POOR DOCUMENT

MC 2033

DENIES KNOWLEDGE OF SBARETTI'S SCHEME

Sir Wilfrid Laurier Makes Lengthy Statement in Manitoba Controversy

Declares That Papal Ablegate Had No Authority to Promise Extension of Boundaries in Return for Separate Schools ---Takes Issue With the Statement of Hon. Mr. Rogers--- Several Members Advocate That Pope's Ambassador Be Notified to Return to Rome.

Ottawa, April 5—(Special)—Sir Wilfrid Laurier today in parliament made a sweeping denial of any connection with Mgr. Sbaretti's proposal to the Manitoba government.

Before the orders of the day were called Sir Wilfrid Laurier rose to present further correspondence in reference to the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba. R. L. Borden asked if the letter of 23rd February referred to in the press had been brought down.

Laurier's Statement.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier said it had not and that he desired to make a statement. He proceeded: "I desire at this moment to call the attention of the house to a statement which was published this morning in the newspapers of the city and which I understand has been published in all the press of Canada. This statement is made by Mr. Rogers, a member of the Manitoba government, concerning the action taken by myself and by my colleagues upon an application made some time ago by the government of the province of Manitoba under instructions from the legislature of that province, for an extension of its boundaries.

"I may say at once that it will be my duty so far as the action of the government is concerned in this matter to give the statement a direct and absolute and a categorical denial. (Loud cheers). In order that there may be no misunderstanding. I think it is better that I should read to the house and therefore place upon its records the statement of Mr. Rogers as I find it in the Citizen."

Sir Wilfrid then read in full the statement as published this morning and went on:

A Sweeping Denial.

"Before I proceed any further I may say at once, referring to the whole tenor of this document, in so far as there is a charge that there was an understanding between Mgr. Sbaretti and myself to have the school question considered in connection with the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba, there is not a shadow nor a tittle of truth in it. (Loud cheers). Mr. Rogers says: 'It is certainly idle for any person to assume that Monsigneur Sbaretti, occupying the position he does, would presume to make the suggestion of terms and conditions which he did without the full knowledge and consent of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his colleagues.'

"I assert that if Mrgr. Sbaretti did press Mr. Rogers to make the suggestion of terms and conditions, stating that it was with my knowledge he states something which is not in accordance with truth. (Applause.) If that has taken place, it has taken place wholly without my knowledge and without my participation, and I never heard of it in any way whatever until last Saturday, when the matter was brought to my notice by a telegram from the Toronto Globe.

"Then Mr. Rogers goes on to say: 'And on the other hand, Sir Wilfrid's attitude carries with it evidence of a full knowledge of arrangement, as is evident by his creation of excuses for delay, as well as his failure to give reason or cause for the same, and further by his unfairness in bringing down one side of the case and attempting to secure a prejudgment from the people without their having Manitoba's reply to his minute of council of March 21, which was received by this government on March 28, and replied to on March 31.'

"On Monday last, which was the 3rd of April, I brought down to this house a return to an address moved for some time ago by the honorable member for Marquette (Dr. Roche), asking for copies of all correspondence that had taken place between the government of Manitoba and this government on the subject of extension of the boundaries of Manitoba. The last paper upon this return was an acknowledgment of the receipt of our reply to the prayer of the Manitoba government. We have received since that time a further rejoinder by Manitoba to our reply. We did not bring it down on Monday with the return because we had not then received it. It arrived at the Privy Council office only yesterday and I at once gave orders to the clerk of Privy Council to have it prepared for presentation to the house and I have today laid it on the table of the house. In all this there was no evidence of any intention to to conceal anything. There was nothing to conceal, this was a public document.

Papers Not Received.

"Then I see by the correspondence that the order of the Manitoba government was passed on 31st of March, which was last Friday. It was sent to us on the following day, Saturday. It could not, therefore, get here until yesterday morning and as soon as it was received by us, as I said a moment ago, I gave instructions to have it prepared and I laid it on the table of the house so as to form part of the correspondence which people of this country have the right to have before them.

"Now, I pass to another statement of Mr. Rogers".

