New Advertisements.

Scaly Skin Diseases.

Psoriasis 5 years, covering face, head, and entire body with white scabs. Skin red, itchy, and bleeding. Hair all gone. Spent hundreds of dollars. Pronounced incurable. Cured by Cuticura Remedies.

Cured by Cuticura.

My disease (psoriasis) first broke out on my left cheek, spreading across my nose, and almost covering my face. It ran into my eyes, and the physician was afraid I would lose my eyesight altogether. It spread all over my head, and my hair all fell out, until I was entirely bald-headed; it then broke out on my arms and shoulders, until my arms were just one sore. It covered my entire body, my face, head and shoulders being the worst. The white scabs fell constantly from my head, shoulders and arms; the skin would thicken and be red and very itchy, and would crack and bleed if scratched. After spending many hundreds of dollars, I was pronounced incurable. I heard of the Cuticura Remedies, and after using two bottles Cuticura Resolvent, I could see a change; and after I had taken four bottles, I was almost cured; and when I had used six bottles of Cuticura Resolvent and one box of Cuticura, and one cake of Cuticura Soap, I was cured of the dreadful disease from which I suffered for five years. I thought the disease would leave a very deep scar, but the Cuticura Remedies cured it without any scars. I cannot express with a pen what I suffered before using the Cuticura Remedies. They saved my life, and I feel it is my duty to recommend them. My hair is restored as good as ever, and so is my eyesight. I know of others who have received great benefit from their use.

Mrs. ROJA KELLY, Rockwell City, Iowa

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, have cured thousands of cases where the shedding of scales measured a quart daily, the skin cracked, bleeding, burning, and itching almost beyond human endurance, hair lifeless or all gone, suffering terrible. What other remedies have made such cures

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, red, rough, chapped and oily skin prevented by Cuticura Soap.

IT STOPS THE PAIN.

Backache, kidney pains, weakness rheumatism, and muscular pains relieved in one minute by the Cuticura Anti-Pain Plaster. The first and only instantaneous 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 fac-similes of our signatures attached, in its advertisements."

J. H. Lampton
J. H. Emly
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, April 15, 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
PRIZE OF	25,000 is	25,000
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. More 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.

SHERIFF'S SALE!

To be sold at Public Auction, on Thursday, the 27th day of February, next, in front of the Post Office, in Chatham, between the hours of 12 noon and five o'clock p. m.

All the right, title, and interest of Jacob Price, a and to all that piece, parcel or lot of land and premises situate, lying and being on the south side of the Tabusintac River, in the Parish of Alnwick and County of Northumberland, abutted and bounded as follows, viz.:—Butterly by lands occupied by Richard Price, Westerly by lands occupied by Gordon Strang, Easterly by lands occupied by Mrs. John McKenzie, and Northerly by Indian Reserve lands, containing 100 acres, more or less, and being the lands and premises on which the said Jacob Price at present resides.

The same having been seized by me, under and by virtue of an Execution issued of the Supreme Court in the suit of Alexander Loggie and James Anderson against the said Jacob Price and Henry Price.

JOHN SHIRREFF, Sheriff.

Sheriff's Office, Newcastle, N. B., 12th November, A. D., 1889.

PUBLIC NOTICE.

Application will be made to the Legislature of New Brunswick at the next Session thereof for the enactment of a Bill intituled, "An Act to further amend 44th Victoria, Cap 62, intituled an Act to consolidate and amend, the several acts relating to the South West Boom Company." The object of this Bill is to authorise the South West Boom Company to extend the limit of its Boom Easterly or down Stream towards Barnaby Island.

Newcastle, 11th February, 1890.

Local Legislature.

THE GREAT STUMPAGE DEBATE!

[*Continued from 1st page.*]

such that some fixed rule could be determined on this question. It was one surrounded with difficulty. It was a special tax, some thought, that was being taken out of them. Others viewed it in different lights and his desire was that some reasonable means should be adopted to remedy the matter. It was with the view of meeting the claims of the people interested in this industry that he had considered the question, and the views he had expressed were those he had formed after due thought over the question involved.

The resolution was seconded by Mr. Anderson.

