

CHIGNECTO POST AND BORDERER

SACKVILLE, N. B. NOV. 27, 1890

We are offering the CHIGNECTO POST new subscribers from the first of December till the end of 1891, for One Dollar payable strictly in advance.

The Liberal Meeting.

Those who attended the meeting in Music Hall on Monday evening and expected to hear Mr. Longley answer the questions asked by the Post last week, were disappointed in the manner in which he worked out of the difficulty, presented to him, and evaded every direct answer. We asked Mr. Longley to name any article which the farmers of Sackville could sell to better advantage under Reciprocity than they can at present, when the local market supplied by outside producers. His lecture was more remarkable for what it did not say than for what it did. He did not favor the audience with his views in detail as to how unrestricted trade would effect our beef industry and dairy products, the many other articles which the United States would sell in competition with our own. He gave no answer to the questions the Post propounded beyond stating that a higher authority than the Post had committed it to Reciprocity, namely Sir John A. Macdonald.

We contend that this is merely special pleading; it is no answer to the questions respecting trade which we put. Mr. Longley, having undertaken to enlighten the public, should have answered them on their merits. Neither the Post nor the best readers of Westmorland are bound to accept what Mr. Longley purports to be Sir John Macdonald's opinion on trade matters, as conclusive.

Further, follows, that that Canada will lose 15 million of dollars revenue, which she now collects on United States imports. Mr. Longley failed to point out this loss, and also failed to suggest any source that would yield an equivalent return.

2nd. He failed to point out that under his proposal, Canada, while admitting United States products free, would be imposing a heavy duty— from 30 to 50 per cent—on British goods. It may be perfectly loyal for us to treat the Mother country in that way; of that point, however, every decent man will be a spark of genius will have but one opinion. It would be the height of ingratitude on our part, in consideration of the mercantile protection we have received, to discriminate against our benefactors.

One part of the address was devoted to proving that Sir John and his government were favorable to Reciprocity; the other part, that they were against it. He demolished the Post by claiming that Sir John was favorable to it; he held it to be against it by proving that it was against it. We have no strong objection to Mr. Longley insisting with all his irresistible eloquence, that Sir John favors reciprocal relations; and we see to reason why he should not, on the other hand, claim with convincing power that he has been clearly misled by Sir John; but for Mr. Longley to claim both positions for Sir John on the same platform, in the same evening and in the same speech, is an acrobatic feat in elocution not often equalled.

His Sackville audience is at a loss to know what he thinks Sir John believes; and also how the government could be both for and against Reciprocity at the same time. He did make it clear, however, that no matter on what side the government was, it was wrong and should be condemned by all honest people.

We feel it incumbent upon us to state in this connection that Mr. Carleton is not a native of Westmorland. A tramp thinking he would be a tramping card to play, reported him from St. John to be the Irish tramp; but for Mr. Longley to claim both positions for Sir John on the same platform, in the same evening and in the same speech, is an acrobatic feat in elocution not often equalled.

His Sackville audience is at a loss to know what he thinks Sir John believes; and also how the government could be both for and against Reciprocity at the same time. He did make it clear, however, that no matter on what side the government was, it was wrong and should be condemned by all honest people.

We feel it incumbent upon us to state in this connection that Mr. Carleton is not a native of Westmorland. A tramp thinking he would be a tramping card to play, reported him from St. John to be the Irish tramp; but for Mr. Longley to claim both positions for Sir John on the same platform, in the same evening and in the same speech, is an acrobatic feat in elocution not often equalled.

His Sackville audience is at a loss to know what he thinks Sir John believes; and also how the government could be both for and against Reciprocity at the same time. He did make it clear, however, that no matter on what side the government was, it was wrong and should be condemned by all honest people.

We feel it incumbent upon us to state in this connection that Mr. Carleton is not a native of Westmorland. A tramp thinking he would be a tramping card to play, reported him from St. John to be the Irish tramp; but for Mr. Longley to claim both positions for Sir John on the same platform, in the same evening and in the same speech, is an acrobatic feat in elocution not often equalled.

His Sackville audience is at a loss to know what he thinks Sir John believes; and also how the government could be both for and against Reciprocity at the same time. He did make it clear, however, that no matter on what side the government was, it was wrong and should be condemned by all honest people.

We feel it incumbent upon us to state in this connection that Mr. Carleton is not a native of Westmorland. A tramp thinking he would be a tramping card to play, reported him from St. John to be the Irish tramp; but for Mr. Longley to claim both positions for Sir John on the same platform, in the same evening and in the same speech, is an acrobatic feat in elocution not often equalled.

