

ESTABLISHED, 1852

The Casket

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY AT ANTIGONISH, BY THE CASKET PRINTING AND PUBLISHING COMPANY (LIMITED).

Terms: \$1.00 per Year in Advance.

THURSDAY, MAY 19.

Relic hunters have stripped the tomb of Walt Whitman and the hill on which it is situated of nearly everything portable in the way of vines and plants.—Exchange.

How touching! But had Walt Whitman been one of God's saints, instead of an eccentric writer of so-called poetry, how idolatrous the conduct of those people would have been?

A unique case in the sad and sickening record of divorce in the United States occurred at Cincinnati a few days ago, when a couple, married at 4 o'clock in the evening called at an attorney's office at 9 on the following morning and asked him to get them a divorce. Such is the outcome of lax divorce laws. Marriage will be lightly entered upon so long as the law facilitates escape from it.

The anniversary of His Lordship Bishop, Cameron's consecration falls on Sunday next. On that day he will be twenty-two years a Bishop, having received episcopal consecration at Rome as Coadjutor Bishop of Arichat on the 22nd of May, 1870. His Lordship's health is greatly improved; in fact almost all trace of the distressing cough from which he suffered during the winter has disappeared. May he long live to rule our Diocese with wisdom and firmness.

Wyoming women are to vote for President at the next national election, and are seriously endeavoring to fit themselves for a trust which they believe to be important. The women of Cheyenne have organized a league club and propose to study, talk and listen to addresses on discussions bearing on topics of national interest which may help them to vote honestly and intelligently.—New York Ledger.

What the Wyoming men are doing all this time we are not told; but we presume they attend to the cooking and look after the babies. We even fear that, as the political campaign began so early, the school-master gathered his pupils behind a hedge, while some one kept watch lest the sleuths of the Government should discover them. To-day, the descendants of those who made and executed those laws cast in the teeth of the injured people their illiteracy; and a British Ministry, led by a man who has twice within the past few months on the public platform shown himself to be a brutal ruffian, and backed by a majority which has been told in almost every-by-election for years back that it is in direct opposition to the will of the people, makes that illiteracy a pretext to deprive numbers of the Irish people of a right to a voice in what most intimately concerns them. This Ministry not only violates the spirit of the British Constitution by clinging to office in defiance of the English people's oft-expressed repudiation of it, but even dares to disfranchise tens of thousands in its desperate efforts to escape destruction when at length the letter of the Constitution compels it to dissolve Parliament. The old charge, made in the course of the debate, that the people of Ireland were intimidated by the priests, was indignantly denied by an Irish Protestant member, Mr. MacNeil, who, as he said, was himself elected over a Catholic opponent.

The famous shrine at Beauce, Quebec, is to be enriched with another relic of St. Anne—a large fragment of the Saint's arm.—Mgr. Marquis, who had been deputed by Cardinal Taschereau to bring the relic from Rome, has been in New York for the past week or ten days, and the relic which he brought, with him has been there exposed for the veneration of the faithful in the church of St. John Baptist. Thousands upon thousands have gone thither to venerate the relic, many having come from far distant places to pay this tribute of devotion to the good St. Anne. Many cures are said to have been wrought in connection with the exposition of the sacred relic. The leading New York dailies, such as the Herald and Sun, give lengthy descriptions of the impressive scenes that have been witnessed in the church of St. John Baptist since the relic was exposed there, and also publish the names of persons that have been miraculously cured.

The Michigan Catholic on May 12, quotes and comments upon the following despatch from Mason City, Iowa, dated May 8:

Religious circles are agitated over the action of Rev. Charles Lutz, pastor of St. John's Guild, of this city. He notified his people of his resignation, and announced that he hoped henceforth his allegiance would be the Roman Catholic Church. He has gone to Montreal to enter the Order of St. Sulpice to study for the priesthood. He is highly educated, and says that his mind has been leading him to take this step for some time.

We have reasons for believing that this is the reverend gentleman of that name who had charge of the Anglican congregation at Canso two years ago, and whose High Church principles were so decided as to cause much comment. We rejoice to hear that he has received the grace of conversion, and pray that he may persevere. The writer of the despatch should of course have said "the Seminary of St. Sulpice" instead of "the Order of St. Sulpice." Mr. Lutz is a native of Switzerland.