Mr. Hanington

declared that there was an entire change of policy on the part of the government. The result would be that the revenue of the country would be very materially affected and some of the much-needed services would be left unprovided for to a large extent. The revenues of the province were derived from but few sources, and chief among them was the stumpage. Were that reduced, what would be the inevitable consequence? Direct taxation. Were they at all disposed to avoid this, then assuredly the stumpage should not be reduced, and it especially ought not to be reduced at a time when the demand for it was not at all imperative. He was sorry the hon. chief commissioner could not be present, as he had intended to ask him if there was not a deficiency in this department of some $50,000, which had been carried to this year's account. He would challenge the statement in the resolution that there was an excess of revenue sufficient to justify this reduction. If there was, then what need existed for them to withdraw from the amount at the credit of the province the sum of $20,000? That fact stared them in the face, and it would behoove the leader of the government to answer his question. In 1882 the receipts were some $133,000; in 1884, $127,000; 1885, $103,000; in 1886, $122,000; 1887, $180,000; in 1888, $121,000; and in 1889, some $135,000, and while these facts stared the government in the face, yet there was the declaration of his learned friends opposite that they could not then attempt to make any reduction of the stumpage. Then how they were to justify the resolution now before the house he was at a loss to perceive.

THE PROPOUND KNOWLEDGE OF THE OPPOSITION LEADER.

There were but some 25 men who would be affected by the resolution, while the road and bridge service, teachers, ferries, agricultural societies and many other important services would be losers. The feeling in the country was that the present rate was fair and reasonable. The government would be more justified in increasing rather than reducing the stumpage rates. The Attorney General had said that the government had interviewed the lumbermen of the North Shore as late as September or October. Was that not in view of the fact that there was to be a general election? He thought so. The government had stood firm in reference to their stumpage rates until a general election was in view. When it was feared by the government that they might lose St. John (and he had nothing to say on that contest at the present time), the government sought to win the support of Northumberland, and hence the proposition in September or October last to make concessions to the lumbermen. Mr. Hanington condemned the government's course generally, and moved this resolution:

Whereas, The values and profits of the lumber business have largely increased during the past two years, and that industry is now successful and fairly remunerative; and

Whereas, The annual returns of the expenditure and liability of the government and departments since the end of the fiscal year last passed, for the services and contracts of that year, are not yet laid before the house, and without such information it is impossible to judge of the true state of the provincial affairs and finances; and

Whereas, under the existing laws the whole question of stumpage and information in connection therewith is one that is under the control of, and can be, and is contemplated to be dealt with by the executive in the proper exercise of its functions, powers and responsibilities under the principles of responsible government, which principles the executive have herein ignored;

Therefore resolved, That this house does not deem it advisable now to approve of a remission or reduction of the rate of stumpage on lumber as now established, or of the appointment of a commission in respect thereto.

Continuing, Mr. Hanington found fault that the Surveyor General's report was not presented; declared the law commission was a failure; and he concluded with a strong protest against the government's action in the stumpage matter.

Mr. Burchill

said this was a question which had for some time past been agitating the public mind and the attention of this house. It was as the hon. gentleman who had just sat down stated, a very important question indeed. It was a question of importance to the whole province, but it was a question of more than ordinary importance to the northern counties of the province, among which was the county he had the honor to represent. That it was important to that county was shown by the fact that it was made

ONE OF THE QUESTIONS AT THE POLLS,

and, further, the government had been approached by delegations from that county for the reduction of the stumpage. It was, therefore, a matter of congratulation that the present government had it in their power to accede to that request, and that they now felt themselves in a position to grant the lumber operators of the northern counties that relief which they had so long sought for. It was also a matter of congratulation to the province at large that now this question was about to be determined.

MR. HANINGTON'S CHANGE OF FRONT.

He was surprised at the attitude of the hon. leader of the opposition for, till he had heard him express his views on the subject, he had hoped for the assistance of that hon. gentleman. They all could remember that, on former occasions, that hon. gentleman had given expression to his opinions on the matter in a different strain to that in which he had expressed himself to-day. He would take occasion, before he resumed his seat, to call the attention of the house to the statements that hon. gentleman had made in times past with reference to this question.

NORTHERN DISADVANTAGES.

