General Business.

Scratched 28 Years

Body covered with scales. Itching terrible. Suffering endless. No relief. Doctors and medicines fail. Speedily cured by Cuticura at a cost of $5.

Cured by Cuticura.

If I had known of the CUTICURA REMEDIES twenty-eight years ago it would have saved me $500.00 (two hundred dollars) and an immense amount of suffering. My disease (psoriasis) commenced on my head in a spot not larger than a cent. It spread rapidly all over my body and got under my nails. The scales would drop off of me all the time, and my suffering was endless and without relief. One thousand dollars would not tempt me to have this disease ever again. I am a poor man, but feel rich to be relieved of what some of the doctors said was leprosy, some ringworm, psoriasis, etc. I took....and....Sarsaparilla over one year and a half, but no cure. I cannot praise the CUTICURA REMEDIES too much They have made my skin as clear and free from scales as a baby's. All I used of them were three boxes of CUTICURA, and three bottles of CUTICURA RESOLVENT, and two cakes of CUTICURA SOAP. If you had been here and said you would have cured me for $200.00, you would have had the money. I looked like the picture in your book of psoriasis (picture number two. "How to Cure Skin Diseases"), but now I am as clear as any person ever was. Through force of habit I rub my hands over my arms and legs to scratch once in a while, but to no purpose. I am all well. I scratched twenty-eight years, and it got to be a second nature to me. I thank you a thousand times.

DENNIS DOWNING, Waterbury, Vt.

Cuticura Resolvent

The new Blood and Skin Purifier and purest and best of Humor Remedies. Internally, and CUTICURA, the great Skin Cure, and CUTICURA SOAP, an exquisite Skin Beautifier, externally, speedily, and permanently cure every species of itching, burning, scaly, crusted, pimply, scrofulous, and hereditary diseases and humors of the skin, scalp, and blood, with loss of hair, from pimples to scrofula.

Sold everywhere. Price, CUTICURA, 75c.; SOAP, 35c.; RESOLVENT, $1.50. Prepared by the POTTER DRUG AND CHEMICAL CORPORATION, Boston.

Send for "How to Cure Skin Diseases," 64 pages, 50 illustrations, and 100 testimonials.

PIMPLES, black-heads, chapped and oily skin prevented by CUTICURA MEDICATED SOAP.

FREE FROM RHEUMATISM. In one minute the Cuticura Anti-Pain Plaster relieves rheumatic, sciatic, hip, kidney, chest, and muscular pains and weakness. The first and only pain-killing plaster. 30 cents.

UNPRECEDENT ATTRACTION! OVER A MILLION DISTRIBUTED

L. S. L.

Louisiana State Lottery Company.

Incorporated by the Legislature for Educational and Charitable purposes, and its franchise made a part of the present State constitution, in 1879, by an overwhelming popular vote.

Its MAMMOTH DRAWINGS take place Semi-Annually, (June and December), and its GRAND SINGLE NUMBER DRAWINGS take place in each of the other ten months of the year, and are all drawn in public, at the Academy of Music, New Orleans, La.

Famed for Twenty Years, For Integrity of its Drawings and Prompt Payment of Prizes.

Attested as follows:

"We do hereby certify that we supervise the arrangements for all the Monthly and Semi-Annual Drawings of The Louisiana State Lottery Company, and in person manage and control the Drawings themselves, and that the same are conducted with honesty, fairness, and in good faith toward all parties, and we authorize the company to use this certificate, with facsimiles of our signatures attached, in its advertisements."

G. T. Beauregard
J. A. Early
Commissioners.

We the undersigned Banks and Bankers will pay all Prizes drawn in The Louisiana State Lotteries which may be presented at our counters.

R. M. WALMSLEY, Pres. Louisiana National Bank.
PIERRE LANAUX, Pres. State National Bank
A. BALDWIN, Pres. New Orleans National Bank.
CARL KOHN, Pres. Union National Bank.

Grand Monthly Drawing,

at the Academy of Music, New Orleans, Tuesday, May 13, 1890.

Capital prize, $300,000.

100,000 Tickets at Twenty Dollars each. Halves $10; Quarters $5; Tenths 2; twentieths $1.

LIST OF PRIZES

1 PRIZE OF $300,000 is		$300,000
1 PRIZE OF 100,000 is		100,000
1 PRIZE OF 50,000 is		50,000
2 PRIZES OF 25,000 are		50,000
2 PRIZES OF 10,000 are		20,000
5 PRIZES OF 5,000 are		25,000
25 PRIZES OF 1,000 are		25,000
100 PRIZES OF 500 are		50,000
200 PRIZES OF 300 are		60,000
500 PRIZES OF 200 are		100,000
APPROXIMATION PRIZES.		
100 Prizes of $500 are		$50,000
100 do 300 are		30,000
100 do 200 are		20,000
TERMINAL PRIZES.		
999 do. 100 are		99,900
999 do. 100 are		99,900
3,134 Prizes, amounting to		$1,054,800

NOTE.—Tickets drawing Capital Prizes are not entitled to terminal Prizes.

