternal grandfather was born within the Dominions of the Crown, although he himself was born abroad, provided that at the time of his birth his father had not ceased to have the rights of a British subject (otherwise than by death), and was not in the service of a foreign state at enmity with the Crown of England.

Therefore, any person born in Canada is a British subject, and the arrangement in regard to Imperial Naturalization which, it is reported, has been reached by the Canadian and British governments does not apply to Canadians, but only to aliens who desire to become British subjects in the full sense of the term.

VICTOR E. MITCHELL.

Montreal, Aug. 25, 1913.

NEW DEPUTY MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE

William Himsworth, Chief Clerk of Department, Appointed.

Ottawa, Aug. 27—William Himsworth, for many years chief clerk of the inland revenue department, has been appointed deputy minister. He has been acting deputy for some months. Since the retirement from the deputyship of W. J. Gerald.

J. W. Vincent, barrister, of Ottawa, the unsuccessful Conservative candidate in the county of Russell in the last general election, has been appointed assistant deputy minister and secretary of the department. Mr. Vincent is the law partner of the son-in-law of Hon. Bruno Nantel, minister of inland revenue.

TRIPPLE WEDDING AT TRACADIE

Three Brothers Take Life Partners at the Same Ceremony.

Tracadie, N. B., Aug. 22—On Tuesday, August 12, a triple wedding was celebrated at St. John Baptist church, Tracadie, by Rev. Father Levasseur, the bridegrooms being Frank, Albert and Jonas Ferguson, the three sons of George Ferguson, and the brides, Miss Josephine Brideau, Miss Zulima Godlin and Miss Blanche Mills, all of Tracadie.

A DOUBLE HONOR.

(Charlottetown Patriot).

A double honor has been bestowed upon Charlottetown and the island generally. E. T. Higgs, merchant, has been elected president of the Maritime Board of Trade, and R. L. Cotton, journalist, has been elevated to the important position of president of the Maritime Press Association. We rejoice in the honors bestowed upon these two worthy citizens of Charlottetown. Mr. Higgs is one of the rising young business men of the province. He has long been identified with boards of trade, having been secretary, vice-president and president, successively of the Charlottetown board. He is alert and active, has a thorough grasp of business conditions, transportation matters, and is in every way fully qualified for the high and responsible position to which he has been elevated. We heartily congratulate him upon his well merited recognition at the hands of the Maritime Board of Trade.

Mr. Cotton is a newspaper man of note, and is now proprietor of the Maritime Stationers, Sunnyside. He is full of business and vim. He has long been a member of the press association and last year was elected vice-president and this year occupies the proud position of president of that most important organization. We believe Mr. Cotton will make a most capable president and will discharge his responsible duties in such a manner as to reflect the highest credit upon the press association and himself. He has a capital knowledge of journalism and contributions affecting the press in the maritime provinces; therefore, Charlottetown and the province at large are doubly honored, and we again heartily congratulate both Mr. Higgs and Mr. Cotton on the honors they have gained.

Mistaken Generosity.

(Philadelphia Telegraph).

Louis Wagner told a story the other day to demonstrate that it is not always best to have a bountiful heart.

Some time ago, according to the narrative of Louis, a man loaned a friend his best pair of trousers to attend a social function, and after waiting three weeks for the return of the garment, he sent a messenger to jog the memory of the borrower.

"Mr. Smith says he wants those trousers right away," declared the messenger. "He has got to attend a wedding."

"They won't do to wear to a wedding," responded the borrower. "I collided with a motorcycle and tore them."

"You don't mean it?" exclaimed the messenger. "What is Mr. Smith going to do?"

"That's an easy one," was the prompt reply, "tell him to borrow a pair the same as I did."

TRAINED DOGS IN BELGIAN ARMY MANOEUVRES

Haul Quick Firing Cannon Through Forests Where Horses Are Unable to Travel.

Namur, Belgium, Aug. 27—The Belgian army begins today to work out a plan for the protection of the frontier of Belgium against a theoretical effort of the German army to cross a corner of Belgium in order to invade France.

The troops taking part in the manoeuvre number 22,775 men and 1,014 officers of all arms.

A new feature introduced into the exercise is a column of quick-firing cannon drawn by packs of trained dogs, which are able to penetrate forests and rough country, where horses would be useless.

Four military aeroplanes accompany the troops for reconnaissance work.

TRURO BLAZE DOES $1,500 DAMAGE

Restaurant in Old Station House Gutted by Fire—John M. O'Brien the Chief Sufferer.

Truro, N. S., Aug. 26—The Truro fire brigade had a stubborn fight this afternoon with a fire which started in the upper part of the section of old Truro station house occupied by John M. O'Brien, as a restaurant, and living apartments for his employes. The blaze started near the chimney which ran up through the roof from the kitchen. The fire department turned out quickly and fought the fire with much energy. It took two hours to conquer the outbreak. The result of which is a loss of about $500 to the building and upwards of $1,000 dollars to the occupants.

HUGE FLOATING REPAIR PLANT FOR BRITISH NAVY

London, Aug. 27—The British admiralty has issued specifications for a large floating factory for the Cromarty naval base capable of making any repairs to warships possible without going into dry dock. To co-operate a floating dock for the newest vessel will be built 4,450 feet in length and 90 feet in breadth with square hull having many water tight compartments to be used for the bunkers and boiler. Turbines will generate the power to operate the plant aboard. The superstructure measuring 420 feet, will contain the foundry, the machine, the electrical and boiler shops, all of which will be operated by turbine current. The above factory which is to provide for the housing for 186 officers and men, is for delivery in June 1914.

Ah! There Was the Mystery!

(Atlanta Constitution.)

Two darkies bought a piece of pork, and Sam, having no place to put his share, trusted it to Henry's keeping. They met the next night, and Henry said:

"A mos' strange thing done happen at my house, las' night, Sam. Ah myst'ry to me."

"What was dat, Henry?"

"Well, Sam," explained Henry, solemnly, "dis mawnin' I go down in de cellar for to git a piece of hawg for breakfas', an' I put my han' down in de brine an' feels roun', but ain' no pork dar; all gone; so I tu'n up de bar'l, an', Sam, sho' as preachin', de rats had done et a hole clar fro' de bottom of dat bar'l, en' dragged de meat all out!"

Sam was petrified with astonishment for a moment, and then said:

"Why didn de brine run outen de hole?"

"Well, yo' see, Sam," replied Henry, "dad't de myst'ry."