It would be comical, ludicrous as well as absurd, were it not also very sad, that a handful of Galilean fishermen should be able to persuade some thousands of mankind (especially woman kind) that they have been and are the true and only Church, that they are infallible, and that it is an awful thing to differ from them in faith. The impudence of those Galileans is almost sublime. But their assumptions impose on many a good and sincere soul.

These are not, as might be supposed, the words of a Pagan of the first century; they are those of the Presbyterian Witness of May 14, A. D. 1892. We have simply substituted "harpful" for "body," "Galilean fishermen" for "Italian priests," "thousands" for "millions," and "Galileans" for "Italians," to show the Witness and those who are shallow enough, to think

with it, the real character of its "argument." Had the editor of the Witness lived in the time of the Apostles, it is quite clear what his opinion of their "sublime impudence" would be.

A Bill to make voting in Dominion elections compulsory, which was introduced this year for the second time by Col. Angott, has been approved of by a special committee of the House of Commons, which added to it a clause excepting from its operation those "who have religious objections to voting" and another providing that any person who wishes to do so may have his name removed from the voters' list before the final revision. The measure seems to us to be a very anomalous one and an unnecessary interference with the liberty of the subject. Doubtless the drag-ging of voters to the polls by the agents and friends of the candidates, which the Bill is intended to stop, is a serious abuse; but it is questionable whether it is a greater evil than the adoption of this rather arbitrary measure would be. There are many evils which are suffered to exist rather than that the liberty of the subject should be curtailed. Why should a man be compelled either to take active steps to have his name removed from the list or to go to the poll against his will; for, as the law can scarcely undertake to compel him to mark his ballot correctly, it can really secure nothing more than his attendance at the poll. That a man may have good and sufficient reasons for abstaining from voting in a particular case, we think no reasonable person will deny; and these reasons may be the result of circumstances arising after the final revision takes place. The very word "franchise" means a privilege, and it is plain that under such a law the term would be a misnomer. We do not deny that the exercise of the franchise in a given case may be a solemn duty, as its conscientious exercise, when exercised at all, always is; but not all duties in a free State are enforced by fine.

One of the grossest and most high-handed acts of political injustice within recent years was perpetrated in the British House of Commons on Friday last, when a conscienceless majority voted, 117 to 51, to repeal the clause in the Ballot Act providing for the voting of illiterate persons. It was openly and shamelessly avowed by R. G. Webster, M. P., that the object of the motion was to disfranchise a large number of the people of Ireland. British laws have made numbers of the people of Ireland illiterate; for it was once a crime to teach them. The school-master gathered his pupils behind a hedge, while some one kept watch lest the sleuths of the Government should discover them. To-day, the descendants of those who made and executed those laws cast in the teeth of the injured people their illiteracy; and a British Ministry, led by a man who has twice within the past few months on the public platform shown himself to be a brutal ruffian, and backed by a majority which has been told in almost every-by-election for years back that it is in direct opposition to the will of the people, makes that illiteracy a pretext to deprive numbers of the Irish people of a right to a voice in what most intimately concerns them. This Ministry not only violates the spirit of the British Constitution by clinging to office in defiance of the English people's oft-expressed repudiation of it, but even dares to disfranchise tens of thousands in its desperate efforts to escape destruction when at length the letter of the Constitution compels it to dissolve Parliament. The old charge, made in the course of the debate, that the people of Ireland were intimidated by the priests, was indignantly denied by an Irish Protestant member, Mr. MacNeil, who, as he said, was himself elected over a Catholic opponent.

According to Mosheim.

Among the statements in reference to the Nestorian heresy which the Rev. Dr. Blair puts forward in his letter to the Witness on the authority of Mosheim, is the following:

According to Mosheim it is the general opinion of ecclesiastical writers, both ancient and modern, that the opinions of Nestorius and of the council which condemned them were the same in effect, that their difference was in words only, and that the whole blame of the unhappy controversy was to be charged upon the turbulent spirit of Cyril, and his aversion to Nestorius.