The principal platform on which the members from the northern counties based their claim to a reduction of the stumpage was that that part of the province was laboring under disadvantages which the southern part of the province did not suffer from. The hon gentleman had stated that there was no difference between the different parts of the province in that respect, but he would show that there was a difference in the rates of freight from ports in the northern counties to what there was in the southern ports, and especially from the port of St. John. St. John deals were also worth more in the English market than North Shore deals were. Why, he was not prepared to say; he thought it was more a matter of prejudice than aught else. Another point—and a strong point—was that while the exports from the northern counties of the province were confined to the summer months, those from the southern ports, including St. John, could be carried on at all seasons of the year. A great deal had been said in the press of the country for some time past about the harbor of St. John. It had been put forward that that harbor was the best on this side of the Atlantic, and it was no doubt in the interest of the country that such a contention should be made. At all events it was a well-known fact that St. John harbor was at all times open and that shipments could be made from it at all times of the year and shippers at that port could, at any time there was a rise in the British market, take advantage of it, and he thought he need only call attention to the fact that in 1889, while the northern ports were closed, shippers at St. John were shipping deals at a freight of 80 shillings. When he mentioned those facts, he thought they were such as would commend themselves to the careful attention and consideration of all members, as being good points in favor of the

CLAIM OF THE NORTHERN COUNTIES

for reduction of the stumpage. All mill men, lumber merchants and others connected with the business were aware that the profit, on account of the competition, was small and therefore in that view of the case it was important to see what were the facts as to the price paid for the lumber. He would tell them that a reduction of $20,000 on the stumpage meant an amount that would pay the interest on the subsidy of 200 miles of railway. He was in favor of further railway development where it was called for. He pointed out that there were in this province about 9,000,000 acres of granted lands, about 7,000,000 of ungranted lands and about 3,000,000 acres of land now under license that are lumber lands.

MR. HANINGTON AND N. B. BONDS.

The lumber lands of the province meant an investment that, properly guarded, would inure to the benefit of the province for all time to come. It meant a capital invested that gave the province financial credit. Why was it that our 4 per cent bonds were at a premium now?

Hon. Mr. Blair—Good government.

Mr. Hanington—Good government is it? They are killing the goose that lays the golden egg. The present government have not improved the situation much, because the bonds were taken at par when we were in.

Hon. Mr. Pugsley—Oh no! They sold at about 90.

Mr. Hanington—I mean the railway bonds.

Hon. Mr. Pugsley—Of course the companies had to take them at par, but they were not worth that.

Mr. Hanington—I say that the government were offered par for 4 per cents. from gentlemen in New York.

Hon. Mr. Pugsley—Did you not continue to issue 5 per cent. bonds right down until you left office? Is it not true that you did not issue any 4 per cent. bonds while you were in office?

Mr. Hanington—Did we not legislate for 4 per cent. bonds?

Hon. Mr. Pugsley—Yes, but did you issue them?

Mr. Hanington—I did not say we issued them, though I think we did. Continuing, Mr. Hanington pointed out that the $3,000,000 acres of lumber lands the province owned was what gave the province a credit in the money market. Let the government reduce the stumpage and they would thereby acknowledge that the value of the lands had depreciated.

THE PRICE OF LATHS.

Mr. Burchill said he would refer especially to the matter of laths, which in St. John were worth from $1.40 to $1.75.

Hon. Mr. Hanington—No, no.

Mr. Burchill—The hon. gentleman says "no, no."

Hon. Mr. Tweedie—You say, yes, yes.

Mr. Burchill—I think I am correct, for on the North Shore we are glad to get $1 for them; that is a great difference. Then arises also the question of

FREIGHT FROM THE NORTHERN COUNTIES

to the American ports, for in the United States the demand arose for the laths. From St. John to Boston or New York the rate was some 50 cents, while from the northern ports the rate of freight was from 90 cents to $1.10. These were a few of the disadvantages which he claimed the Northern ports labored under. Now the hon. member from Westmorland had stated that no such principle as discrimination in favor of the northern counties was made at the time of the imposition of these duties, but he would call the attention of the hon. member to the fact that all the parts of the province

WERE NOT TREATED ALIKE

and that a distinction was made between north and south. The contention now raised was not a new one, for it was urged, and was recognized, as would appear by the records of the country, if the hon. members would turn to the regulations concerning lumber made in 1874, they would there find that all sawn logs, spruce and pine, cut and sent down streams flowing into the St. Lawrence were only subject to 60 cents, while any place else in the province was liable to 80 cents. (Mr. Burchill here read the regulations in extenso.) Now, if that fact, he said, was recognized at that time that there was an advantage in favor of the south, did not then the same advantage exist to-day, and in asking for the reduction as they had for several years past, and which hon. gentlemen opposite were then quite willing to grant, were they asking for any more than had been admitted should be given to them? Surely the members from the northern counties were not asking for anything more than members on the opposition side of the house had stated they were entitled to, and which they thought, as also did this government, that they should now receive. He would call the attention of the house to the remarks of Mr. Park when this matter was before the house in 1885 and which would be found on page 27 of that year's debate as follows:—

