

OTTAWA LETTER.

The Dominion is Not Ready for Prohibition.

This is the Decision of the House, Under Laurier's Lead, by a Vote of Two to One.

The Plebiscite Only Intended to Fool the Temperance People—No Man Stood Better With His Fellows in the Last Parliament Than the Late Hon. Mr. Dickey.

OTTAWA, July 4.—Mr. Flint says he wants provincial prohibition. Mr. McClure goes in for general prohibition. But the house of commons, by a majority of more than two to one, has decided that the country is not ready for prohibition of either kind. The vote is 98 to 41. The majority includes supporters of the government and opposition. The minority is made up of 15 government and 26 opposition. In other words, the liberals got the amendment, and the opposition 28 to 17 against it. The ministers in a body voted for the Parmelee amendment, which declared that the result of the plebiscite would not be successfully enforced. Motions and amendments were all made from the government side, and were all arranged by the party beforehand with a certainty that the Parmelee motion would be carried, thus preventing a vote on either of the other awkward questions. Last year the same motions and amendments were proposed, and in the same order, by the same members with the same evident purpose. But a motion to adjourn deferred a still more easy way of escape, and the vote was avoided altogether.

We have now the end of the plebiscite farce, and which the liberal leaders have foreseen from the beginning. It appears from a statement made by the premier in the house that an agreement was reached seven years ago in the party convention that unless a majority of the whole electorate asked for prohibition the aggressive temperance men of the party would cease to give trouble and would fall in with the programme of the opponents of prohibition. Anyone could see that no possible plebiscite could carry a majority of the total registered vote. Such a majority never has been, and probably never will be given for any cause or any party. In practice it is an impossible vote, as Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Fisher have well known. So that now, after seven years, and after all the worry and deceit and expense of the plebiscite, Mr. Fisher and his colleagues are simply carrying out the undertaking they made and the bargain then entered into at the beginning with the enemies of prohibition.

So far as can be seen, Mr. Flint, Mr. McClure and the other prohibitionists in the party, are carrying out their part of the bargain. Even Mr. Spence and Mr. McLarnan of the Dominion Alliance, who assisted in framing the plebiscite clause in the Ottawa convention were quoted yesterday by government supporters as having agreed that the government would have no obligation to introduce the prohibitory law in view of the results of the plebiscite. It remains for the temperance men of the country, who in some cases left their old party because they saw in the Laurier programme some hope of prohibition, to continue to urge modification of the legislation, to revise their action in the light of recent events. They complained of conservative opposition to prohibition. They find liberal opposition combined with hypocrisy and treachery. At most they got from conservatives a blow in the face. They can now decide whether they prefer a stab in the back.

Yesterday's debate was more of a debate than that of any session. The speeches were short and generally vigorous, though some important members were a little vague in defining their personal position.

Mr. Ellis began the discussion where it left off ten weeks ago, and put in a plea against the Parmelee motion. He explained that he was in favor of a general prohibition and would vote for it, but offered his own modification as the next best thing. Mr. Wallace advocated prohibition with compensation. He believed that as the liquor interest had been built up under legislative support, and as it was and would be an aggressive business against prohibition, it would be a great economy and advantage to buy it out. His estimate is that it would cost about eight or ten million dollars, by the payment of which the country would save twenty or thirty millions a year now wasted in liquor, and would secure a strong influence in favor of enforcing the law. Provincial prohibition would simply concentrate the business in Quebec, with illigimate trade elsewhere, and with no adequate machinery for enforcement. Given general prohibition with compensation, and all the machinery of the federal departments would be available for enforcement, while there would be no longer any resistance from the great influence now financially concerned in the trade.

Dr. Macdonald claims to be a prohibitionist and advocates some sort of a scheme for prohibition by groups of counties, a suggestion which afterwards took a kind of form in Dr. Douglas's motion for the "enlargement" of the Scott Act. Mr. Craig held to his original view that the vote for prohibition was not large enough to justify government action. It was his good fortune to be commended by all the ministers who spoke.