AGENTS WANTED

For Club Rates, or any further information desired, write legibly to the undersigned, clearly stating your residence, with State, County, Street and number. Mere rapid return mail delivery will be assured by your enclosing an Envelope bearing your full address.

IMPORTANT.

Address M. A. DAUPHIN, New Orleans, La.,

or M. A. DAUPHIN, Washington, D. C.

By ordinary letter, containing MONEY ORDER issued by all Express Companies, New York Exchange, Draft or Postal Note.

Address Registered Letters containing Currency to NEW ORLEANS NATIONAL BANK, New Orleans, La.

"REMEMBER that the payment of Prizes is GUARANTEED BY FOUR NATIONAL BANKS of New Orleans, and the Tickets are Signed by the President of an Institution whose chartered rights are recognized in the highest Courts; therefore, beware of all imitations or anonymous schemes."

ONE DOLLAR is the price of the smallest part or fraction of a Ticket ISSUED BY US in any Drawing. Anything in our name offered for less than a Dollar is a swindle.

WOOD-GOODS.

WE MANUFACTURE AND HAVE

FOR SALE

Laths,
Palings,
Box-Shooks,
Barrel Heading,
Matched Flooring,
Matched Sheathing,
Dimensioned Lumber,
Sawn Spruce Shingles.

THOS. W. FLETT,
NELSON.

Miramichi Advance.

CHATHAM, N. B. - - - - - APRIL 24, 1890.

About Election Expenses.

The St. Andrews *Beacon* poses as one of the "innocents" of journalism. It assumes that the $1,500 contributed by a number of St. John gentlemen to the York election fund in the January contest, was sent there to "corrupt the electors," and it says, "Surely this was bad enough." There is no evidence to show that the money was sent to corrupt the electors. The *Beacon* is a very young journal, and there has been no election in Charlotte since its birth, because the people of that county, very sensibly, did not give encouragement to the *Beacon's* opposition friends. When the *Beacon* folks have had a little experience in contested elections, they will know that, however purely they may be conducted, a candidate cannot get through one without incurring him a good deal of money. In large counties like York, where there are a good many parishes to organize, hundreds of dollars may be honestly spent in properly reaching and informing the electorate. Travelling expenses of agents, for a dozen parishes, including horse-hire, and other legitimate disbursements form no small item, especially in the month of January. It is not unusual for committees to distribute from 20,000 to 50,000 newspapers during an election campaign in a large constituency, and these, even at two cents each, make a big hole in $1,000, to say nothing of the expense of mailing, including wrapping, addressing and postage. Then, if the candidates provide necessary refreshments for voters travelling long distances to exercise their franchise, who shall say they do wrong? It is a custom of the country and the outgrowth of the hospitality of the race. Why should people be hospitable every day in the year, save on polling day? We deprecate the free distribution of intoxicants at elections, but the man who pretends that it is wrong for electors to have reasonable refreshments furnished to them in country districts where the location of polling places necessarily involves more or less of travel, only endeavors to cover a natural disposition to be mean by a contemptible hypocrisy. If the *Beacon* will consult someone who knows something of the subject from an experimental standpoint, it will be convinced that two or three thousand dollars might be spent in an election in York, Northumberland, Westmorland or any other of our large counties without a cent of it corruptly influencing voters. As a matter of fact, the necessity for spending money in the late election in York was great, for the opposition forces were making a desperate and expensive fight of it. The desperation still continues, and will do so as long as the enemies of Mr. Blair can find funds to corrupt the constituency and fools to make and believe charges such as that recently formulated by Mr. Atkinson. It is in the interest of such parties that a certain class of papers are so ready to cry out about corruption on the part of others, but we have no doubt that the majority of the *Beacon's* readers will take little stock in the view it seems to entertain of the purpose for which the St. John friends of the government sent that $1,500 to the York election committee. Like too many other papers, as well as politicians, the *Beacon* appears to have been disappointed in the hope that its friends would prove that Mr. Blair had disgraced himself and the province, so it joins in the cry that the receiving by the York committee of the $1,500 referred to was, necessarily, for a corrupt purpose.

VETERANS:—At a meeting of the Imperial Federation League at St. John, a few days since, Sir Leonard Tilley, who presided, in replying to a vote of thanks, alluded to his own advancing age. Eighteen months ago, he said, there were living six members of the New Brunswick House of Assembly of 1851. Since then Hon. Daniel Hanington, Judge Gray and Judge Botsford have died. Now only Chief Justice Ritchie, ex-Governor Wilmot and Sir Leonard Tilley remain of the forty-one gentlemen composing that house in 1851.

THE LEGISLATURE.

The past week has been a busy one at Fredericton, so far as work in the Assembly goes, although it is doubtful if the people will feel disposed to thank Mr. Hanington and his followers for the great waste of money involved in the clearing up of the charges preferred against Premier Blair by Mr. Atkinson of Carleton.