"He intended to take the feeling of the house upon the question. He moved the following as an amendment to the motion to go into supply, saying that he moved it as an independent member in the interests of a ground-down people; 'Whereas, this house by the adoption of the address in reply to the speech of his honor the lieutenant governor on the 28th day of February last, has expressed its opinion that as yet no trustworthy signs were perceptible of an early revival of trade as respects our greatest staple article of export, and that this branch of industry is in a languishing state; and, Whereas, the present rate of stumpage is fixed at $1.25 per thousand superficial feet on logs which seems excessive in the present depressed state of trade, therefore resolved, That the estimated revenue for the current year should be based upon a reduction of the current rate of stumpage now charged upon timber, logs and other lumber."

That was the resolution moved by that hon. gentleman and on that resolution

MR. HANINGTON WAS FOUND SAYING,

at page 43 of the same report:—

"Now as to the amendment calling for a reduction of the stumpage moved by his friend Mr. Park, it was a most deserving measure and it coincided with the sentiment of the country. The attorney general and his factious associates could not bluff it down (hear, hear). They had a pliant majority and might undertake to squelch out free discussion, but for the credit of the house he (Mr. Hanington) hoped they would not dare to do it. For the credit of this house he hoped no amendment would be moved to the amendment. The mover of the first amendment had in contemplation only such a temporary reduction in the stumpage as the immediate interests of the country required. The rate of decrease ought properly to be left with the government and the course of the mover was on the whole as constitutional as it possibly could be. In the present stringent condition of business it contemplated a reduction of taxation and was it not worth while to ease the country of a load of $40,000 taxation?"

Such were the sentiments of the hon. gentleman in 1885. I say that the

SAME REASONS EXIST TO-DAY

as existed then for a reduction of the stumpage. True, the circumstances had changed slightly, but what were the statements of that hon. gentleman to-day? We are forced to come to the conclusion that he has changed to suit the particular circumstances in which he may be placed. Notwithstanding the statements made in 1885, when he claimed a reduction, and stated it was beneficial to the interests of the country, yet that same hon. gentleman says now that the reduction of the stumpage would be anything but to the interest of this country. The reasons given were that the same circumstances did not exist. He (Mr. Hanington) had stated that lumber was worth $4 more now than in 1886, yet he, a practical man, would say that such was not the case. In his own business he had received $8.50 to $9, whereas in 1889 he had received from $8.50 to $9.50 for sales he had made in the British market. These were net results, the difference between the quoted market prices of 1886 and 1889 being accounted for by the fact that the excess of freight rates in 1889 over those of 1886, left the shipper little, if any, better off. Hon. gentlemen could

DRAW THEIR OWN CONCLUSIONS

from such figures. The hon. leader of the opposition had compared the lumber operators of his own county to those of the North Shore, and had stated that they received but some $2.50, while he knew from his own operations that on the North Shore they received some $5. When the report was received from the crown land department it would be seen that in that hon. gentleman's county a large portion of the land on which lumber was cut was owned by private parties, and hence the difference, for they charged more fees for stumpage than did the crown, and it was consequently in their interest that the crown should maintain their present rate of stumpage. While the land companies had taken the best land and had left only inferior lands to the crown, they had charged a higher rate of stumpage than had the government, and were the present reduction made, it would only be an equitable one.

DEPENDING THE NORTH.

He would from his place defend the operators on the North Shore from the attacks made on them of late. They were not, as had been alleged, land-grabbers or land-robbers. They were not monopolists, nor were they millionaires. Few, if any, had any profit on their lumbering operations in the past few years, and some had even carried on their operations at a loss to themselves. The measure now proposed was simply one of justice. It was one that had been long demanded, and it was but right that now the measure of justice intended to be done to the northern counties should be carried to a consummation.

Dr. Atkinson

made an out and out opposition speech, even declaring that low stumpage was prejudicial to lumbermen.

Mr. Labillois

said he thought the member for Carleton was drawing on his imagination when he spoke of the over-expenditures made by the chief commissioner of public works. He mentioned instances where the chief commissioner had been unable to grant favors which he had requested, by reason of the great demands made by the southern section of the province. That gentleman (Mr. Ryan) had stated that of all the counties in the province Carleton gave him the most trouble. He (LaBillois) thought if there had been any over-expenditure that county was responsible for it. It did not, therefore, come with much grace from the member for that county to make the charges which he had made against that gentleman.