The house listened to Sir Wilfrid Laurier without much enlightenment. The premier has now become a critic of temperance suggestions. He is absolutely without any policy of his own except that of standing still and wait-

ing for public opinion to ripen. There was very little to ripen in Sir Wilfrid's remarks, whose argument was that the government had performed its whole duty when it took the vote, and since it is wrong to impose prohibition on a people who do not want it, it follows—Sir Wilfrid was not very clear as to what followed, but he wanted the house to vote for Mr. Parmelee's motion.

Since, therefore, Quebec must not be left out of the prohibition scheme, and since Quebec is dead opposed to prohibition, on its own account, and since it is wrong to impose prohibition on a people who do not want it, it follows—Sir Wilfrid was not very clear as to what followed, but he wanted the house to vote for Mr. Parmelee's motion.

Mr. Foster denied absolutely the statements of the Parmelee amendment. He insisted that the result of the plebiscite vote did not support the conclusion reached by the government. In the first place the vote was taken under circumstances discouraging to the temperance people. There had already been plebiscites ordered by government and nothing had come of them.

Mr. Foster made a comparison between Sir Wilfrid's speeches in his campaign in '96 and his answers to questions put to him at that time with the statements he made now. No one could reconcile them. Sir Wilfrid could not have obtained any temperance vote if he had spoken in 1898 as he spoke now. Why did he not tell the people the conditions of the plebiscite before the plebiscite was taken? Then Mr. Foster went on to tell how Mr. Fisher carried on his plebiscite campaign. Mr. Fisher and he were together at a joint meeting at the opening of the contest and Mr. Fisher told the people to vote for prohibition, and he himself voted for the same meeting. In Mr. Fisher's presence, Mr. Foster said: "Here is a member of the government, the right-hand man of the premier himself, and he has told you openly and plainly that if you vote for prohibition you must carry this plebiscite, and the only interpretation of that is that if we get a majority of the votes polled, we shall have the consequent action of the government." Mr. Fisher sat there offering no word of dissent.

Mr. Fielding had an inspiration and produced a ballot. This was nearly all black, with a small white space near the name for the marking. The lighting, and all the protection from accidents. The carriage was not separated from the railway, and it is intended that all passenger traffic shall cease while the train is approaching or passing the bridge.

Mr. Martin thinks that the province does not come very well out of this bargain, and the minister himself says that the arrangement is not unfavorable to the government of Canada. Mr. Martin thinks that the province is paying more than the interest of the cost of a highway bridge, so that it gains nothing by the co-operation of the province. But Mr. Elair insists that a highway bridge could not be built for less than a half a million dollars. In reply Mr. Martin says that if this is so a railway bridge alone would cost a great deal more, say \$650,000. The proposed structure is estimated by the province to cost \$750,000, so that there is only \$100,000 additional for the roadway. Now Mr. Martin maintains that the bridge will have to be built in any case for the Murray Harbor railway, and that the province is made to pay the interest on the half of \$750,000, while the only value it gets is \$100,000.

Mr. Martin reminds Sir Louis Davies of his great campaign in behalf of the local government candidate in last year's election at Belfast and Murray Harbor. In these contests Sir Louis Davies carried around with him a plan of the proposed bridge which the two governments were going to build. According to Mr. Martin, Sir Louis told the people that he had come to the conclusion that the best way for his life at Moncton getting these plans perfected. Sir Louis does not deny the exhibition of the plans, but he will not admit now his claim to three days' hard work. It can be proved that he did not spend the time there. But the queer feature of the case is that while Sir Louis Davies admits that the plan he showed around Belfast and Murray Harbor was the old one for a more expensive structure, he says now that the present plan for the cheaper bridge and inferior accommodation for wagons was arranged last fall by the engineer at Moncton. Either Sir Louis was exhibiting a bogus plan of the gold brick style when he had a cheaper one already arranged, or else after having shown his more elaborate scheme he went back to Moncton and made the arrangement for the inferior structure. In any case the bridge failed to carry him over. He lost both elections.