"In three days' time," he says, "On February 20, a letter was received from his excellency, Mgr. Sbaretti, asking for a conference. This invitation was accepted and his excellency then presented the following memorandum, remarking that if we would place this on statue book of our province that it would greatly facilitate an early settlement of our mission, fixing of our boundaries, which would be extended to shores of Hudson Bay. His excellency further added that our failure to act in the past had prejudiced our claim for extension westward."

Not a Party to Conference.

"According to this statment it appears that Mr. Rogers and Mr. Colin Campbell, who were the delegates of the Manitoba government, had a conference with Mgr. Sbaretti, the papal ablegate. There has been a rumor in the press—not in the press but at all events about the corridor of this house—that this conference had been brought about by means of one of my colleagues. I have to say to the house and I have the authority of my colleagues for this, that there never was any conference brought about by him between the delegates and Mgr. Sbaretti and I have to make this further statement that neither myself nor any of my colleagues were intermediaries between Mgr. Sbaretti and the delegates of Manitoba. If there has been such a conference, how it came about I cannot say. Perhaps Mgr. Sbaretti may have had previous communication with these gentlemen, I do not know. Perhaps he knew them and perhaps that is the reason why he called upon them to have a conference. At all events it is no concern of mine, I know nothing and I never knew anything of it until this day, nor did the government. (Cheers.)

"What conversation took place between the papal ablegate, Mr. Rogers and Mr. Colin Campbell I do not know. This is a question, perhaps, as to which there may be something later on; I do not know. But, I take the statement as I find it here and upon this statement I have the right to make some comments which may throw some light perhaps on what has taken place. Mr. Rogers says that the ablegate made this remark: "This invitation was accepted and his excellency then presented the following memorandum, remarking that if we would place this on the statute book of our province it would greatly facilitate an early settlement of our mission, the fixing of our boundaries, which would be extended to the shores of Hudson Bay." As to that I have no reason to make any comment, because that is a thing as to which I know absolutely nothing. Then Mr. Rogers goes on to say: "His excellency further added that our failure to act in the past had prejudiced our claim for extension westward.'

Manitoba Never Asked Extension Before.

"Well, Sir, I cannot conceive how the papal ablegate or anybody else, could have stated that the failure of the province of Manitoba to amend the school act prevented the extension of its boundaries westward, and that if such had been done it would have facilitated this extension. I cannot conceive how it is possible that such a statement of opinion could have been made, considering the fact that since the month of July, 1896, when we came into office up to month of January, 1905, we never received from the government of Manitoba a communication asking for the extension of the boundaries of that province. (Cheers.)

"There may have been resolutions passed by the legislature asking for the extension of their boundaries; I do not know. I am told that there have, and I have seen in the press that resolutions were passed in 1901, that a resolution was passed also as I understand it in 1902 and resolutions were passed, I know, in 1905. In 1905 these resolutions were followed by executive action, they were called to our attention, but neither in 1901 nor in 1902 were these resolutions passed by the legislature of Manitoba, followed by executive action or called to the attention of the government of Canada.

"This morning when I read the interview with Mr. Rogers I asked myself if my memory was at fault and if there had been any communication sent to us which in the multitude of things with which we are called upon to deal, I must have forgotten. I enquired of my colleagues if they had any recollection of any such communication being sent to us and they all answered me they had no such recollection. I then enquired from the clerk of the privy council if there was anything in the archieves of the department, which would show that any such communication had been received by us and I received this letter, this memorandum from the clerk of the privy council; "From June 1896 to January, 1905, there is no record in the privy council of a claim advanced by the province of Manitoba for the extension of its boundaries.

"In May, 1902, there was a protest in the Northwest Territories against the extension of boundaries of province of Manitoba.

Laurier's Version.

"Now, Sir, with these preliminary remarks, I shall proceed to give my version of what took place between Mr. Colin Campbell and Mr. Rogers and us when they came here as delegates from the government of Manitoba. I shall take in the first place the following statement made by Mr. Rogers: 'We received a formal invitation by telegraph from Sir Wilfrid Laurier to come to Ottawa as soon as convenient. We left on February 14th and arrived on afternoon of the 16th, when we received a letter from Sir Wilfrid at the Russell House, saying that he would be pleased to meet us at his office at midday on Friday, 17th.'