(Dr. Atkinson here said he had not desired to make any reflections on the commissioner. There was no member of the government for whom he had as much respect as for that gentleman.)

Mr. Labillois, proceeding, pointed out that the government, in the policy they were now carrying out, did not represent alone the county of Northumberland but of 90,000 people of the North Shore, or one-third of the entire province. He believed that the reduction in stumpage would not be of as much benefit to the larger operators as to the sub operators of the North Shore. He did not think it was in the interest of the province that these

SECTIONAL CRIES SHOULD BE RAISED

as between the north and the south. He pointed out that the north contributed $39,000 out of the $114,000 received from stumpage last year. The government should give the people of the North Shore the consideration which these figures demanded. The North Shore members had always acted most generously and patriotically in reference to the numerous claims of the southern sections of the province. The North Shore was unanimous on this question. He pointed out the advantage the south possessed in having a nearer market and longer shipping season, and less depth of snow in the winter. It was clear to him that the government of the province for the past seven years had been, on the whole, satisfactory to the general mass of the people. Such opposition as the government had met with was sectional and personal, and beside its merits. If this had not been the case it would have been impossible for so many members to secure their return by acclamation in support of the government. The railway question was not one involved in the present discussion.

Mr. Phinney.

Mr. Phinney said that as a member from a northern county he desired to take a broad general view of this question. Had the government submitted to the house a bold, manly resolution in favor of a reduction of the stumpage he would have voted for it. He would then have stifled the justifiable personal feeling he entertained towards the government which had treated him so unfairly in the past. The present resolution was a mere begging of the question. It was a mere subterfuge—a political fraud. If it satisfied the northern members they were easily satisfied. The resolution had been forced from the government, not because they felt they were doing justice to the North Shoae, but because political exigencies demanded it. But if the present resolution satisfied the members for Northumberland it did not satisfy him or the lumber operators of his county whom he had communicated with.

Several members of the government—Who was it? George McLeod was it not?

Mr. Phinney—Yes, George McLeod and I had as much right to consult him as the government had to consult Mr. Snowball.

Hon. Mr. Pugsley—His answer was to

SACRIFICE EVERYTHING

and turn the government out if possible.

Mr. Phinney—Yes, to turn the government out would not be much of a sacrifice to the country. (Laughter.) It was proposed that the house should say that it did not disapprove of a reduction in the stumpage, pending a report of the commission, and subject to such conditions as the governor in council may impose. He thought that language meant reduce the stumpage and afterwards impose conditions that the northern lumbermen could not accept, namely, compel them to relinquish their leases. The proposals of the government were not satisfactory to the lumber operators of Kent. He quoted from the attorney general's speeches where he described the demands of Northumberland as unreasonable and said he (Mr. Blair) would have stood better in the county if he had

GONE DOWN WITH THE SHIP

rather than have gone back on his record as he had.

Hon. Mr. Pugsley—I would like to know if the hon. gentleman is in favor of a reduction of stumpage?

Mr. Phinney replied that he would answer that at his convenience. Proceeding he pointed out that the declarations of Messrs. Ritchie, McLellan and Emmerson in the assembly had been emphatically against a reduction of stumpage. He doubted very much whether even the chief commissioner of public works had been consulted. Great was Northumberland and Tweedie was its prophet. (Laughter.) That gentleman had sacrificed his principles for the purpose of keeping in power a government that was discredited at the polls. He might be reminded that he was assuming the position of a great purist in this matter; he should aim high though it hit low. It was the boast of the present surveyor general a short time ago, that he held the government at his mercy and was master of the situation. He had said that he was going to run the department of the surveyor general for all it was worth.

Hon. Mr. Tweedie—So I am.

Mr. Phinney—If he is going to do that he will soon find himself in collision with the attorney general. The hon. surveyor general will

EITHER HAVE TO RULE OR BE RULED,

and I do not think he is the man to rule alongside of the attorney general, Mr. Phinney contended that the *tu quoque* argument was a weak one to apply to the opposition. If any of the members of the opposition had made any overtures to the Northumberland members they did it at a time when the party was not organized, and certainly did it without his cognizance. The hon. solicitor general was very anxious to know his views as to whether there should be a reduction of stumpage. He was sorry to say that the question was not an important one to the county of Kent, where the lumber output was decreasing from year to year. It would make very little difference to the operators of that county. He read from the official report of his own (Phinney's) speech in the house last year on the question of stumpage. In that speech he had said the people of his county were

ALMOST UNANIMOUS IN FAVOR

of a reduction of the stumpage. Of course they would not want the stumpage reduced if by that it was intended to reduce the grants for roads, bridges, schools and the other great services of the country. The last elections had been held at a most inclement season.