His Sackville audience is at a loss to know what he thinks Sir John believes; and also how the government could be both for and against Reciprocity at the same time. He did make it clear, however, that no matter on what side the government was, it was wrong and should be condemned by all honest people.

We feel it incumbent upon us to state in this connection that Mr. Carleton is not a native of Westmorland. A tramp thinking he would be a tramping card to play, reported him from St. John to be the Irish tramp; but for Mr. Longley to claim both positions for Sir John on the same platform, in the same evening and in the same speech, is an acrobatic feat in elocution not often equalled.

An American Want.

At the annual dinner of the New York Chamber of Commerce held recently, the true attitude of the Americans towards Canada was stated by Mr. Chauncey M. Depew, to whom had been accorded the subject, "Reciprocity." The American custom in the past has been to be little Canada as much as possible, to look upon her as a struggling institution to which an offer of annexation should be translated as an offer of assistance, and not to be declined under any consideration. On all occasions, our Dominion has been viewed outwardly by the Republic as a country whose future depended upon political union with it; and that we should be glad to entertain such a proposal.

At the above dinner, the curtain was withdrawn and the background of the American opinion was presented by Mr. Depew, in the course of his brilliant address, said it was the grand aim of the American people to bring Canada into political federation with the United States in order to increase their rapidly decreasing mineral resources and to widen the market for their surplus supplies. Reciprocity is apparently the only desire of the Americans at present; but the ultimate and expected end of such legislation is indicated by Mr. Depew when he says: "The unifying power which commercial union would lead us in a few years to political federation, which would carry the American flag from the falls of Niagara to the North Pole."

The enthusiasm is admirable, but it is to be borne in mind that the Canadians are as loyal today as ever and will not for a moment accept a proposition whose object is to tear asunder the bonds which bind them to the grandest nation on the earth. America for the Americans is the cry, and not only in Canada to be annexed, but all the country from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from Cape Horn to the North Pole, is to be beneath the American flag. One cannot speak for the South, but the people of Canada will never live beneath the American flag so long as it is the stars and stripes.

Mr. Depew possesses undoubted ability as a railroad man, but as a voice of Canadian sentiment and Canadian future prosperity he is some latitudes wide of the mark. Canada is as valuable to Canada as to the Americans, and the people of the Dominion are well aware of the fact.

Westmorland Co. Teacher's Institute.

The following is the programme of the Westmorland County Teacher's Institute, which meets in the school building, Moncton, on December 18th and 19th:

THURSDAY, 10 A. M.
Enrollment, Election of Officers—Address by President.

AFTERNOON, 2 P. M.
Arithmetic in Ungraded Schools—Amos O'Brien.

Useful Knowledge—Geo. J. Oulton.
Evening—Public Meeting.

FRIDAY, 9 A. M.
The Uses and Abuses of History—Miss Maggie Harper.

Moral Teaching—Mrs. Olive Fairweather.

AFTERNOON, 2 P. M.
Natural Science—W. M. McDonald.
Paper, Subject not given—F. A. Butler.

Teachers buying one first-class ticket can return free.

Westmorland County Court.

CRIMINAL DOCKET.
Queen vs Robert Polley.—Action for assault with intent to do grievous bodily harm. True bill. To be taken up on Thursday.

Queen vs Wm Bulmer.—For stealing a heifer. No bill.

Queen vs William Day.—For stealing a heifer. No bill.

Tried under the Speedy Trials Act; sentence to be pronounced on Wednesday.

NEW DOCKET.
John Lanchester vs N. Hazen Smith. Hasty and Co. for plaintiff, A. J. Chapman for defendant.

S. Leslie Chapman vs Frank H. Brown. W. W. Wells for plaintiff, J. A. Harris for defendant.

Thomas Brownell vs David S. Taylor. R. B. Smith for plaintiff, Hamilton & Co. for defendant.

Chas. Farwell vs Prim Theriault. Powell and Bennett for plaintiff.

Baziliste LeBlanc and husband vs H. G. Farr.—Hamilton and Co. for plaintiff. Smith and Kay for defendant.

Gilbert F. Stevens vs Abraham Beamish.—Smith and Kay for plaintiff, John J. Ash for defendant.

G. E. Boyce vs J. A. James Crawford. H. Atkinson for plaintiff.

Thos Dunlap et al vs James Brown.—T. A. Kinman for plaintiff, E. P. Williston for defendant.