"In this statement there is nothing which is not in accordance with the truth, but it is not the whole truth. It leaves the impression that we took the initiative of our own accord to have these gentlemen come from Manitoba to discuss that matter with us, whereas the truth is that we simply responded to an invitation which came to us from the government of Manitoba. I have brought here the whole corespondence which has taken place upon this subject.

"I stated a moment ago that from the month of June, 1896, to the month of January, 1905, we had not received a communication from the government of Manitoba asking for the extension of their boundaries and I repeat the statement. The first communication which we ever received upon this subject is the following:

Manitoba's Memorial.

"January 20, 1905. To Sir Wilfrid Laurier:

"Government of Manitoba, on motion of legislative assembly, has today forwarded to his excellency the governor general, a memorial relating to extension of boundaries of province and I am directed to write you and request that you will be pleased to appoint an early date for receiving a deputation from the government of Manitoba in relation to the matter. It would be appreciated if such a date could be made, for the first or second week in February.

(Sgd.) "D. H. McFADDEN,
"Provincial Secretary."

To this letter I answered in the following terms, stating in part: "The memorial has not yet been received at the office of the privy council. I shall bring your request to the attention of the government as soon as possible after its receipt and will communicate with you later on."

In accordance with the promise there made, when we had received that memorial from the government of Manitoba I brought it to the attention of the privy council and I was authorized to send the following telegram:

Answer to Manitoba.

"With reefrence to your last memorial, re extension of limits, will be ready to receive your delegation at any time convenient to you."

"That telegram is dated the 13th of February and on the same day I received the following telegram from Mr. McFadden: 'Replying to your telegram of even date, Hon. Messrs. Rogers and Campbell have been appointed to confer with your government regarding the extension of boundaries. They leave here tomorrow, will reach Ottawa Thursday, 16th. Kindly notify them at Russell House as to time and place for interview suitable to your own convenience."

"In accordance with this last telegram inviting me to fix a time and to inform Mr. Campbell and Mr. Rogers of what time we would be ready to receive them, I caused my secretary, in compliance with their desire, on the 16th of February to send the following letter:

"16th Feb., Sir Wilfrid Laurier will be glad to receive you tomorrow, the 17th inst., at half past seven o'clock in his office at the privy council. (Sgd.) Rodolphe Brodeau.

"That was on the 16th of Feb. and on the following day accordingly there took place the interview at my office with the delegates from Manitoba. There had been a sub-committee of the privy council appointed to receive the delegates and the ministers present on that occasion were the minister of justice, the postmaster general and myself. I think the secretary of state was present but of that I am not quite sure.

I take now the statement of Mr. Rogers as to what took place then.

(B) copy follows.

"Mr. Rogers says: 'During that interview we presented the claims of the province as urgently and strongly as possible. In reply Sir Wilfrid said that if we would be good enough to remain in Ottawa for three or four days he would again send for us and would then be in a position to give us an answer.'

Disputes Mr. Rogers.

"As to the latter statement I am sorry to say that my memory is not in accordance with the memory of Mr. Rogers. I do not want to make any imputation, but I flatter myself that I have a pretty good memory and my memory is corroborated by that of my colleague. What took place was this: We heard the petition presented to us by the delegates from Manitoba. Mr. Rogers was the spokesman. I do not think Mr. Campbell said anything at all, but if he did he took a very indifferent part in the discussion, which was mainly carried on by Mr. Rogers. He presented to us a repetition of all the claims which are advanced in the state paper now on the table of the house. He asked that the boundaries of the province should be extended westward, northward and eastward. Westward, that it should have a part of the new province of Saskatchewan; a part of districts of Assinaboia and Saskatchewan northward, that they should have territory towards the north, and eastwards towards Hudson Bay.

"I may say at once that we discussed this at some length, in fact at considerable length. When Mr. Rogers advanced the claim on behalf of Manitoba that its boundaries should be extended westward and include part of the present district of Assinaboia and Saskatchewan, we presented to Mr. Rogers what seemed to be a very strong objection to that. We told Mr. Rogers, in fact, that this claim had been considered by the government of Sir John Macdonald in 1884, and had not been granted; that the reasons which existed in 1884 for refusing the prayer of Manitoba were far stronger today than they were then; that at that time that part of the territories was in its infancy, but that at present it had a considerable population, as advanced as the population of Manitoba. That there were objections further; that the legislature of the Territories had protested against its being annexed to Manitoba and therefore we did not see how it was possible to grant that part of the prayer of the province of Manitoba.