After the charges had been effectually disproved everybody wondered why Messrs. Hanington and Phinney did not withdraw from the case and, like honorable men, endeavor to counteract the injury done to the good name of the province by Mr. Atkinson's ill-considered and malicious attack. Their persistent efforts, however, to secure the wasting of further time by attempts to have a lot of hearsay witnesses summoned and resort to every possible device to prolong and involve the inquiry in side issues, disappointed the hope of their friends that they might prove capable of rising above the level of partizanship in so important a matter. A subsequent declaration of Mr. Atkinson, however—made on Monday last—showed that all the leading opposition lawyers were really as responsible for the charges as he, himself, was, and this, in part explained why a more honorable course was not followed by them as soon as Alderman Kelly and Mr. Blair's testimony was given.

The witnesses for Dr. Atkinson being, at last, exhausted and the committee's deliberations on the charges ended the following finding was submitted to the House:—

"The committee have carefully and exhaustively inquired into the subject matter of the said resolution, and submit herewith a full and complete copy of the evidence taken before the said committee, together with the proceedings thereof. That they have carefully examined such evidence and find the charges contained in the said resolutions entirely groundless and without foundation in fact. That the said Honorable Andrew G. Blair is fully exonerated from the charges preferred against him, and that the evidence produced on the part of the prosecution before your committee not only fails to sustain the charges contained in said resolution, but completely disproves them, and your committee express their regret that such a groundless and malicious charge should have been made against the said Andrew G. Blair.

Dated the 16th day of April, A. D. 1890.

WM. WILSON,
JAMES MITCHELL,
THOS HETHERINGTON.

Mr. Phinney submitted the following minority report:—

We, the undersigned, a minority of the committee to whom was referred the resolution moved by M. C. Atkinson, a member for the county of Carleton, preferring certain charges against the Hon. A. G. Blair, beg to report as follows:

No direct evidence was adduced before the committee on the part of the prosecution to establish the truth of the charges as contained in the resolution. While Mr. Blair has positively and emphatically denied all knowledge of any agreement or arrangement with Mr. Leary by which he (Leary) was to contribute to the election fund of Mr. Blair and his colleagues in York or that any money was so received from Mr. Leary or his agents for that purpose, we desire, however, to call attention to the fact that a considerable amount of evidence offered on the part of the prosecution and which in our opinion was relevant and important to the inquiry was excluded under the ruling of the majority of the committee, and that in consequence the investigation has not been as thorough and searching as in our opinion, in justice to all concerned, it should have been, and we have to express our regret that against the remonstrance of the undersigned such testimony was ruled out. We also regret to report that it is undoubtedly proved that the sum of $1,500 was sent from St. John by parties in sympathy with the government and who took a deep interest in the dock scheme in that city to aid in the election of the government ticket in York on the eve of the general provincial election and immediately prior to the execution of the contract by the provincial government with Mr. Leary for the construction of the dock, and that such contribution, or a major part of it, was made with the knowledge and approval of the Attorney General and Solicitor General.

J. D. PHINNEY,
M. C. ATKINSON.

Mr. Baird gave notice of the following motion for Saturday:

Resolved, That this house adopt with great satisfaction the report of the committee appointed to investigate the charge preferred on Tuesday, the 8th day of April, instant, by Mr. M. C. Atkinson, a member from the county of Carleton, against the Hon. A. G. Blair, attorney-general and leader of the government, which finds that the charge has not only not been established, but that the evidence adduced before the committee completely disproves the said charge, and the house records its profound regret that so unfounded an accusation should have been preferred by a member of this house.

Mr. Pugsley suggested that as the session was now far advanced perhaps the house would feel like unanimously agreeing to consider the report this afternoon, rather than wait till Saturday.

Mr. Hanington claimed that the evidence was so voluminous that the usual time should elapse before Mr. Baird's resolution could be discussed.

This was considered as another attempt to secure delay, because all the members had had access to the committee room and most of them had heard the evidence as it was delivered, Mr. Hanington, himself, being as familiar with it as were the members of the committee themselves. He seemed determined, however, to claim rigid adherence to the rule and the house was obliged to wait until Saturday for the discussion.

The bill in amendment of the Controverted Elections Act was discussed at some length on Thursday and progress was reported with leave to sit again.

On Friday, Mr. Phinney made his inquiry as to the government's intention regarding a bear bounty.

Mr. Mitchell—It is "bearly possible that a bounty will be granted."

Mr. Phinney made his motion regarding the Quebec resolutions. He had given Messrs. Blair and McLellan credit for sincerity in connection with the Quebec Conference? What has become of the resolutions? What effort has the government made to give effect to them? The house and country are entitled to the information.

The motion was seconded by Dr. Atkinson.