Hon. Mr. Blair—How many dominion elections have been held in the winter season?

Mr. Phinney—I am not here to answer for the dominion government. His colleague (Mr. LeBlanc) had run against him with a candidate selected by the attorney general. The latter was not satisfied with his (Phinney's) independent support. The resolution of the attorney general evaded the real question and sought to throw upon the house responsibility that should rest upon the shoulders of the government. He therefore preferred to vote for the amendment of Mr. Hanington. He would not say that the government was not right in seeking to reduce the stumpage, but he refused to accept this mongrel arrangement which was only made to save the government from defeat.

FREDERICTON, March 19th.

Hon. Mr. Pugsley

resumed the stumpage debate. He said he was pained by the attitude of Mr. Phinney, whose sincerity he had never before doubted. It would make little or no difference perhaps to the people of the province what the opinion of that hon. gentleman was on this question, but it was of

GREAT IMPORTANCE TO THE HOUSE AND COUNTRY

that his vote should be given in accordance with his honest opinion. The house was entitled to the honest opinion of the hon. gentleman as to whether or not the stumpage should be reduced. The hon. member should give an independent vote, regardless of any telegram he may have received from Mr. George McLeod.

Mr. Phinney—I did not say I had received a telegram from Mr. McLeod on this question.

Hon. Mr. Pugsley—I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon: he did say so. Reference to last year's official debates would show the inconsistent position of the hon. member from Kent at the present time. The opinion then given was no doubt a manly and honest opinion. It could not be said on behalf of the hon. member that things had materially changed since he made the speech from which he (Pugsley) intended to quote. That speech had not been made as far back as 1884, 1883 or 1886; but it was made last year. Turn to page 29 of the official reports and what do we find? The hon. member for Kent is reported as saying "he would not be doing his duty if he did not say something on the stumpage question. It was one that deeply concerned his constituency." Yet he now says that the question is one in which his county takes but little interest. Were the farmers of Kent not as much interested in the continuation of the roads and bridges and in the efficiency of the school service last year, when Mr. Phinney thought the stumpage matter

ONE OF SO MUCH IMPORTANCE,

as they are this year? The hon. member last year did not wish to be understood as saying that it was only the lumbermen of Kent who were interested in the stumpage question. He said on that occasion, as a reference to the official reports will show, "the county council of Kent had passed resolutions favoring a reduction of the stumpage, and he (Mr. Phinney) would be recreant to his duty if he did not agree with the remarks of the hon. member from Northumberland on the question." Further on in the same speech Mr. Phinney said it was the duty of the North Shore members to voice the feelings of their constituents on this question," and again "some of the most prominent men of his county demanded a reduction of the stumpage on the ground that such a reduction was a public necessity. He hoped that the government would favorably entertain the request of the North Shore lumbermen and make a reduction in the stumpage as soon as possible." Not only was the hon. member in favor of a reduction of the stumpage, but according to his own statement he wanted it made without delay. What is his position now? What is his attitude when there is a proposition before the house looking to

AN IMMEDIATE REDUCTION OF THE STUMPAGE?

Was the hon. member's hope last year that the government should reduce the stumpage as soon as possible evidence that the government never held out any hope to the lumbermen in the future, and yet now because the government proposes to reduce the stumpage the hon. member makes reflections upon them. He (Pugsley) was afraid that the fact that Mr. Tweedie had been taken into the government instead of Mr. Phinney himself had more than a little to do with the attitude of the hon. member for Kent. (Mr. Phinney—Oh, no.) He thought that after listening to the remarks of the hon. member from Kent last night the house should be convinced that were that hon. gentleman free to speak and vote according to the dictates of his own conscience and his own best judgment he would certainly favor a reduction of the stumpage. Whatever views he might entertain as to the form in which the question now came before the house, the remarks of that hon. member must have convinced the house that in his opinion the stumpage now imposed was

A BURDEN AND AN INJUSTICE

to the people of the North Shore, and ought to be removed. Such was the irresistible conclusion that was to be drawn from that hon. gentleman's remarks. The complaint was not so much to the proposition as made by the government, but rather that it did not go far enough and that it did not meet what that hon. gentleman thought was the reasonable demand of the people in that district. The hon. gentleman had referred to a communication he had had with a gentleman who at one time was a lumberman, but who was not at present so much a lumbermen as a politician, and who had denounced the government for the appointment of Police Magistrate Ritchie.