"With regard to the northern portion of the District of Saskatchewan, we said to Mr. Rogers and to his colleague, Mr. Campbell: We do not know that there is any objection to granting you the upper portion of the District of Saskatchewan; it is true that we understand there is an objection raised, but it is a question which can be discussed later on; at all events we do not intend to introduce this part of the territory of Saskatchewan into the new provinces and we had better leave it for further discussion.

"When it came to a discussion on the extension of the boundary eastward, towards Hudson's Bay, my colleague, the post-master general, who was with me then, at once took strong objections to that claim of Manitoba.

Ontario's Claim to Be Considered.

"He stated that in his opinion it would not be fair to the province of Ontario that that claim should be considered unless the province of Ontario had an opportunity to discuss it with the province of Manitoba. That was on the 17th of February. I do not remember that I said to Mr. Rogers and Mr. Campbell that if they were to wait for some days we would again send for them and be in a position to give them an answer. What I distinctly remember stating, as it was my duty to do, was that their representation would be brought to the attention of the council and that probably they would get an answer at an early date. More than this I do not remember stating and I do not think I did.

"The two bills for the creation of the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta were introduced on the following Tuesday, the 21st of February. Mr. Rogers was present on the floor of this house, and Mr. Campbell was also present on the floor of this house on that occasion, and heard the statement I then made. That statement was that I had the authority of my colleagues to say that we could not see our way to extend the boundaries of the province of Manitoba westward, for reasons which I have just given; that we had reserved the northern portion of the district of Saskatchewan for future action, and that, with regard to extending the boundaries to Hudson's Bay, we were of the opinion that the province of Ontario and province of Quebec should be consulted. Mr. Rogers heard this statement, and therefore knew what was the policy of the government on that question.

"Now, sir, this shows one thing, that this policy of ours was settled then and there, without interference from anybody, without participation by anybody. (Cheers).

"We settled our own business according to our rights. We told the province of Manitoba that we could not extend its boundaries westward for reasons he gave, and on that decision we took our stand before this house and maintained it. But we stated that we were prepared to consider the claim of the province of Manitoba for extension northward towards Hunson Bay in connection with the claims of the new province of Saskatchewan and the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. Since that time we have embodied these views in a minute of council, which has been communicated to the Manitoba government.

"There is no difference between a minute of council and the statement I made on the floor of this house on the 21st of February, except this, that in the minute of council, after having given the matter due consideration, we have expressed the view that there was no reason for calling the province of Quebec to that conference, because it was not sufficiently interested in the matter, but we have declared our readiness to consider the proposition, immediately after the creation of new provinces to have a conference in which the provinces of Saskatchewan, Ontario and Manitoba would be represented. That is the position in which the matter now stands.

Letter He Didn't Receive.

"My honorable friend, the leader of the opposition, has called my attention to a letter of Mr. Rogers of the 23rd of Feb. That letter is not in the interview as reported in the Citizen, but I found it in another paper, the Toronto Star of yesterday. My honorable friend, the leader of the opposition, asked me a moment ago why this letter was not included in the correspondence that has been brought down. The answer is, that I have not received that letter. (Applause.) It is not of very great consequence in view of the facts as they stand. It is simply a letter of protest; it adds nothing at all to the facts; but I did not receive it.

"This morning I asked my secretary to search and see whether or not it had been received. I have no remembrance of having received it and it is not on file. I have brought everything that there is on file on this question. Moreover, I do not think it matters very much whether Mr. Rogers wrote or did not write that letter, in view of an interview which he gave and which was published in the Citizen of the 20th of February last upon this very point. In that interview Mr. Rogers stated to the reporter: "Mr. Campbell and myself have been appointed to come here to plead for what is considered by Manitoba to her just claims, before the government who are the tribunal in the case and whose decision must be final."

"When do you expect a decision?"

"I presume that when the bill, which is promised for Tuesday next, is brought down it will represent the government's decision in the matter."