Mr. Blair in reply strongly criticised the conduct of Mr. Phinney during the present session. He (Phinney) seemed to be deeply hurt because someone else had been selected as a government supporter in Kent. The selection of someone else had been made because Phinney, elected as a supporter, could not be depended upon to give the government a reasonable and fair support. The hon. member while posing as an independent had stabbed the government in the back by an opposition vote without first having given the government his advice touching the matter on which he voted against them. There was no correspondence except of a confidential character.

Mr. Phinney's motion was voted down,

The controverted elections bill was recommitted and discussed, progress being reported with leave to sit again.

On Saturday Mr. Baird moved his resolution in reference to the Atkinson charges, making an admirable speech, He was followed by Mr. Hanington, who admitted that Mr. Blair had been fully exonorated from any personal connection with or knowledge of the facts on which the charge was based and he, Mr. Hanington, was glad to be able to so state. He claimed, however, that Mr. Atkinson was justfiied in making the charge upon the information he had received. Mr. Hanington endeavored to show that Hon. Mr. Pugsley was in some way connected with Mr. Leary and corruptly interested in securing the St. John Dock contract for that gentleman.

In fact, it soon became apparent that the opposition, having failed in their attack on Mr. Blair had determined to cover up their disgraceful discomfiture by an attempt to besmirch Mr. Pugsley

The government, desiring to end the debate, had about decided to let the opposition do their scavenger-work alone and reach a vote when they had talked themselves out.

Dr. Alward, however, caused a slight departure from this programme by moving the following in amendment to Mr. Baird's resolution:—

Strike out all the words after resolved and insert the following: That while it appears in the evidence before the committee on the oath of Hon. Mr. Blair and others, that he personally did not know from whom the one thousand five hundred dollars sent from St. John to his partner came, or that it was sent on any conditions as to its delivery, nor that it was paid by anyone interested in, or anxious for the dock contract of the 17th of January to go to Mr. Leary, yet it is to be regretted that by the exclusion of evidence by the majority of the committee a full examination into the facts and circumstances of the charges was prevented and this house also regrets the existence of many of the facts proved, and especially of the arrangement by the Solicitor-General for the payment of the said sum of one thousand five hundred dollars, by persons taking an active interest in and anxious for the government contract for docks and works to be given to Mr. Leary and its payment to Mr. Blair's partner to aid in the election of Mr. Blair and the government ticket in York, on the same day and just about the time the government contract was signed and delivered to Mr. Leary's agent, as such transactions, among other evils, tend to throw discredit and suspicion on the management of public affairs and on those to whom are entrusted the making of contracts and the management and control of public moneys and interests.

Dr. Alward argued, as Mr. Hanington had done, that all witnesses asked for by counsel for Mr. Atkinson ought to have been summoned, and claimed that if they had been that member's charges would have been the means, perhaps, of connecting Mr. Pugsley somewhat closely with the Leary contract.

Dr. Alward's main argument, however, was a defense of Mr. Atkinson and it was interesting to find that efforts had now to be made in his behalf to save him from condemnation for having brought his infamous charges against premier Blair.

Mr. Palmer of Queens replied to Messrs. Hanington and Alward and did so very effectively, but Hon. Dr. Pugsley made a most complete defence of the position of both himself and the premier. We, therefore, give his speech quite fully, as it will enable our readers to understand the merits of the whole question.

Hon. Mr. Pugsley said a charge had been preferred against the attorney general for which there had been no reasonable foundation or cause. That charge had fallen to the ground, and although that was the case the house was now asked to consider the amendment of the hon. member for St. John. (Alward.) Although that charge had been proved beyond a doubt to be a reckless charge, although it had been proved conclusively, out of the mouth of the witness for the prosecution, that the charge against the attorney general is absolutely false, and that he is absolutely innocent of the foul and infamous charge brought against him, yet the member for St. John (Alward) thought fit to move this amendment that the solicitor general had done something for which he should be called upon to answer. Although he (Pugsley) had not been placed on trial, although no charge had been preferred against him, and no opportunity given him to answer, yet this house was

CALLED UPON TO CONDEMN

and in some way discredit him before the people of this country. It did not seem to him that the course taken by the hon. gentleman would commend itself to any fair minded man either in the house or country. It did occur to him that when a member of this house, having in his place preferred a charge of so grave a character against the attorney general, and after he had had an opportunity of calling witnesses and when, by the testimony of the witnesses whom he (Atkinson) had called, not only had he failed to prove the charge, but after he had completely established the innocence of the attorney general it did seem to him that if the member for Carleton were honest; if he were actuated by any principle of fairness; if he had in his breast any honest instinct of fair play or decency, he should have risen in his place and expressed regret for the charge he had made, and that he should at the same time express his utter contempt for the man who had incited him to prefer the charge. It was no wonder that when the member for Carleton was before the committee, and when he was being examined at his (Pugsley's) instance after he (Atkinson) had completely failed to establish his charge; it was no wonder that when he had been asked by the speaker who had incited him to take this course against the attorney general he (Atkinson)

WAS ASHAMED TO TELL THE COMMITTEE.

who had given him the information and who had incited his action.