We have no doubt at all that Dr. Blair reports Mosheim correctly. But to us it is of little consequence what is or is not according to Mosheim if it is not according to the truth. Apart altogether from what he states here we believe that Mosheim is not a safe historical guide. Our reason for so believing will appear later on. Meanwhile let us test the accuracy of the statement before us. The German historian sets out with an affirmation that is very wide indeed of the truth. How can he describe the opinion of a small minority as "the general opinion of ecclesiastical writers, both ancient and modern?" Of the ancient ecclesiastical writers only those shared that opinion who were in sympathy with Nestorius himself or with his heresy; and these were a mere handful. On the other hand, every Catholic writer on Church history or dogmatic theology since the fifth century—and their name is legion—strongly maintains the opposite opinion. Since the so-called Reformation, Protestant writers, impelled by a fellow-feeling which is easily understood, have taken up the defence of Nestorius and have tried to make out that he was more sinned against than sinning. But it would have been as

difficult for Mosheim to show that all the Protestant writers who dealt with the question before him were even a respectable minority of the then modern ecclesiastical writers, as it is preposterous for him to affirm that there existed any such consensus of opinion as he claims among ancient ecclesiastical writers.

As for the absurd contention that the whole controversy between the Catholics and Nestorians was about words merely, and not doctrine, we will not waste much time with refuting it. The very existence of the Nestorian sect in the East down to this day, points to a difference in doctrine as the cause of its original separation from the Church. Who can bring himself to believe that Celestine would convene a synod at Rome, that 250 bishops would meet at Ephesus, to settle a controversy about words? Sermons and other writings of Nestorius still extant clearly show that he denied the hypostatic union of the two natures in Christ, and admitted, only a moral union which consisted in the indwelling of God the Word in the man Jesus as in a temple. Hence he persisted in denying the Divinity of Jesus, the Son of Mary; and Socrates, the Greek historian tells us (Lib. viii. c. 34) that when many of the bishops before the opening of the Council confessed that Christ is God, Nestorius said: I cannot recognize as God a child two or three months old. . . . nor will I longer have any intercourse with you. These words alone would be enough to convict Nestorius of denying the mystery of the Incarnation.

We shall now proceed to show from outside testimony how utterly untrustworthy the Lutheran Mosheim is as an historical guide. In the "Spicilegium Dacherii" is published a sermon by Eligius, a Catholic saint and bishop who lived in the seventh century. Mosheim in his work on ecclesiastical history makes an extract from this sermon to show how the Christian religion had degenerated by the time of St. Eligius, how the Christians in that age placed "the substance of religion in external rites and bodily exercises." MacLaine, Mosheim's English translator, makes the following reflection on the passage quoted by Mosheim as if the original text of the saint's: "We see here a large and ample description of the character of a good Christian, in which there is not the least mention of the love of God, resignation to His Will, obedience to His laws, or of justice, benevolence, and charity towards men." Robertson and Hallam cite the same passage with comments similar to those of MacLaine. In 1833, Dr. Waddington, the Protestant Dean of Durham, being engaged in publishing an Ecclesiastical History, had quoted at page 153 of his work the passage as given by Mosheim; but by the time he got to page 298 he had consulted the original text, and found to his utter amazement that the extract made from St. Eligius was composed of sentences picked out here and there from a long sermon,—most sentences of which, in the very midst of those actually quoted, contained all those matters; the supposed absence of which was the very charge brought against the Saint by Mosheim, MacLaine, and the rest. "It was with great sorrow and some shame," so wrote Dr. Waddington on discovering his mistake, "that he, i. e. Dr. Waddington himself, ascertained the treachery of his historical conductor. The expressions cited by Mosheim," he adds, and cited, too, with a direct reference to the "Spicilegium," were "forcibly brought to light by a very unparadigmatic mutilation of his authority." He then goes on to express his opinion of Mosheim, which we give as quoted by Newman at page 107 of "The Present Position of Catholics in England":

"The impression," he says, "which Mosheim, by 'stringing together,' certain sentences, 'without any notice of the context,' conveys to his readers, is wholly false; and the indignity which is cast upon his author is not the less reprehensible, because it falls on one of the obscurest saints in the Roman calendar. If the very essence of history be truth, and if any deliberate violation of that be sinful in the profane annalist, still less can it deserve mercy or pardon in the historian of the Church of Christ."

We commend these words of the truth-loving Protestant Dean to the careful consideration of our friend Dr. Blair and of all those who look up to Mosheim as an authority on matters relating to the history of the Church. By how much the more damage they are to the German historian's reputation for veracity, by so much the better they serve, at least indirectly, the cause of truth.

POWER OF EXPRESSION.