There was a great deal of talk about the protection of the ballot boxes and the certificate of the count. Mr. McNeill was the ballot box enclosed in a sealed covering of linen paper. It was suggested also that the box itself be made stronger than those now used and that it should be fastened and sealed like a freight car on a railway. All these precautions adopted or suggested indicate a very general feeling which exists in Ontario at present that the ballots are not safe in the hands of the kind of officers who are to be the officials. The machine has filled the honest public with a terror which causes a vague search for refuge in all kinds of ridiculous ways.

Mr. Fielding had an inspiration and produced a ballot. This was nearly all black, with a small white space near the name for the marking. The lighting, and all the protection from accidents. The carriage was not separated from the railway, and it is intended that all passenger traffic shall cease while the train is approaching or passing the bridge.

Mr. Martin thinks that the province does not come very well out of this bargain, and the minister himself says that the arrangement is not unfavorable to the government of Canada. Mr. Martin thinks that the province is paying more than the interest of the cost of a highway bridge, so that it gains nothing by the co-operation of the province. But Mr. Elair insists that a highway bridge could not be built for less than a half a million dollars. In reply Mr. Martin says that if this is so a railway bridge alone would cost a great deal more, say \$650,000. The proposed structure is estimated by the province to cost \$750,000, so that there is only \$100,000 additional for the roadway. Now Mr. Martin maintains that the bridge will have to be built in any case for the Murray Harbor railway, and that the province is made to pay the interest on the half of \$750,000, while the only value it gets is \$100,000.

Mr. Martin reminds Sir Louis Davies of his great campaign in behalf of the local government candidate in last year's election at Belfast and Murray Harbor. In these contests Sir Louis Davies carried around with him a plan of the proposed bridge which the two governments were going to build. According to Mr. Martin, Sir Louis told the people that he had come to the conclusion that the best way for his life at Moncton getting these plans perfected. Sir Louis does not deny the exhibition of the plans, but he will not admit now his claim to three days' hard work. It can be proved that he did not spend the time there. But the queer feature of the case is that while Sir Louis Davies admits that the plan he showed around Belfast and Murray Harbor was the old one for a more expensive structure, he says now that the present plan for the cheaper bridge and inferior accommodation for wagons was arranged last fall by the engineer at Moncton. Either Sir Louis was exhibiting a bogus plan of the gold brick style when he had a cheaper one already arranged, or else after having shown his more elaborate scheme he went back to Moncton and made the arrangement for the inferior structure. In any case the bridge failed to carry him over. He lost both elections.

There was a great deal of talk about the protection of the ballot boxes and the certificate of the count. Mr. McNeill was the ballot box enclosed in a sealed covering of linen paper. It was suggested also that the box itself be made stronger than those now used and that it should be fastened and sealed like a freight car on a railway. All these precautions adopted or suggested indicate a very general feeling which exists in Ontario at present that the ballots are not safe in the hands of the kind of officers who are to be the officials. The machine has filled the honest public with a terror which causes a vague search for refuge in all kinds of ridiculous ways.

There was a great deal of talk about the protection of the ballot boxes and the certificate of the count. Mr. McNeill was the ballot box enclosed in a sealed covering of linen paper. It was suggested also that the box itself be made stronger than those now used and that it should be fastened and sealed like a freight car on a railway. All these precautions adopted or suggested indicate a very general feeling which exists in Ontario at present that the ballots are not safe in the hands of the kind of officers who are to be the officials. The machine has filled the honest public with a terror which causes a vague search for refuge in all kinds of ridiculous ways.

There was a great deal of talk about the protection of the ballot boxes and the certificate of the count. Mr. McNeill was the ballot box enclosed in a sealed covering of linen paper. It was suggested also that the box itself be made stronger than those now used and that it should be fastened and sealed like a freight car on a railway. All these precautions adopted or suggested indicate a very general feeling which exists in Ontario at present that the ballots are not safe in the hands of the kind of officers who are to be the officials. The machine has filled the honest public with a terror which causes a vague search for refuge in all kinds of ridiculous ways.