Mr. Hanington said the committee ruled the questions out.

Hon. Mr. Pugsley—The learned gentleman, the counsel for the hon. member for Carleton and who at the same time was the hon. member for Westmorland, had taken occasion to inform the member for Carleton that he was not bound to answer the question and had advised him not to answer it. Every legal member of the house knew that if a man were to charge the attorney general as the hon. member for Carleton had charged him, he would be liable to an action for slander, and any jury would mulct him in heavy damages. Unless he could give good reason for making the charge he would be liable indeed to a criminal prosecution, he would be liable to arrest and to be placed in the criminal dock and tried for libel because the laws of the country hold the character of every British subject sacred and the law would not permit any man with impunity to slander the character of another. The hon. member for Carleton had been given an opportunity to give to the committee the information and the facts upon which he had thought proper to prefer the

HEINOUS CHARGE HE HAD MADE

against the hon. leader of the government. He (Atkinson) had not availed himself of that opportunity; he had by his conduct, by his silence and by his declining to answer convicted himself before the country of having perpetrated awilful and malicious slander. It had been stated by the hon. gentleman who had last addressed the house that the result of the inquiry must be most gratifying to the house and to the attorney general. It was exceedingly gratifying to him (Pugsley) he cared not though the result of the inquiry might in some degree reflect upon himself, and even though he had not had an opportunity of answering the charge which had been preferred against him now for the first time, and though his character might be damaged by the false mode in which they sought to attack him, yet it was to him a matter of the greatest satisfaction that his leader, who had for the past seven years enjoyed to the most marked degree the confidence and the respect of his fellow citizens,

WOULD NOT BE INJURED

nor his reputation sullied by the malicious slanders which had been given expression to. It was, indeed, a matter of satisfaction to the house and the country at large that the hon. leader of the government would occupy in the future as he had in the past, the same high position in the minds and hearts of the people of this country. It had been alleged by the opposition speakers that the investigation had not been as full and as complete as it should have been; it had been stated that evidence had been excluded which should have been admitted by the committee and which, he admitted, might have proved something more than that which had been proved. It might be well to inquire into the character of the evidence sought to have been brought forward. Was that evidence, evidence of fact? He thought not. It had not been proposed to give evidence of a single fact further than had been given. Every fact offered in evidence had been allowed and he defied any hon. gentleman to show a single instance where evidence that would have had any bearing directly or indirectly had been excluded by the committee.

Mr. Hanington—Did not the committee refuse to bring witnesses to prove that $4,000 had been offered to procure the contract by Leary or his agents?

Hon. Mr. Pugsley—It was stated to the committee that if they had the evidence of Mr. Barker or J. C. Robertson they could have proved that I or my brother, or someone else on Leary's behalf had offered to somebody, whether to this government or any member of the government, or whether to Barker or Robertson they did not say, had offered that sum if they would get the contract for Leary. Continuing he said that such evidence

WOULD NOT GO TO PROVE A FACT

but was simply offered in the endeavor to get in hearsay testimony, and that without any manner connecting the attorney general with it and without showing it was a proposal made on behalf of the government, or any member of the government without pretending to show that those witnesses could have proved one solitary fact. It would, perhaps, not be out of place to here state that the question had been put to him and he had denied it. It had not been suggested that it could be proven that any member of the government had done so or that any body professing to act on behalf of the government had done so, and he was here to state that he unqualifiedly hurled back the insinuation. He had done so before the committee in the presence of the learned counsel for the prosecution who now seemed to be acting in a double capacity.

Mr. Hanington—And pray what did you do?

Hon. Mr. Pugsley said he was here for the purpose of asserting, and he would assert without fear of contradiction, that the chairman of the committee had informed the counsel for the prosecution that if they could show that Mr. Blair, or any member of the government, was directly or indirectly connected with any statement which they said they could make it would have been admitted.

Mr. Hanington—Told me so?

Mr. Wilson—Yes, I did tell you so over and over again.

Mr. Hanington—You decided it behind my back and never informed me of any such thing, and the only thing I know about it is that when I came in the clerk, Mr. Richards, told me so.

Mr. Pugsley—That statement, sir, of the hon. gentleman, is

LIKE A GREAT MANY MORE STATEMENTS

he has made; it is like the statement he made last night when I happened to make some observations to him, and when he retorted across the house with the very courteous remark, "You are a sneak."

Mr. Hanington—I did not say that. That is a misreport. I said in reply to you when you said I could not get out of that line, and after I had withdrawn the word tool, there is one thing I am not, I am not a sneak. Those are the words I used.

Mr. Pugsley—The hon. member's memory has been defective. On former occasions he has been known to make statements on the one day and when brought up before him say he had never made a statement of the kind. Will the hon. gentleman admit this statement as reported because he certainly did?

Mr. Hanington—When the hon. gentleman so recklessly states that which he knows to be untrue I shall not reply to him.

Mr. Pugsley—Will the hon. member say on Monday he did not insinuate that I was not a gentleman.