It is interesting to compare the different ways in which able writers express the same thought. Their respective styles are best seen in their comparative. Thus, the Anglican Bishop Butler and Cardinal Newman both had occasion, though in different connections, to express the fact that the doctrine of original sin, instead of being difficult of belief, is apart altogether from revelation, an almost necessary hypothesis, once it is suggested, whereby to account for the actual state of mankind. Bishop Butler, who, by the way, was born exactly two centuries ago (May 18, 1692), is undoubtedly the ablest prelate the Church of England has produced. His way of putting the fact mentioned above is as follows:

Whoever will consider the manifold miseries, and the extreme wickedness of the world; that the best have great wrongs within themselves, which they complain of, and wish to amend; but that the generality grow more profligate and corrupt with age; that even moralists thought the present state to be a state of punishment; and that the earth our habitation has the appearance of being a ruin; whoever, I say, will consider all these, and some other obvious things, will think he has little reason to object to the Scripture account that mankind is in a state of degradation; against this being the fact: how difficult soever he may think it to account for, or even to form a distinct conception of the occasions and circumstances of it. But that the crime of our first parents was the occasion of our being placed in a more disadvantageous condition,

the members are simply delegates. The senate of the German Empire, for instance, (the Bundesrath), is a body of ambassadors representing the governments of the states united in the Empire. They seek special instructions for votes of importance. They have, however, this much independence, that their votes are valid even when they disobey instructions. The Bundesrath represents the federal principle of the Empire. The United States Senate is also a federal body, each State being represented by two senators; but these are not delegates of the State Legislatures which elect them. They are not subject to be instructed as to their votes. Each Senator is entitled to vote according to his own opinion. Members of the House of Representatives are equally or more fully empowered in this respect, and Sir Charles Blake, speaking of the colonies of Britain, tells us that "colonial members of Parliament are not so much in the position of delegates as are members of Congress in the United States." He says elsewhere that Sir Henry Maine in his Popular Government "assumed that under democratic government members would, to an increasing degree, receive positive mandates from their constituents, although colonial example would have shown him that colonial representatives are left more free in this respect than are members of Parliament in Great Britain." The great Edmund Burke was once taken to task by the electors of Bristol for a vote which they considered wrong. He replied:

"To deliver an opinion is the right of all men: the opinion of constituents is a weighty and respectable one which a representative ought always to rejoice to hear, and which he ought always most seriously to consider. But authoritative instructions, mandates issued, which a member ought always blindly and implicitly to obey, to vote and argue for, though contrary to the clearest conviction of his judgment and conscience, these things are utterly unknown to the laws of this land, and arise from a fundamental mistake of the whole order and tenor of our constitution."

As a matter of fact, then, the member is not merely a spokesman or mouthpiece. He is a fully empowered member of a central legislative body. The importance of this fact lies in the need of national unity in policy and legislation. If each member were simply a delegate, there would be too much clashing of local interests. Parliament at Ottawa is not a meeting of representatives, but of the people of the Dominion. The first consideration for a member as to his vote is the welfare of the nation as a whole. This is a fundamental reason why the particular constituency which elected him has not the right to send him an authoritative mandate. A member's vote affects the whole country. The local interests of a constituency are subordinate to the common good. Electors are only too apt to ignore this subordination and to forget that the franchise is a trust held for the common benefit of all whom the vote affects. Perhaps the time will come when electors will see that, as regards Dominion elections, even their own local interests are best served by voting on broad national grounds; but till then at least, it would be very strange if the electors were to become mere delegates of the constituencies. Another consideration is the large scope and the complexity of modern legislation. The task of government is as complex as is the lay of economic, social, religious, and other forces in the commonwealth. These various interests, as they are called, are rightly represented in Parliament, though there is no express provision for their representation in the written Constitution. Any given member represents more than his own constituency, and hence the constituency cannot rightfully claim full control over him. NARRATIVE.

Teachers are cordially invited to inspect A. Kirk & Co.'s mammoth stock of Dry Goods.—adv.