There was a great deal of talk about the protection of the ballot boxes and the certificate of the count. Mr. McNeill was the ballot box enclosed in a sealed covering of linen paper. It was suggested also that the box itself be made stronger than those now used and that it should be fastened and sealed like a freight car on a railway. All these precautions adopted or suggested indicate a very general feeling which exists in Ontario at present that the ballots are not safe in the hands of the kind of officers who are to be the officials. The machine has filled the honest public with a terror which causes a vague search for refuge in all kinds of ridiculous ways.

There was a great deal of talk about the protection of the ballot boxes and the certificate of the count. Mr. McNeill was the ballot box enclosed in a sealed covering of linen paper. It was suggested also that the box itself be made stronger than those now used and that it should be fastened and sealed like a freight car on a railway. All these precautions adopted or suggested indicate a very general feeling which exists in Ontario at present that the ballots are not safe in the hands of the kind of officers who are to be the officials. The machine has filled the honest public with a terror which causes a vague search for refuge in all kinds of ridiculous ways.



The Dainty White Things
that are washed with SURPRISE Soap—a little Surprise Soap and still less labor—are not only clean but uninjured.
You want the maximum wear out of your clothes. Don't have them ruined by poor soap—use pure soap.
SURPRISE is a pure hard Soap.

THE FORGERY CASE.

The preliminary examination of Frederick S. Whittaker on the various charges of forgery was continued at the police court Saturday morning before the police magistrate. The recorder and A. I. Trueman appeared for the prosecution. L. A. Currey, the counsel for the defence, was not present, and A. W. Baird explained that he was called away on important business up the river. Mr. Baird asked for an adjournment until Monday, but the magistrate thought the case had better proceed, as it was not so very important in a preliminary examination that counsel should be present.

George A. Schofield was then sworn. He deposed that he was the manager of the Bank of New Brunswick. Early in May, he said, Frederick S. Whittaker presented the S. A. Crowell note for discount. The amount, \$751.00, was credited to his account in the bank. The endorsement was in Mr. Whittaker's handwriting. The discounting of the note was done as an ordinary business transaction.

Mr. Skinner next put in the witness's hand a note dated May 1st, 1900, purporting to be signed by John M. Smith of Windsor. Mr. Baird objected to the witness giving evidence with regard to this note, on the ground that it had nothing to do with the case now before the court (the Crowell case). Mr. Skinner contended that there was a provision for just such a proceeding in forgery cases. Such evidence could be admitted merely to establish a knowledge of guilt on the part of the prisoner. The magistrate ruled that this was so, and said such evidence could be given in cases of forgery. He would note the objection, however, which was a proper one.

Mr. Schofield then told of discounting this note, and was shown a second note purporting to be signed also by John M. Smith, dated April 2nd, for \$351. This was also discounted by the bank in the ordinary course of business, and the proceeds were placed to Mr. Whittaker's credit, after which Mr. Whittaker drew the money out. The Bennett, Smith & Co. note for \$601.50, dated January 23rd, was next shown the witness, who deposed that the same was discounted like the others, the prisoner getting the proceeds. The words "Aboutkin," \$5,000 at 12 p. c., meant the premium on that amount of insurance on a vessel of that name. Mr. Whittaker was engaged in a marine insurance business. Another note of Bennett, Smith & Co. for \$112.50 was shown the witness, who swore that this was also discounted by the bank in February last. The name "Lansdown" on the note indicated the amount was for insurance on that vessel.

Mr. Schofield gave similar evidence regarding the note for \$501, bearing the name of Charles DeW. Smith. Mr. Schofield said he knew Mr. Crowell was doing a hardware business in Yarmouth, and was also interested in vessels. Mr. Whittaker mentioned his business when he presented the note.

Mr. Skinner asked the witness if at the time he discounted the Crowell note he believed in the signature genuine. Mr. Baird made an objection to the question on the ground that the witness could not be asked what he believed or thought, nor could he give his impressions. The question, however, was allowed, and Mr. Schofield replied that he certainly believed the signature to be Mr. Crowell's, or he would not have discounted.