Mr. Hanington—I will say so on Sunday, Monday and Tuesday.

Mr. Pugsley—On the 17th the hon. gentleman is reported to have said that he was advised to state that I had

GOT $3,000 FROM PARTIES INTERESTED

in the Leary dock scheme. I ask whether he made that statement or not? Does the hon. gentleman decline to answer?

Mr. Hanington—I talk to gentlemen.

Mr. Pugsley—I ask the gentleman if he will not tell me to tell this house the name of his informer. The hon. gentleman has charged me, the solicitor general of this province, sworn to guard sacredly the rights and interests of the people of the province, with having received $3,000 from a public contractor; he has charged that I, who had the duty of drawing this contract, and of seeing that the interests of the province were carefully guarded and protected; he has deliberately charged me in the presence of the committee and of the people who were present at the investigation of this matter, that I had received $3,000 from a public contractor, and I ask the hon. gentleman to tell me (and if he will not tell me then to tell this house) who informed him that was so. I have the right to ask and I appeal to this house and I appeal to you sir if, when a charge of that grave character is made against me, I am not entitled to the name of his informant? The hon. gentleman refuses to answer. I would not, sir, be justified in making use of any language which is not parliamentary, but I would say that the man who would circulate against a fellow member of this house a charge of that serious character can be characterized by no other title than that of a

MALICIOUS AND CONTEMPTIBLE SLANDERER,

and, Mr. Speaker, if there was any language that was parliamentary that would more strongly express the contempt I have for such a man I wish to be understood as using it. Mr. Pugsley then proceeded to say that it was perhaps due to the house and to the constituency which had on four different occasions returned him as their representative (twice by large majorities and twice by acclamation) that he should say there was not a word of truth in the statement that had been made; neither directly or indirectly had he received from Mr. Leary or any person on his behalf one single cent. He had never had, directly or indirectly in any shape or form, in any contract which Leary was to get in connexion with the dry dock any interest whatever. He trusted that the gentlemen of the house would pardon him for dealing with the matter, but he could not, in justice to himself, allow it to pass and therefore took the present occasion to

GIVE IT AN UNEQUIVOCAL DENIAL,

though perhaps it was hardly needed since the house had had in the past, from time to time, an experience of such reckless statements. He would now proceed to deal with a matter more immediately before the house, and it would be his duty to trace the history of the St. John dock and harbor improvements and his connexion with them. Some time last year an application had been made to the government on behalf of a company known as the Van Slooten Company. That application had been preceded by one from a company, the promoter of which was A. A. Stockton, one of the hon. members for the city and county of St. John. Subsequently, on the 14th of December, an application was made on behalf of the city council of St. John to the government and a memorial was presented urging that the subsidy should be given to Mr. Leary. It would be borne in mind by hon. members, from the papers which had been laid on the table of the house, that that application was not one simply made by Mr. Leary, but was also made on behalf of the city of St. John through its mayor and common council; it was a memorial presented to the government under the common seal of the city of St. John, asking that a contract should be given not to either one of the companies referred to, but to J. D. Leary. (The solicitor general here read the memorial of the city council.) Did that memorial say that the feeling was confined to a few of the residents of St. John? He thought not; he would rather infer from that, that the feeling in favor of the proposed works was

A WIDESPREAD ONE,

yet, after the expression of opinion as set forth in that memorial, certain people had seen fit to charge the government with deliberately selling that contract to Leary, and he regretted to know that one of the hon. members for the city and county of St. John, who had, in another place, strenuously advocated the dock scheme, should have seen fit to join in the cry that was raised against the government. They had, forsooth, charged the government with this great crime, and simply because they had, after mature consideration, yielded to the strong expression of public sentiment as expressed by the mayor and common council of the city of St. John and if, after yielding to their entreaties, we are to be met by such charges he thought it would afford very little encouragement to any government to make efforts to aid St. John in making improvements at that port. That memorial contained a request that a larger subsidy than that provided by the act of 1882 should be given. It would be well to bear in mind that it had been presented on the 14th of December, but at the same time it should be borne in mind that although it was a short while before the writs were issued for the election, the government had

NO CONTROL OVER THE MEMORIALISTS.

The government could not say to them they should not present their memorial at that time, for fear it would be afterwards contended if they supported it that they had done so from political motives and that it was to influence public sentiment in St. John.

Passing from that he would ask the house to bear in mind that some 16 or 17 days thereafter, namely, the 30th of December, an order in council passed authorizing the provincial secretary to enter into a contract with Leary at any time, subject, of course, to certain conditions. On the following day the provincial secretary wrote the mayor of St. John informing him that the memorial had been complied with.