James Legere et al vs P. G. Sweeney.—Wells and Welch for plaintiff, W. A. Russell for defendant.

James Park et al vs Archibald Shaw.—H. Atkinson for plaintiff.

W. H. Sumner et al vs Chas. W. Derry.—Wells and Welch for plaintiff, W. A. Russell for defendant.

Wm B. Deacon vs Alex. Read.—W. A. Russell for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

Minor F. Foster vs S. E. McManus.—Hamilton and Co. for plaintiff, H. H. James for defendant.

Mary S. Gilbert et al vs Geo. F. Wallace and W. A. Lawrence.

Jas R. Ayrer vs W. E. Wortman.—Powell and Bennett for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

SPECIAL DOCKET.
Richard S. Salter vs Edward Richard and John Richard.—T. A. Kinman for plaintiff, A. D. Richard for defendant.

Wm B. Deacon vs Alex. Read.—W. A. Russell for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

Minor F. Foster vs S. E. McManus.—Hamilton and Co. for plaintiff, H. H. James for defendant.

Mary S. Gilbert et al vs Geo. F. Wallace and W. A. Lawrence.

Jas R. Ayrer vs W. E. Wortman.—Powell and Bennett for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

SPECIAL DOCKET.
Richard S. Salter vs Edward Richard and John Richard.—T. A. Kinman for plaintiff, A. D. Richard for defendant.

Wm B. Deacon vs Alex. Read.—W. A. Russell for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

Minor F. Foster vs S. E. McManus.—Hamilton and Co. for plaintiff, H. H. James for defendant.

Mary S. Gilbert et al vs Geo. F. Wallace and W. A. Lawrence.

Jas R. Ayrer vs W. E. Wortman.—Powell and Bennett for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

SPECIAL DOCKET.
Richard S. Salter vs Edward Richard and John Richard.—T. A. Kinman for plaintiff, A. D. Richard for defendant.

Wm B. Deacon vs Alex. Read.—W. A. Russell for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

Minor F. Foster vs S. E. McManus.—Hamilton and Co. for plaintiff, H. H. James for defendant.

Mary S. Gilbert et al vs Geo. F. Wallace and W. A. Lawrence.

Jas R. Ayrer vs W. E. Wortman.—Powell and Bennett for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

SPECIAL DOCKET.
Richard S. Salter vs Edward Richard and John Richard.—T. A. Kinman for plaintiff, A. D. Richard for defendant.

Wm B. Deacon vs Alex. Read.—W. A. Russell for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

Minor F. Foster vs S. E. McManus.—Hamilton and Co. for plaintiff, H. H. James for defendant.

Mary S. Gilbert et al vs Geo. F. Wallace and W. A. Lawrence.

Jas R. Ayrer vs W. E. Wortman.—Powell and Bennett for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

SPECIAL DOCKET.
Richard S. Salter vs Edward Richard and John Richard.—T. A. Kinman for plaintiff, A. D. Richard for defendant.

Wm B. Deacon vs Alex. Read.—W. A. Russell for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

Minor F. Foster vs S. E. McManus.—Hamilton and Co. for plaintiff, H. H. James for defendant.

Mary S. Gilbert et al vs Geo. F. Wallace and W. A. Lawrence.

Jas R. Ayrer vs W. E. Wortman.—Powell and Bennett for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

SPECIAL DOCKET.
Richard S. Salter vs Edward Richard and John Richard.—T. A. Kinman for plaintiff, A. D. Richard for defendant.

Wm B. Deacon vs Alex. Read.—W. A. Russell for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

Minor F. Foster vs S. E. McManus.—Hamilton and Co. for plaintiff, H. H. James for defendant.

Mary S. Gilbert et al vs Geo. F. Wallace and W. A. Lawrence.

Jas R. Ayrer vs W. E. Wortman.—Powell and Bennett for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

SPECIAL DOCKET.
Richard S. Salter vs Edward Richard and John Richard.—T. A. Kinman for plaintiff, A. D. Richard for defendant.

Wm B. Deacon vs Alex. Read.—W. A. Russell for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

Minor F. Foster vs S. E. McManus.—Hamilton and Co. for plaintiff, H. H. James for defendant.

Mary S. Gilbert et al vs Geo. F. Wallace and W. A. Lawrence.

Jas R. Ayrer vs W. E. Wortman.—Powell and Bennett for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

SPECIAL DOCKET.
Richard S. Salter vs Edward Richard and John Richard.—T. A. Kinman for plaintiff, A. D. Richard for defendant.