Mr. Phinney—The gentleman to whom you refer is not the gentleman to whom I referred. I had not only communication with one gentleman but many on the question in Kent.

The hon. solicitor general said he referred to Mr. Geo. McLeod, of St. John, and the hon. gentleman had admitted that he referred to that gentleman.

Mr. Phinney—The gentleman from whom I received the communication was not Mr. Geo. McLeod.

The solicitor general accepted the statement of the hon. member, but would have to remark that the statement did not accord with that made last evening.

Mr. Phinney said the interpretation was unfortunate.

The solicitor general thought not.

Mr. Stockton—Probably it was another telegram?

Mr. Phinney—There are Learys and O'Learys and Macleods and McLeods.

The solicitor general did not understand the reference the hon. gentleman made and would ask him to inform him what he referred to.

[Nothing more, save of an evasive character was said by Mr. Phinney, but it was afterwards understood that it was Mr. Geo. K. McLeod who wrote to Mr. Phinney.]

Hon. Mr. Pugsley continued, making excellent points against all the previous opposition speakers, and delivering what was conceded to be one of the very best speeches of the debate.

Mr. McKeown

followed Mr. Pugsley and declared that he, for one, had never held out or hinted to anyone, in behalf of the opposition or for himself, the hope that the stumpage would be reduced, and he argued strongly that there was no justice in the demand for a reduction of stumpage. He said he would ask no better question with which to appeal in behalf of the opposition to the people of the province.

Mr. O'Brien.

said that as one of the participants in the historic deal, something would be expected from him. He pointed out that the north had not been acting alone in the past in its efforts to secure a modification of the government's lumber policy. One of the delegations which had come here had been engineered by Mr. George McLeod in the city of St. John, who now, for political purposes, was against a reduction of stumpage. He was not in favor of the ten years' leases, but the operators of the North must have land in some way because of the

LARGE AMOUNT OF CAPITAL

they had invested in their mills and appliances. It was not true that the four men elected in Northumberland at the last general election had been elected in opposition to the government. His own position from the first had been that of an independent in the interests of his county. At that time he had said he did not care what government was in power, he would support any government that would give the people of his county the consideration they were entitled to.

OPPOSITION OFFERS.

It had been stated that the Northumberland members could have got better terms from the opposition. That was true. (Applause.) Two or three delegations had come from the opposition to Miramichi. If these men were so sure that the Northumberland representatives were elected in opposition to the government, why did they, at such an early date, give evidence of their doubt of the fact?

THE YELLOW VALISE MISSIONARY.

Mr. Stevens and others who came to him told him there was no doubt they would get all they wanted. He (O'Brien) had said that their people would not consent to anything under a reduction of 45 cents. To that Mr. Stevens said he could not speak for all of the 18 men who composed the opposition. He was then including the Northumberland independents, but he had no doubt that a reduction of the stumpage would be made to 80 cents by the opposition. (Applause.) More than that, he said Northumberland could have the present surveyor general as attorney general and leader of the government. (Applause.) Mr. Stevens had also, on that occasion, expressed his fear that Mr. Tweedie was kicking a little in the traces. (Laughter.) As to the matter of leader, Mr. Stevens said he and his colleague could not follow the present leader of the opposition. (Great Laughter.) There were certain reasons why he thought that could never be. He (O'Brien), however, had stated that in case he were in the opposition Mr. Hanington would be his choice. The only difference was that the Northumberland members preferred to deal with the present government rather than with the opposition. They were satisfied as long as they got what they asked for. (Laughter.) He thought that was a reasonable position to take, as they had canvassed the county almost exclusively on the stumpage question.

AN ANXIOUS OPPOSITION.

Since he came to Fredericton also the opposition and their agents had been very prevalent in the vicinity of the Northumberland men. Evidently the men from that county were men of great importance in the eyes of these gentlemen. These agents told them that they were foolish, as they could get more from the opposition. In concluding, he said he was proud of the chance of now casting his first vote in the interests of his county. (Applause.) The four northern counties would not forget in the future which party had helped them, and which party had made overtures to them only to turn their backs upon and attempt to deceive them.