Mr. Pugsley here read the letter. He would ask the house if that was not a public declaration that the government would be willing, if it met with the approval of their friends in the legislature, to favorably consider the granting of such further aid as might be desirable in the public interests? That was not a statement made to Leary, but was publicly made to the mayor. By that letter the government had put itself into communication not with Leary or any agent for Leary, but with the city of St. John, in the most public manner. In that letter the government, through its provincial secretary, had declared to the public authorities of the city of St. John in the most public and solemn manner that they were

PREPARED TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT

with such persons as they approved. That was followed up by the letter of the provincial secretary under date of the 3d of January to the mayor of St. John, in which it had been made even more clear than it had been before that the provincial secretary was prepared to sign a contract with Leary. (Mr. Pugsley here read this letter.) That letter was the result of the mayor of St. John, the man authorized to speak for the whole people of St. John, calling upon Mr. McLellan and requesting from him some further proof of the willingness of the government to sign the Leary contract. The mayor then knew the plans and specifications had not been approved of, that the dominion government had not given the required subsidy and everybody knew that the contract then to be entered into must necessarily be a provisional one, and therefore not a binding contract. He would ask the house, and through the house the country, if, after that letter which had been sent

BROADCAST OVER THE FACE OF THE PROVINCE,

the government could have receded from the position they then took? After that all that remained to be done was to arrange the details of the contract. The evidence of the hon. attorney general, corroborated by that of Mr. McLellan, was that he (Pugsley) was to prepare the same and that it was to be signed in accordance with the letter given. From and after the date of that letter, to all intents and purposes, the government had awarded that subsidy to Leary subject to the approval of the plans and specifications. The evidence taken before the commission would show that Murray, who was acting for Leary, knew that he was to prepare the contract and submit it to him.

Mr. Pugsley then quoted in full the evidence of Mr. Murray at the inquiry, showing the latter's ideas of the contract and the terms, and thought it disproved the insinuations and charges against him. He asked if that evidence showed he was anxious to have the contract signed; did it not show that the anxiety was on the part of Mr. Leary? Mr. Murray said further he refused to sign the contract without the saving clause in it, and it was inserted and he was told of it the 10th or 12th of January.

Continuing Mr. Pugsley said a great deal of the charge against the attorney general was that the contract as signed contained a provision that in case Leary did not get additional aid that he had been hoping for, the contract would not be binding, because it was felt, as Murray says, that he would not bind himself absolutely to go on without such additional subsidy, and it would be

IMPOSSIBLE AND UNREASONABLE

to expect that he should. After referring to the amount that would be spent in the construction of the dock and its capabilities when constructed, in addition to the other harbor improvements, he proceeded to say that he felt it was justice to put that clause in the provisional contract so that it would enable Mr. Leary to proceed to Ottawa and there urge his claim as to additional aid. It had been charged that the contract was drawn in favor of Leary. In reply to that he would say that it was not drawn in favor of Leary, but was drawn in every particular against him and in favor of the province. He invited hon. gentlemen to take that contract up and to show him, if they could, one single clause in which the interests of the province had not been looked after. No subsidy became due under that contract to Mr. Leary until the work was completed according to the plans and specifications which were to be approved by the governor in council prior to the commencement of work. Such subsidies in all were equal to a cash payment of $30,000 on an expenditure by Leary of $500,000. He did not think it was such a bargain for Leary

AS WOULD INDUCE HIM

to give away several thousands to aid in the election. He had already called attention to the date on which Mr. Murray said the clause had been put into the contract and had given it as the 10th or 12th of January, and he desired to call particular attention to this date, because it was important, to show that the statements made by hon. members on the other side of the house as to Mr. Murray's evidence in this particular were, to say the least, very inaccurate.

Turning to the evidence of the hon. attorney general and that given by himself it would be seen that the draft contract had arrived in Fredericton previous to the Sunday. This was contrary to one of the statement he had himself made that he had prepared it shortly after the 3d of January and on it being acquiesced in by Mr. Murray, he had immediately sent it to the attorney general.

Mr. Pugsley then quoted the evidence of the attorney general and himself on this point, and said that although some hon. gentlemen might say that I am not to be believed, yet I ask this house (and I venture to say that I can appeal to many hon. gentlemen in this house, who have known me—and who know me—during the three years I was the presiding officer of this house), and I can ask them whether or not they are able to accept the statements that I have made. I have sworn, Mr. Speaker, that after I drafted this contract, and after it was completed as it stands to-day, I forwarded it to the attorney general and asked him to look it over and return it to me. Do you not think

IF A BARGAIN HAD BEEN ENTERED INTO

by which, in consideration of this contract being signed, Leary was to contribute thousands of dollars for the purpose of carrying on the elections, that I would not have impressed upon the attorney general the desirability of returning this immediately? And do you think if such a bargain had been made, he would have left it among his papers and gone off to the country? I ask hon. members to look at our conduct and say if we did not act in a proper and a reasonable manner. I was asked why I did not wire him about the contract but what was my answer? Had there been any bargain it might have been necessary to have done so, but I did not. Had there been any bargain do you think I would have waited till I went to Harvey on another matter to speak about it? When I went there it was upon another matter, and I was perfectly indifferent as to when the contract would come, It is true that the mayor and council of St. John and also Mr. Murray were anxious that it should be signed, but there was no haste on my part. It was immaterial to me, sir, when it would be signed as I had

NO ULTERIOR OBJECT IN VIEW.