Wm B. Deacon vs Alex. Read.—W. A. Russell for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

Minor F. Foster vs S. E. McManus.—Hamilton and Co. for plaintiff, H. H. James for defendant.

Mary S. Gilbert et al vs Geo. F. Wallace and W. A. Lawrence.

Jas R. Ayrer vs W. E. Wortman.—Powell and Bennett for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

SPECIAL DOCKET.
Richard S. Salter vs Edward Richard and John Richard.—T. A. Kinman for plaintiff, A. D. Richard for defendant.

Wm B. Deacon vs Alex. Read.—W. A. Russell for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

Minor F. Foster vs S. E. McManus.—Hamilton and Co. for plaintiff, H. H. James for defendant.

Mary S. Gilbert et al vs Geo. F. Wallace and W. A. Lawrence.

Jas R. Ayrer vs W. E. Wortman.—Powell and Bennett for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

SPECIAL DOCKET.
Richard S. Salter vs Edward Richard and John Richard.—T. A. Kinman for plaintiff, A. D. Richard for defendant.

Wm B. Deacon vs Alex. Read.—W. A. Russell for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

Minor F. Foster vs S. E. McManus.—Hamilton and Co. for plaintiff, H. H. James for defendant.

Mary S. Gilbert et al vs Geo. F. Wallace and W. A. Lawrence.

Jas R. Ayrer vs W. E. Wortman.—Powell and Bennett for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

SPECIAL DOCKET.
Richard S. Salter vs Edward Richard and John Richard.—T. A. Kinman for plaintiff, A. D. Richard for defendant.

Wm B. Deacon vs Alex. Read.—W. A. Russell for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

Minor F. Foster vs S. E. McManus.—Hamilton and Co. for plaintiff, H. H. James for defendant.

Mary S. Gilbert et al vs Geo. F. Wallace and W. A. Lawrence.

Jas R. Ayrer vs W. E. Wortman.—Powell and Bennett for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

SPECIAL DOCKET.
Richard S. Salter vs Edward Richard and John Richard.—T. A. Kinman for plaintiff, A. D. Richard for defendant.

Wm B. Deacon vs Alex. Read.—W. A. Russell for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

Minor F. Foster vs S. E. McManus.—Hamilton and Co. for plaintiff, H. H. James for defendant.

Mary S. Gilbert et al vs Geo. F. Wallace and W. A. Lawrence.

Jas R. Ayrer vs W. E. Wortman.—Powell and Bennett for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

SPECIAL DOCKET.
Richard S. Salter vs Edward Richard and John Richard.—T. A. Kinman for plaintiff, A. D. Richard for defendant.

Wm B. Deacon vs Alex. Read.—W. A. Russell for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

Minor F. Foster vs S. E. McManus.—Hamilton and Co. for plaintiff, H. H. James for defendant.

Mary S. Gilbert et al vs Geo. F. Wallace and W. A. Lawrence.

Jas R. Ayrer vs W. E. Wortman.—Powell and Bennett for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

SPECIAL DOCKET.
Richard S. Salter vs Edward Richard and John Richard.—T. A. Kinman for plaintiff, A. D. Richard for defendant.

Wm B. Deacon vs Alex. Read.—W. A. Russell for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

Minor F. Foster vs S. E. McManus.—Hamilton and Co. for plaintiff, H. H. James for defendant.

Mary S. Gilbert et al vs Geo. F. Wallace and W. A. Lawrence.

Jas R. Ayrer vs W. E. Wortman.—Powell and Bennett for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

SPECIAL DOCKET.
Richard S. Salter vs Edward Richard and John Richard.—T. A. Kinman for plaintiff, A. D. Richard for defendant.

Wm B. Deacon vs Alex. Read.—W. A. Russell for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

Minor F. Foster vs S. E. McManus.—Hamilton and Co. for plaintiff, H. H. James for defendant.

Mary S. Gilbert et al vs Geo. F. Wallace and W. A. Lawrence.

Jas R. Ayrer vs W. E. Wortman.—Powell and Bennett for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

SPECIAL DOCKET.
Richard S. Salter vs Edward Richard and John Richard.—T. A. Kinman for plaintiff, A. D. Richard for defendant.

Wm B. Deacon vs Alex. Read.—W. A. Russell for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

Minor F. Foster vs S. E. McManus.—Hamilton and Co. for plaintiff, H. H. James for defendant.

Mary S. Gilbert et al vs Geo. F. Wallace and W. A. Lawrence.