Mr. Stevens

denied the accuracy of Mr. O'Brien's version of what took place between them in Mr. O'Brien's house. He (Stevens) had no authority then or now to pledge the opposition to any course, but he was not ashamed of any word he had uttered, and he felt that Burchill, who was present, would indorse the recital of what then occurred. He attacked Mr. O'Brien for violating the well-established laws of hospitality and the rules of decency by making public a private conversation that took place beneath his (O'Brien's) roof. Mr. Stevens dealt with the stumpage resolutions at some length, opposing and ridiculing them.

Mr. Robinson

said the feeling in Northumberland was very strong in favor of the reduction of the stumpage—it was the opposition to the stumpage that had brought him here. He felt in 1857 that the government showed a desire to do something for the lumbermen, and put in the estimates the sum of $5,000 for the improvement of steams—and it was because the lumbermen could not agree that the sum was withdrawn from the estimates. There had been

NO OPPOSITION TO THE GOVERNMENT.

If they gave us relief for our great industry we were willing to support any government, and having appealed to the county on that ground it could not be said that they had sold themselves. He claimed that lumbermen on the North Shore had either to

GET REDRESS OR GO OUT OF THE BUSINESS.

One man on the North Shore had gone out of the business and his mill had been sold the other day—a two gang mill for $5,000. It had been said that the lumber industry was in a better condition now than in 1886 but this was not so. He had sold 3,000,000 feet of deals in 1886 for $9.50 and now would be glad to get $9 for them. Mr. Robinson in continuing his remarks alluded to some of the statements of Mr. Hanington who he said was willing to reduce the stumpage to 80 cents in 1887. This caused the leader of the opposition to rise and say he never made such a statement. "Oh yes you did" was the reply of Mr. Robinson, and the leader said no more but the whole house smiled. Mr. Robinson then took up

SOME STATEMENTS OF MR. PHINNEY,

which brought that gentleman to his feet with the remark, "I never said I was opposed to a reduction of the stumpage." "No," said Mr. Blair—"He is not opposed to a reduction of the stumpage, but he will vote against the resolution. This brought out a retort from Mr. Phinney at the conclusion of which, Mr. Robinson concluded his remarks by asking the house to fairly consider the interests of the North Shore.

Hon. Mr. LeBlanc

said the new settlements in Kent County had received ample justice. He was himself a settler in Kent 40 years ago and had undergone all the hardships of a first settler. He had voted in 1885 against the reduction of stumpage but his constituents had informed him in 1886 that while they returned him he must vote for a reduction of stumpage. The government had then promised that while the stumpage could not be reduced, then, it would be at the first opportunity. As to the statement of Mr. Phinney that there had been an attempt to introduce the religious cry into Kent it was quite evident that no such cry had been raised for had there been such a cry Mr. Phinney would have been sitting quietly at home. Mr. Phinney attempted to interrupt him and came off second best.

Messrs. Turner and Alward

followed, Mr. Powell having the floor at adjournment.

On Thursday, Mr. Powell resumed the debate, making a good speech. He moved an amendment to the amendment, which was ruled out of order. It was to postpone the debate, but, having a preface, could not be entertained.

Mr. Wilson followed Mr. Powell, in a very effective speech and Mr. Pourier after giving a sketch of his life, made a well-delivered speech on the subject before the house. Dr. Stockton occupied the afternoon with a three-hour speech, which was well-delivered and presented the Opposition's points quite completely. He continued for a few minutes of the evening session and the floor was next taken by

Hon Mr. Tweedie,

who said: I was not aware that there was any rule of the house or of parliamentary procedure requiring a member of the government, or indeed any private member to rise in his place and speak at a certain time in the course of a debate, yet my learned friend opposite (Mr. Stockton) has seen fit to make unwarranted statements in reference to my not speaking, until it suited me to do so. The hon. member for St. John City has assailed the government, not only upon this resolution but also upon its general policy.

MR. ALWARD'S POSITION.

What was to be said as to the conduct of that hon. gentleman? Why, sir, that he supported the government in the past and till the last session closed—he even supported them in the very acts which he has now taken occasion to criticise, and which he now claims to be improper. Had he not done so, then his speech might have had far more weight and force than it can possibly have at the present time. Is not that the record of that hon. member? His record shows that he stood here as the firm friend and follower, and a staunch supporter of the government in the past. He did so, as I have already said, all through, but he had abandoned the government at last. What for? Not upon any question of policy, not upon any question of public polity, but upon the smallest point it was possible to conceive of—the appointment of the Police Magistrate in the City of St. John. Why did he oppose the government in that matter? It was because he could not and did not get it all his own way; and, because he thus failed