"Mr. Rogers was here present on the floor of this house on the 21st of February and heard me state the views of the government and therefore there was not much occasion for him to write two days later asking for a decision. But this point is of no consequence. I mention it simply as a reason why the letter was not included in the correspondence. I have only one word more to say about the extraordinary interview of Mr. Rogers. I read again what I read a moment ago, a statement of Mr. Rogers which apepars in the Citizen under the heading "Laurier's Double Dealings." Mr. Rogers says: "We have no desire in Manitoba for double dealing about this or any other question. This, however, appears to be a favorite course of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's. For example in 1896 he signed an official statement declaring himself to be entitled to credit for the final settlement of the Manitoba school question while immediately following we find from correspondence brought down in the parliament of Canada the following extract from a letter to Cardinal Rampolla, which he has never denied."

Appealed to Pope as Private Individual.

"I have only two observations two make on this. I do not know to what Mr. Rogers refers when he says that I signed an official statement declaring myself to be entitled to credit for the final settlement of the Manitoba school question. It is not of any consequence, but I do not know what Mr. Rogers means when he says that.

"In the statement immediately following the impression is conveyed that the Canadian government brought down the correspondence between the government of Canada and Cardinal Rampolla. There is no such thing in fact. The government of Canada never had any correspondence, because there was none to bring down. What is true is that in 1896, myself and several of my co-religionists, having some difficulties in our own church, appealed to the authorities of our own church to settle them. There was nothing more than that. We did it, not as a government, but simply as men belonging to the Roman Catholic church.

"We had trouble over matters of ecclesiastical policy and we appealed to the supreme arbiter in our church to determine these matters. There was nothing more nor less. On this occasion I have nothing more to say but I thought that under the circumstances I owed it to myself and the house simply to make a statement of the facts as they are. (Aplause.)

Sir William Mulock.

Sir William Mulock reaffirmed the objection that he had taken at the conference on February 17, to Manitoba getting all the unorganized territory to the north and east of Hudson Bay without Ontario being consulted. His idea was that a fair division would be to give Ontario a deep water port on Hudson Bay, say at the mouth of Nelson river, and Manitoba another deep water port, say at the north of the Churchill. There was no deep water port on James Bay.

Mr. Borden's Regrets.

R. L. Borden regretted that Sir Wilfrid could not make as explicit a statement about the difficulties in his cabinet.

That Missing Letter.

Mr. Staples (Conservative, MacDonald), made a statement respecting what he called the mysterious letter of February 23. He said that Mr. Rogers asked him to have this letter delivered at the residence of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. He gave this letter to a messenger named Boileau to take to the residence of the premier. The messenger said that he delivered the letter.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier repeated that he had never seen the letter.

Wants Passports for Sbaretti.

Mr. Maclean (of South York), claimed that he had foreshadowed what has happened on February 27, when he read an article from Le Soleil saying that Manitoba was to be punished because it abolished separate schools. He wanted to know if the Manitoba government received the proposed amendments to the school law from Sbaretti.

Turning to the educational clauses he said that they would never pass as long as he and those associated with him could resist them. He said that Monsignor Sbarretti should get his passports. No Italian priest should toll or tithe the dominion.

Mr. Miller (South Grey), said that Mr. MacLean's speech reminded him of the line in Shakespeare: "Get glass eyes, and like a scurvy politician seem to see the things he does not."

Bourassa Defends Sbaretti.

Mr. Bourassa said that free speech was not enjoyed in the house and no man from Russia would make such an onslaught upon the Pope as they had listened to. Every civilized government carried on direct relations with the See of Rome.

Hon. Peter White said that Mr. Bourassa's speech was one of the most inflammatory he had ever listened to. The people of this country had a right to complain of the conduct of the papal ablegate, and he ought not to remain here an hour longer than was necessary to communicate with Rome.

Dr. Sproule thought that the situation justified the conclusion that Manitoba's boundaries were not extended because of the interference of the papal ablegate.

The debate on the autonomy bill was resumed by Wilson (of Lennox).

I. C. R. to Parry Sound.

On the bill to take over the Canada Atlantic by the Grand Trunk railway, Hon. Mr. Emmerson said that a notice would appear on the order papers tomorrow to take running rights over the Canada Atlantic railway from Parry Sound to Coteau to Montreal. The compensation would be fixed by the railway commission and also the regulations for running I. C. R. trains.

The rates between Montreal and Parry Sound will be subject to the control of the commission, but the commission will have nothing to do with the rates running over the I. C. R. east.