Mr. Skinner was proceeding to put the same question with regard to the other notes, but the magistrate stopped him, ruling that it was not admissible as evidence except in the case before the court.

PAR
The Boer
Floor
Bitterly Deno
St. Johns,
spoken
Dr. Borden
Company
Charter
ers f
Dr. Borden Dr
Legislation—
Man—Grants
—General Bu

OTTAWA.
Mr. Casey H
of privilege
statement of
the agitation
was in the ha
dian member
members of a
were agreed
Mr. Craig,
not afraid to
demnity for
\$500 had been
shorter than
wright and is
The subject
The premi
had not left
not been app
Hon. Mr. J
reading of
per postage
found on all
the province
Mr. Foster
ment of pr
to retain th
which reply
would proba
Mr. Davin
voted of 27
Ferguson, co
The comm
till tomorrow
on motion
Stansied, e
sion to pres
the right of
The premi
now left wit
Mr. McDo
occasion to
standings w
Hon. Mr. S
create the
national pol
the Nova S
that the De
do with it.
In the ques
duction bet
the nation
tion of the
more rapid
tion; 2nd
increase of
of the argu
Co. had be
owned by
old mines
mained out
that the m
of which m
the chief
and as yet
some as th
and very li
Island. H
ships resu
Victoria an
Mr. McDo
Whitney C
good, but
ceded with
tion. He s
for making
nor for cl
pay as wel
he blamed.
ing precar
made his c
the people
grievance
Hon. Mr.
discuss the
say that
The magist
liberal par
to look ar
Mr. Bell
matter w
importance
had to gov
pers relat
for the im
John. W
charges se
Africa see
through th
The comm
thousand
cargo, and
house, the
were Cana
stating th
letters fr
St. John,
making t
firm York
New York
stating th
to have th
or St. Joh
goes sent
peared to
St. John
Repliyng
er stated
made the
possible.
made in
In some c
five or six

Mr. Baird objected to the witness giving evidence with regard to this note, on the ground that it had nothing to do with the case now before the court (the Crowell case). Mr. Skinner contended that there was a provision for just such a proceeding in forgery cases. Such evidence could be admitted merely to establish a knowledge of guilt on the part of the prisoner. The magistrate ruled that this was so, and said such evidence could be given in cases of forgery. He would note the objection, however, which was a proper one.

Mr. Schofield then told of discounting this note, and was shown a second note purporting to be signed also by John M. Smith, dated April 2nd, for \$351. This was also discounted by the bank in the ordinary course of business, and the proceeds were placed to Mr. Whittaker's credit, after which Mr. Whittaker drew the money out. The Bennett, Smith & Co. note for \$601.50, dated January 23rd, was next shown the witness, who deposed that the same was discounted like the others, the prisoner getting the proceeds. The words "Aboutkin," \$5,000 at 12 p. c., meant the premium on that amount of insurance on a vessel of that name. Mr. Whittaker was engaged in a marine insurance business. Another note of Bennett, Smith & Co. for \$112.50 was shown the witness, who swore that this was also discounted by the bank in February last. The name "Lansdown" on the note indicated the amount was for insurance on that vessel.

Mr. Schofield gave similar evidence regarding the note for \$501, bearing the name of Charles DeW. Smith. Mr. Schofield said he knew Mr. Crowell was doing a hardware business in Yarmouth, and was also interested in vessels. Mr. Whittaker mentioned his business when he presented the note.

Mr. Skinner asked the witness if at the time he discounted the Crowell note he believed in the signature genuine. Mr. Baird made an objection to the question on the ground that the witness could not be asked what he believed or thought, nor could he give his impressions. The question, however, was allowed, and Mr. Schofield replied that he certainly believed the signature to be Mr. Crowell's, or he would not have discounted.

Cook's Cotton Root Compound
Is successfully used monthly by over 10,000 ladies. Safe, effective. Ladies are urged to get a bottle of Cook's Cotton Root Compound. It is the only medicine that cures all the ailments of women. It is a pure vegetable preparation, and is perfectly safe for all ages. It is sold in all the leading druggists in Canada.