Another master of expression is Prof. Huxley. And, strange to say, he has had occasion to express the same fact as the two above quoted. He, of course, looks at things from a very different point of view. According to him it is not original sin but original brutality that shows itself in man's present sinfulness, but as to the fact of its existence, Huxley is at one with the theologians. He says: I know no study which is so unutterably saddening as that of the evolution of humanity, as it is set forth in the annals of history. Out of the darkness of prehistoric times, man emerges with the marks of his lowly origin strong upon him. He is a brute, only more intelligent than other brutes, a blind prey to impulses, which as often as not lead him to destruction; a victim of endless illusions, which make his mental existence a terror and a burden, and fill his physical life with toil and battle. He attains a certain degree of physical comfort, and develops a more or less workable theory of life, in such favorable situations as the plains of Mesopotamia or of Egypt, and then, for thousands and thousands of years, struggles with varying fortunes, attended by infinite wickedness, bloodshed, and misery, to maintain himself at this point against the greed and the ambition of his fellow-men. He makes a point of killing and otherwise persecuting all those who first try to get him to move on. . . . and the best men of the best epochs are simply those who make the fewest blunders and commit the fewest sins.

Each in his own way these three writers bring home to us the fact that men need a superior guide as much as they are disposed to reject him. Man's reason is implicated in that terrible aboriginal calamity. Actually and historically, as Newman puts it, the tendency of reason is towards a simple unbelief in matters of religion. No truth, however sacred, can stand against it in the long run. The advocates of the supremacy of private judgment utter an historical as well as a theological falsehood when they say that the freest use of reason brings us most closely to God.

IN PARLIAMENT.

A man is elected by a county or other constituency to represent it in Parliament. He is known as the Member for Queen's or Montreal Centre or some other place. To what extent is he obliged to conform his votes to the judgment and wishes of his constituents? He is their representative, and it is really important to know whether this means that he is simply their mouth-piece, rather than a substitute empowered to act for them to the best of his own judgment. To begin with, there is a moral limitation which applies to all sorts of agency. No agent or delegate can rightfully carry out the behests of a principal against the dictate of conscience. There is no need of discussing the question whether a man in his quality of representative must do what he considers morally wrong whenever his constituents require it; but beyond this there is a vast field of action where prudence or expediency or interest is the chief consideration, and in these we may be sure that a member will usually take good care not to run counter to the known wishes of his constituents, but still the important question remains how far he is morally obliged to adopt this line of conduct. If he is simply a delegate or mouthpiece, his obligation lies in that direction. If, on the other hand, he is a fully empowered substitute, his obligation lies rather in the direction of using his own judgment in voting. There are legislative bodies in which

the members are simply delegates. The senate of the German Empire, for instance, (the Bundesrath), is a body of ambassadors representing the governments of the states united in the Empire. They seek special instructions for votes of importance. They have, however, this much independence, that their votes are valid even when they disobey instructions. The Bundesrath represents the federal principle of the Empire. The United States Senate is also a federal body, each State being represented by two senators; but these are not delegates of the State Legislatures which elect them. They are not subject to be instructed as to their votes. Each Senator is entitled to vote according to his own opinion. Members of the House of Representatives are equally or more fully empowered in this respect, and Sir Charles Blake, speaking of the colonies of Britain, tells us that "colonial members of Parliament are not so much in the position of delegates as are members of Congress in the United States." He says elsewhere that Sir Henry Maine in his Popular Government "assumed that under democratic government members would, to an increasing degree, receive positive mandates from their constituents, although colonial example would have shown him that colonial representatives are left more free in this respect than are members of Parliament in Great Britain." The great Edmund Burke was once taken to task by the electors of Bristol for a vote which they considered wrong. He replied:

"To deliver an opinion is the right of all men: the opinion of constituents is a weighty and respectable one which a representative ought always to rejoice to hear, and which he ought always most seriously to consider. But authoritative instructions, mandates issued, which a member ought always blindly and implicitly to obey, to vote and argue for, though contrary to the clearest conviction of his judgment and conscience, these things are utterly unknown to the laws of this land, and arise from a fundamental mistake of the whole order and tenor of our constitution."

As a matter of fact, then, the member is not merely a spokesman or mouthpiece. He is a fully empowered member of a central legislative body. The importance of this fact lies in the need of national unity in policy and legislation. If each member were simply a delegate, there would be too much clashing of local interests. Parliament at Ottawa is not a meeting of representatives, but of the people of the Dominion. The first consideration for a member as to his vote is the welfare of the nation as a whole. This is a fundamental reason why the particular constituency which elected him has not the right to send him an authoritative mandate. A member's vote affects the whole country. The local interests of a constituency are subordinate to the common good. Electors are only too apt to ignore this subordination and to forget that the franchise is a trust held for the common benefit of all whom the vote affects. Perhaps the time will come when electors will see that, as regards Dominion elections, even their own local interests are best served by voting on broad national grounds; but till then at least, it would be very strange if the electors were to become mere delegates of the constituencies. Another consideration is the large scope and the complexity of modern legislation. The task of government is as complex as is the lay of economic, social, religious, and other forces in the commonwealth. These various interests, as they are called, are rightly represented in Parliament, though there is no express provision for their representation in the written Constitution. Any given member represents more than his own constituency, and hence the constituency cannot rightfully claim full control over him. NARRATIVE.