The right to use the terminals and also to construct its own terminals will be given the I. C. R. at Parry Sound. It will be the policy of the government to use the road from Montreal west, with the present system to take freight from the lakes to the Canadian seaboard at Montreal, Quebec, Halifax, St. John and possibly Sydney.

In order to have the rates between Montreal and Georgian Bay uniform the government decided to put it in the hands of the railway commission.

The opposition talked the matter out and did not allow the bill to go through when the hour was up. The bill which Mr. Emmerson proposes will not refer to the Canadian Northern.

Uproar in the House.

There was considerable uproar when MacLean (South York) was addressing the house, and the speaker called him to order. "Don't let him bluff you," yelled Col. Sam Hughes.

"Order, order," called Mr. Speaker, as he addressed Col. Hughes, "or I will be obliged to name you."

Foster—What would happen then?

Mr. Speaker ordered Col. Hughes to sit down while shouts of "expell him" came from the Liberal side.

Col. Hughes later on said that the words he used were, "Dont let them bluff you." At any rate no one was named and MacLean pursued his remarks about municipal rights, educational rights and Quebec going out of its way to fetter and manacle the west.

A REMARKABLE STORY.

Woman Tells of Her Fourteen Years of Suffering.

Mrs. H. J. Rehorn.

From Buffalo, N. Y., comes a startling story, illustrating how much suffering a woman can bear and yet live. Mrs. H. J. Rehorn, 189 Landon St., that city, says—

"Soon after the birth of my first child, years ago, constipation became troublesome and the various pills and medicines I used would give temporary relief, but gradually they seemed to lose their influence and the condition became worse. I must have used fully 50 different remedies.

"At times I would have no relish for food, and what I did eat would distress my stomach. Gas would form and rise, headache and restless sleep, bearing-down pain, backache and gradually I began to recognize the loss of strength, easily tired, and never feeling fully rested.

"My husband brought me home a bottle of a new medicine called Anti-Pill, and from the first I began to improve. My appetite was better and what I ate did not make me feel uncomfortable. Anti-Pill is mild and gentle in its action, and yet it cured my terribly obstinate constipation and made me feel so well."

Every Druggist sells this wonderful Anti-Pill that cured Mrs. Rehorn. 501

EXQUISITE COMPLEXION

Quickly Acquired if the System is Regulated by Dr. Hamilton's Pills.

The power of Dr. Hamilton's Pills over the complexion is marvellous. As if by magic all blemishes, humors and pimples disappear. A clear, ruddy glow is quickly manifest on the cheeks, and look that delight the eye comes to stay. It is by purifying and enriching the blood, and thereby building up the constitution, that Dr. Hamilton's Pills accomplish so much in a short time.

"I can hardly recommend Dr. Hamilton's Pills for the complexion" writes Miss E. M. Porter of Clearview, Co. Before using this medicine I had a very palid, murky complexion, and there was no redness or color in my cheeks. But Dr. Hamilton's Pills changed this and my looks have been much improved."

In every case of dull, sallow complexion, wherever, the skin is blotchy and rough, Dr. Hamilton's Pills quickly prove their merit. You'll look better, feel vastly improved by relying on this great medicine, which is instant in effect. Price, 25c. per box, or five boxes for $1, at all dealers, or by mail, from N. C. Polson & Co., Hartford, Conn., U. S. A., and Kingston, Ont.

UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM SOUTH CAROLINA

Recommends Pe-ru-na---Other Prominent Men Testify.

HON. JOHN J. PATTERSON.

Hon. John J. Patterson, ex-United States Senator from South Carolina, in a letter from 37-8 Chestnut street, Philadelphia, Pa., writes:

"As quite a number of my friends have and are using Peruna as a catarrh cure with beneficial results, I feel that I can safely recommend it to those suffering from that disorder."---J. J. Patterson.

Commodore Nicholson of the U. S. Navy.

Commodore Somerville Nicholson, of the United States Navy in a letter from 1337 R Street, Northwest, Washington, D. C., says:

"Your Peruna has been and is now used by so many of my friends and acquaintances as a sure cure for catarrh that I am convinced of its curative qualities and I unhesitatingly recommend it to all persons suffering from that complaint."—S. Nicholson.