Jas R. Ayrer vs W. E. Wortman.—Powell and Bennett for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

SPECIAL DOCKET.
Richard S. Salter vs Edward Richard and John Richard.—T. A. Kinman for plaintiff, A. D. Richard for defendant.

Wm B. Deacon vs Alex. Read.—W. A. Russell for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

Minor F. Foster vs S. E. McManus.—Hamilton and Co. for plaintiff, H. H. James for defendant.

Mary S. Gilbert et al vs Geo. F. Wallace and W. A. Lawrence.

Jas R. Ayrer vs W. E. Wortman.—Powell and Bennett for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

SPECIAL DOCKET.
Richard S. Salter vs Edward Richard and John Richard.—T. A. Kinman for plaintiff, A. D. Richard for defendant.

Wm B. Deacon vs Alex. Read.—W. A. Russell for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

Minor F. Foster vs S. E. McManus.—Hamilton and Co. for plaintiff, H. H. James for defendant.

Mary S. Gilbert et al vs Geo. F. Wallace and W. A. Lawrence.

Jas R. Ayrer vs W. E. Wortman.—Powell and Bennett for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

SPECIAL DOCKET.
Richard S. Salter vs Edward Richard and John Richard.—T. A. Kinman for plaintiff, A. D. Richard for defendant.

Wm B. Deacon vs Alex. Read.—W. A. Russell for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

Minor F. Foster vs S. E. McManus.—Hamilton and Co. for plaintiff, H. H. James for defendant.

Mary S. Gilbert et al vs Geo. F. Wallace and W. A. Lawrence.

Jas R. Ayrer vs W. E. Wortman.—Powell and Bennett for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

SPECIAL DOCKET.
Richard S. Salter vs Edward Richard and John Richard.—T. A. Kinman for plaintiff, A. D. Richard for defendant.

Wm B. Deacon vs Alex. Read.—W. A. Russell for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

Minor F. Foster vs S. E. McManus.—Hamilton and Co. for plaintiff, H. H. James for defendant.

Mary S. Gilbert et al vs Geo. F. Wallace and W. A. Lawrence.

Jas R. Ayrer vs W. E. Wortman.—Powell and Bennett for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

SPECIAL DOCKET.
Richard S. Salter vs Edward Richard and John Richard.—T. A. Kinman for plaintiff, A. D. Richard for defendant.

Wm B. Deacon vs Alex. Read.—W. A. Russell for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

Minor F. Foster vs S. E. McManus.—Hamilton and Co. for plaintiff, H. H. James for defendant.

Mary S. Gilbert et al vs Geo. F. Wallace and W. A. Lawrence.

Jas R. Ayrer vs W. E. Wortman.—Powell and Bennett for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

SPECIAL DOCKET.
Richard S. Salter vs Edward Richard and John Richard.—T. A. Kinman for plaintiff, A. D. Richard for defendant.

Wm B. Deacon vs Alex. Read.—W. A. Russell for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

Minor F. Foster vs S. E. McManus.—Hamilton and Co. for plaintiff, H. H. James for defendant.

Mary S. Gilbert et al vs Geo. F. Wallace and W. A. Lawrence.

Jas R. Ayrer vs W. E. Wortman.—Powell and Bennett for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

SPECIAL DOCKET.
Richard S. Salter vs Edward Richard and John Richard.—T. A. Kinman for plaintiff, A. D. Richard for defendant.

Wm B. Deacon vs Alex. Read.—W. A. Russell for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

Minor F. Foster vs S. E. McManus.—Hamilton and Co. for plaintiff, H. H. James for defendant.

Mary S. Gilbert et al vs Geo. F. Wallace and W. A. Lawrence.

Jas R. Ayrer vs W. E. Wortman.—Powell and Bennett for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

SPECIAL DOCKET.
Richard S. Salter vs Edward Richard and John Richard.—T. A. Kinman for plaintiff, A. D. Richard for defendant.

Wm B. Deacon vs Alex. Read.—W. A. Russell for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

Minor F. Foster vs S. E. McManus.—Hamilton and Co. for plaintiff, H. H. James for defendant.

Mary S. Gilbert et al vs Geo. F. Wallace and W. A. Lawrence.

Jas R. Ayrer vs W. E. Wortman.—Powell and Bennett for plaintiff, Emmerson and Chandler for defendant.

SPECIAL DOCKET.
Richard S. Salter vs Edward Richard and John Richard.—T. A. Kinman for plaintiff