Teachers are cordially invited to inspect A. Kirk & Co.'s mammoth stock of Dry Goods.—adv.

Another master of expression is Prof. Huxley. And, strange to say, he has had occasion to express the same fact as the two above quoted. He, of course, looks at things from a very different point of view. According to him it is not original sin but original brutality that shows itself in man's present sinfulness, but as to the fact of its existence, Huxley is at one with the theologians. He says: I know no study which is so unutterably saddening as that of the evolution of humanity, as it is set forth in the annals of history. Out of the darkness of prehistoric times, man emerges with the marks of his lowly origin strong upon him. He is a brute, only more intelligent than other brutes, a blind prey to impulses, which as often as not lead him to destruction; a victim of endless illusions, which make his mental existence a terror and a burden, and fill his physical life with toil and battle. He attains a certain degree of physical comfort, and develops a more or less workable theory of life, in such favorable situations as the plains of Mesopotamia or of Egypt, and then, for thousands and thousands of years, struggles with varying fortunes, attended by infinite wickedness, bloodshed, and misery, to maintain himself at this point against the greed and the ambition of his fellow-men. He makes a point of killing and otherwise persecuting all those who first try to get him to move on. . . . and the best men of the best epochs are simply those who make the fewest blunders and commit the fewest sins.

Each in his own way these three writers bring home to us the fact that men need a superior guide as much as they are disposed to reject him. Man's reason is implicated in that terrible aboriginal calamity. Actually and historically, as Newman puts it, the tendency of reason is towards a simple unbelief in matters of religion. No truth, however sacred, can stand against it in the long run. The advocates of the supremacy of private judgment utter an historical as well as a theological falsehood when they say that the freest use of reason brings us most closely to God.

IN ALL COLORED AND FANCY  
GLOVES!  
SILK,  
LISLE,  
TAFFETA.  
Lace Mitts and Gloves  
From 10 cts. a Pair.  
Don't Forget we Keep the Very Best Make of  
KID GLOVES  
And every Pair Warranted.  
HOSIERY!  
Look at our Ladies'  
BLACK CASHMERE HOSE  
For 25 cents.  
Ladies Cotton and Lisle Hose  
ALL PRICES.

Dress Goods  
WE SHOW A SUPERB RANGE IN ALL THE NEWEST GOODS NOW WORN.  
OUR NEW DRESS TWEEDS ARE ALL THE RAGE.  
SOME BEAUTIFUL THINGS IN  
Cheviotts, Corduroys, Grey Belges, Fancy Cords, Nun's Yelling, Diagonal Cloth, Serges.  
Colored Henriettas  
IN ALL THE NEW TINTS.  
COLORED CASHMERE.  
We have no hesitation in stating that all our Cashmeres both in Colored and Black, are Better value than we have ever imported.  
JUST COMPARE OUR PRICES, WHICH IS ALL WE WISH TO INSURE A SALE.  
SEE OUR BEAUTIFUL  
Dress Robes  
For \$5.50.  
Black Nun's Veilings,  
New Grape Cloths,  
Diagonal Cloths,  
Corduroys,  
And all the Black Goods Now Worn.  
Mourning Goods  
A SPECIALTY.

English, American and Canadian  
PRINTS AND SHIRTINGS.  
Look at our English Prints—all Fast Colors, from 12 cents, American and Canadian Prints from 7 cents up, nice patterns. Summer Cashmeres, Oriental Chalfes, Bedford Cords, Scotch Zephyrs, Teazle Cloths, Splendid Gingham for 8 cents. A Large Variety of Patterns in Cottonades,  
10 to 20 yards Grey or White Cotton Sold at Web Prices.  
McCURDY & CO., ANTIGONISH,

These Hands all Point to  
A. KIRK & CO.'S  
Where you will see the Finest Show of

MILLINERY.

Ever Displayed in Antigonish. All New and Stylish. All the New Styles are decidedly novel. Not last season's renovated. Inspection by Ladies invited.