U. S. Minister to Guatemala.

Dr. W. Godfrey Hunter, U. S. Minister to Guatemala, and ex-member of Congress from Kentucky, in a letter from Washington, D. C., writes:

"I am fully satisfied that your Peruna is an efficacious remedy for catarrh, as I and many of my friends have been benefited by its use."—W. G. Hunter, M. D.

Well known men of dignity and prominence in the United States endorse and recommend Peruna for catarrh.

If you do not derive prompt and satisfactory results from the use of Peruna, write at once to Dr. Hartman, giving a full statement of your case, and he will be pleased to give you his valuable advice gratis.

Address Dr. Hartman, President of The Hartman Sanitarium, Columbus, Ohio.

WOODSTOCK MAN MARRIED AT HALIFAX

Halifax, April 5—The marriage took place at 7 o'clock this evening of Miss Maud Strethill, daughter of the late Hugh S. Wright, of Edinburgh, Scotland, and later of Halifax, and Edgar W. Mair, of Woodstock (N. B.) The ceremony was performed at the home of the bride, 67 Tower Road, by Rev. Mr. Armitage, rector of St. Paul's church. Owing to death within a very short period of the bride's father and mother the list of invitations to the wedding was extremely limited. The bride was attended by her sister, Miss Mary Wright, and both wore white. The bride was given away by her brother, Hugh E. Wright. Immediately after the ceremony the young couple left for their wedding trip. Their future home is to be in New Brunswick. Miss Wright, who is perfectly charming, has been a favorite socially during the short period of her residence in Halifax and her friends said "good-bye" reluctantly.

AMHERST MAN SENT TO TORONTO PRISON

Toronto, April 4—(Special)—Harold L. Pickin, who hails from Amherst (N.S.), was today convicted by Magistrate Denison of sending indecent matter through the mails, and sent to Central prison for one year.

DON'T COUGH AWAY YOUR LUNGS

That Catarrh Will Soon be Deadly Consumption Unless You Use "Catarrhozone" at Once.

Discouraged sufferers find blessed relief and permanent cure in Catarrhozone which goes direct to the real cause of the disease. By soothing and healing the inflamed membranes, relief comes instantly. Impossible for anything to be more prompt or satisfactory.

To prove to you that "Catarrhozone" cures are permanent, the following testimonials are given. Study them carefully for your case may be similar. To these people Catarrhozone has brought health. For you it will do likewise.

Nose Completely Stuffed Up.

Mr. Archibald Bass, of New Harbor, N. S., writes: "Catarrhozone" proved itself a remarkable remedy in my case. I suffered terribly from catarrh in the throat and my nose was so stuffed up every morning I could hardly draw my breath. The mucous dropped back into my stomach, upset my digestion and kept me sick all the time. Catarrhozone relieved in a short time and cured perfectly."

Catarrhozone Best of All

Mrs. W. F. Breach, of Chapman P. O., writes: "I have used a great many catarrh remedies, but none of them ever helped like Catarrhozone. It cleared out my nose and throat, and stopped a ringing noise in my ears."

"Don't be misled into accepting a substitute for Catarrhozone, which alone can cure thoroughly. It is so powerfully healing that colds disappear in an hour, and chronic catarrh in a short time. Two months' treatment $1, sample size 25c. At druggists or by mail from N. C. Polson & Co., Hartford, Conn., U. S. A., and Kingston, Ont.

Throat Like Raw Beef.

"Last spring I caught a severe cold," writes George V. Smart of Gilson, P. O. "Every cough blistered my throat, which became perfectly raw. When almost in desperation I was advised to try Nerviline. I rubbed it on and used it as a gargle. Immediate relief followed. For breaking up colds it's the great remedy of today." Used more largely now than ever—and fifty years in use. Surely Nerviline must be good.

P. E. ISLAND HOUSE IN SESSION AGAIN

Premier Peters Sworn In--Trains at Charlottetown After Two Days' Snow Blockade.

Charlottetown, April 4—(Special)—The provincial legislature re-opened tonight. Hon. Premier Peters was sworn in and took his seat, also Hon. S. E. Reid, commissioner of agriculture. The address will be moved tomorrow.

Trains from the west, held up two days by a snow storm, arrived tonight.