It might be asked, said the speaker, why he had gone to Harvey to see the attorney general? There had been some misunderstanding as to when the meeting would take place; notices had been put out calling the meeting and the friends of the government in St. John were anxious that he should address them, when an intimation was received that it would be impossible for him on account of his engagements in his own county to attend, and in consequence of that he (Pugsley) had been requested to go up to Harvey. He had acceded to that request and had gone to Harvey and had urged upon the attorney to comply with the wishes of his St. John friends. During the conversation he had had with him he (Pugsley) had told the attorney general that if it would be any inducement to him to come to St. John they were willing to contribute $1,000 in aid of the election expenses in York. They said in St. John that a certain gentleman, who is very punctilious as regards business, was not quite willing to contribute toward the election expenses of the opposite party and who, when the matter of aiding the election fund for the other side came up, said he would think the matter over and having done so went shortly afterwards to his friends and said he would subscribe towards that object and

CHARGE IT TO THE ACCOUNT OF BABY ALWARD.

At that interview with the attorney general he had not promised that he could attend to the advertised meeting in St. John. Both the attorney general and himself had sworn (and he invited the careful consideration of the house to the evidence they had given) that the dock matter was never mentioned on that occasion or that Leary, or that anybody on Leary's behalf, was interested in it one way or the other in having it then signed. The next day, word was received from the attorney general that he would come down and address the public meeting. On the night on which that hon. gentleman addressed the meeting at the Institute he had made a public declaration, in the presence of hundreds of people, as to what he would do. He then made a careful and guarded statement (guarded as the premier of this province ought to guard his language). There had been no haziness about it at all, and that statement was convincing to those who wished to give it an impartial hearing. It was no private statement but one made openly and from the public platform. One would have supposed, he thought, that,

IF THIS CORRUPT BARGAIN HAD BEEN MADE

somebody on Leary's behalf would have ceived the attorney general privately, and would have received from his own lips some assurance that would be satisfactory, but what was the evidence? The evidence was that the attorney general had not even been informed that the contract was signed. The evidence was that after the 3d day of January, when the attorney general had authorized the provincial secretary to enter into the contract, and him (Pugsley) to draw it, the contract had passed out of his mind so far as he was concerned. He therefore thought he was justified in saying that there was not one tittle of evidence not only which would not authorize or sustain the charge made against the attorney general, but also not one tittle of evidence which would justify any man in charging against any member of the government the crime charged against the attorney general. The gentleman who had preferred this charge ought to have known that foundation he had for the charge, and if he had any charge to make against himself, personally, why had it not been made and not seek, as they were now seeking, to attack him in the amendment proposed? No, that would not do. He had no enemy pursuing him with the cunning of a serpent or the stealthiness of a hyena. He was not in that unfortunate position. He might be driven from the government, and better than he be found to take his place, and the attorney general still be

THE HONORED LEADER OF HIS PARTY.

But, no, the attack must be made against the attorney general; he was the man against whom all this foul slander must be issued; he was the man whose political death must be encompassed and to that end they must, forsooth, bring their charges at this late hour of the session, when they thought the facts could not be fully investigated, when the house could not wait till the full determination of the matter. Then was it they made their charge in the hope that the house would adjourn before the committee could get through with its labors, and thus leave the charge to be circulated broadcast throughout he country uncontradicted. But that had failed. He would ask the house to calmly consider the various grounds that had been put forth in support of the charge. In the first place he would ask the house, having in mind the dates of the contract, his visit to Harvey, the telegram to Mr. Barry and the payment of the money by Murphy to him (Barry) and that if there had been any understanding arrived at by which this contract was to be given to Leary in consideration of his contributing toward the expenses of the provincial elections. If they thought his honored friend the attorney general was a party to such a corrupt bargain as that; whether this contract, which was to be the foundation for the payment of that money; whether he would have paid so little attention to it as he had

HAD SUCH A BARGAIN EXISTED

would he not have returned it by the next mail? Would he have treated it with the indifference he had? Would he have, when asked about it, said he did not know where it was, that it was either at his house or office? When the question came up before the committee he (Pugsley) had not taken the objection he might have taken as to that telegram. What he desired to know at that time was whether he himself or the attorney had signed it. But still he did not press any objection and allowed a copy of the telegram to go stating that he would not put the country to the expense of sending for the operator to come from Harvey with the original, but that it could be sent for and treated in evidence as if it were produced for the operator personally. He then explained further circumstances connected with the signing of the contract as told in evidence. He did think that after a charge had been preferred against the hon. leader of the government—which charge had been completely and entirely disproved—and his complete innocence had been shown, gentlemen opposite should have taken a course different to that which they had, and instead of moving an amendment would have gladly joined in a report acquiescing in