Our Stock of Dress Goods

Comprises all the Newest Materials in all the Popular Shades, and we have a Large Assortment of the Very Newest things in Trimmings. Goods were never so pretty before, and Ladies cannot help but look lovely in such beautiful Fabrics and Fixings. Prices are lower than any known heretofore.

Kid Gloves

(WE KEEP NONE BUT PERRIN'S) Perfection is attained in these Popular Gloves. Demand PERRIN'S LADIES' KID GLOVES WITH THEIR LACING STUDS. They DO NOT CATCH. DO NOT UNFASTEN. DO NOT CUT THE LACING.

And are the only Kid Gloves having the Gusset Finger. EVERY PAIR IS STAMPED. EVERY PAIR IS WARRANTED.

Ladies will find with us the Largest Range of Corsets

to be found in Antigonish. All reliable makes and we sell them at Popular Prices. Our A. K. & CO. CORSET MADE especially for Our Trade, and sold at 50 CENTS, is as good as other Stores' Dollar Corset.

Ladies Hosiery and Underwear

Is a Special Line with us, and in our Millinery Department we carry a Good Assortment of LADIES' WHITE UNDERWEAR.

OUR GENTLEMEN'S OUTFITTING DEPARTMENT

CONTAINS A LARGE STOCK OF CHRISTY'S LONDON FELT HATS AND AMERICAN FELT HATS (All New and Stylish.) OXFORD, FLANNELETTE, WOOL, LISLE THREAD, and SILK-COLORED TOP SHIRTS, WHITE DRESS SHIRTS, HOSIERY, UNDERWEAR, TIES, COLLARS, CUFFS, Etc., AND AN IMMENSE RANGE OF READY-MADE CLOTHING. MEN'S TWEED SUITS FROM \$4.25 UP.

IN STAPLE DRY GOODS

We always have a Full Stock of WHITE GREY COTTONS, CHECKED AND STRIPED SHIRTINGS, PRINT COTTONS, GINGHAMS, FLANNELETTES, COTTONADES, TICKINGS. Prices below Competition.

House Furnishing Goods of every Description.

HEMP, UNION, ALL-WOOL, TAPESTRY and BRUSSELS CARPETS, TABLE and FLOOR OIL CLOTHS, LACE WINDOW CURTAINS, ART MUSLINS, ART WINDOW SHADES, CURTAIN POLES, AND SPRING BLIND ROLLERS, SHEETINGS, TABLE LINENS, NAPKINS, TOWELS, PARLOUR, BEDROOM and KITCHEN FURNITURE.

In Our Boot and Shoe Department

We have Goods Suitable for everybody. Choice Family Groceries.

Flour, Oatmeal, Rolled Oats, Corn Meal, Etc., always in Stock.

A KIRK & CO., Agents for the Melissa Cloths and Garments

McCURDY & COMPANY, Headquarters

FOR DRESS Goods.

Black Goods.

HENRIETTA. All-Wool, 44-inch Henrietta in Finely-Tinted Blacks, beautifully Finished, and for value unequalled.

55c

CASHMERE. A Beautiful Black All-Wool Cashmere—40 inches—this is a Special Brand.

47c

GRENADINES. Splendid Values

10c, 15c, 20c, 25c, 30c, 35c, 40c, 45c, 50c.

Grenadines. ALL WOOL French Cloth 40 INCHES.

37c

CASHMERE. We wish Parties to get Samples of our Cashmeres, add compare with anything in the Market, when they will be more than pleased with their value.

20c, 25c, 30c, 35c, 40c, 45c, 50c.

BLACK SERGE. ALL WOOL Black Dress Serge, 40 INCHES.

38c

BLACK FANCIES. We show an excellent range in Black Fancy Dress Goods, ALL NEW PATTERNS.

45c, 50c, 55c, 60c, 65c, 70c, 75c, 80c, 85c, 1.00, 1.20.

English, American and Canadian PRINTS AND SHIRTINGS.

Look at our English Prints—all Fast Colors, from 12 cents, American and Canadian Prints from 7 cents up, nice patterns. Summer Cashmeres, Oriental Chalfes, Bedford Cords, Scotch Zephyrs, Teazle Cloths, Splendid Gingham for 8 cents. A Large Variety of Patterns in Cottonades,

10 to 20 yards Grey or White Cotton Sold at Web Prices.

McCURDY & CO., ANTIGONISH,