COTTOLENE COTTOLENE COTTOLENE

OUT OF THE FRYING PAN

Has come not a little knowledge as to cookery—what to do, as well as what *not* to do. Thus we have learned to use

COTTOLENE,

the most pure and perfect and popular cooking material for all frying and shortening purposes.

PROGRESSIVE COOKING

is the natural outcome of the age, and it teaches us *not to use* lard, but rather the new shortening,

COTTOLENE,

which is far cleaner, and more digestible than any lard can be.

The success of Cottolene has called out worthless imitations under similar names. Look out for these! Ask your Grocer for COTTOLENE, and be sure that you get it.

Made only by
N. K. FAIRBANK & CO.,
Wellington and Ann Sts.,
MONTREAL.

COTTOLENE COTTOLENE COTTOLENE

SHARP'S BALSAM
OF
HOREHOUND
AND ANISEED.
—FOR—
CROUP, WHOOPING COUGH, COUGHS AND COLDS.
OVER 40 YEARS IN USE.
25 CENTS PER BOTTLE.
ARMSTRONG & CO., PROPRIETORS,
ST. JOHN, N. B

TO LET.

The residence and premises on St. John Street (opposite the Pro-Cathedral) known as the Hon. John M. Johnson property.

Also; the house and premises known as the Letson homestead (suitable for two families) on the west side Cunard Street, (south of Church St.

Immediate possession given. Apply to

MRS. ISABELLA LETSON, or
L J TWEEDIE.

PROFESSIONAL.

George Gilbert,

ATTORNEY, SOLICITOR, NOTARY &c &c.

OFFICE—WATER STREET, BATHURST N. B
12-21-93.

GEO. W. CUTTER,

GENERAL INSURANCE AGENT FOR

FIRE, LIFE AND ACCIDENT COMPANIES

REPRESENTING:

Travelers' Life and Accident, of Hartford, Conn.
Norwich Union, of England.
Royal Canadian, of Montreal.
London and Lancashire Life Assurance Company, of London, England and Montreal, Que.

OFFICE—CUNARD STREET OPPOSITE E. A. STRANG
CHATHAM, N. B

LAND FOR SALE.

The Subscriber offers for Sale one half of the property situated at the mouth of Black River in the parish of Glenelg now jointly owned by him and Donald McLean, and formerly owned by the late Alexander McDonald deceased. For particulars apply to

CAPT. C. C. MCLEAN, Hardwick
or M. S. BENSON, Barrister Chatham

Dated Chatham Dec. 27th 1893.

THE ST. JOHN BUSINESS COLLEGE SHORTHAND INSTITUTE

OUR ATTENDANCE is constantly increasing. We have now more enrolled than at any previous Christmas season.

More applications for admission have been received than ever before

Everything indicates that 1894 will be the most successful year in the history of the College.

Four First Class Teachers now on our staff.

Classes will re-open

TUESDAY JAN. 2' 1894

Send for Circulars and specimens of Penmanship.

KERR & PRINGLE,
St. John, N. B.
12-17

ASSIGNEES' NOTICE.

Notice is hereby given that George Stothart of Chatham, in the County of Northumberland, merchant, has this day assigned his estate and effects to us the undersigned, in trust for the benefit of his creditors.

The trust deed lies at the office of Messrs Tweedie & Bennett, in Chatham, N. B., for inspection and execution.

Creditors desirous of participating in the said trusts are requested to execute said trust deed within three months from this date.

P. H. C. BENSON, }
WM. C. STOTHART, } Trustees.

Chatham N. B. December 18th, 1893.

Sleighs, New Style, Double
AND SINGLE.

I have on hand a first class stock of sleighs of different styles of my own manufacture, which

I WILL SELL CHEAP.

All my work is made of the best of stock, and by first class workmen, and guarenteed

TO GIVE SATISFACTION.

ALEX. ROBINSON.
Chatham Carriage and Sleigh Works,
1.4.94* Chatham N. B

EVERYBODY

ought to see at least one copy of "DONAHOE'S MAGAZINE."

the great popular Catholic publication, that is

Revolutionizing economic thought and wiping out religious bigotry.

* * *

$2.00 A YEAR.

Representatives wanted in every city, town and village. We want ladies and gentlemen, who can give satisfactory references, and we will pay well for their services. Address,

Subscription Dept.,
611 WASHINGTON ST., BOSTON.

F. O. PETTERSON,
Merchant Tailor
Next door to the Store of J. B. Snowball, Esq
CHATHAM - - N. B.
All Kinds of Cloths,
Suits or single Garments.
pection of which is respectfully invited.
F. O. PETTERSON.

Miramichi Advance.

CHATHAM, N. B., - - MARCH 8, 1894.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell and Northumberland.

Some of the newspapers, in dealing with Hon. Peter Mitchell's recent letter to Mr. A. F. Gault on the subject of his personal grievances against Sir John A. Macdonald, seem to assume that there is a feeling in Northumberland county in favor of Mr. Mitchell being its next representative in the House of Commons. Mr. Mitchell recently visited this County and, we believe, claims to have discovered the feeling referred to. In going from place to place in the Dominion in connection with the letter against Sir John A. Macdonald, through which he has secured a great deal of notoriety, he, apparently, lays considerable stress —in the interviews with which he favors the press,—upon his alleged popularity as a coming candidate for Northumberland. If it be true that Mr. Mitchell has been encouraged to entertain that belief, such encouragement could not have been given to him seriously in this County, save by, perhaps, half a dozen persons, and if anybody has given it as a joke it seems little short of cruelty to a gentleman who, in his time, did good service for the country and County, but is now generally recognized as one who has ceased to wield, or be in a position to exercise any effective influence in the active politics of the country. We do not, for a moment, desire to convey the impression that Mr. Mitchell has not more than half a dozen supporters in the County, but that those who know it best would be foremost in counselling him not to try his waning political fortunes in it again.

Northumberland had sufficient experience in being of no account at Ottawa, in the last nine years of Mr. Mitchell's representation, largely through his subordinatiug its interests to what now appears to have been his desire to be revenged upon the late Sir John A. Macdonald. His sinister influence had the same effect between 1878 and 1882, when, though not in Parliament, he brought all his former experience in the House of Commons and the Government to bear in thwarting the efforts for the County's good of the gentleman who represented it during that period. In the hope and under his promise that he would turn over a new leaf, he was returned unopposed as Northumberland's Ottawa representative in 1882, but there was little change for the better up to the election of 1887. He had, as we all know, continued to be a non-effective representative. Many of his old Conservative friends in the County desired to run him against the regular nominee of their party in 1887 and at the urgent solicitation of leading Liberals, including Hon Mr. Blake, Mr. Weldon and others, the local Liberals accepted him as their candidate, on his promising that he would not again seek election in Northumberland, but leave the privilege of representing it at Ottawa to residents and younger men. He was elected. Between that time and the election of 1891 he visited the constituency only twice, and not one elector in every hundred had an opportunity to even see him until the election of the latter year, when, as uaual, he turned up again seeking re-election.

Meantime, the people of the County had become fully sensible of the fact that they were being used by the honorable gentleman, simply and only for the purpose of putting him in parliament. They were not unmindful of the fact that he had, years before, done the constituency good service, but they knew equally well that they had placed him in a position to do so, as well as to do much to advance his own interests. They remembered, too, that those interests, rather than those of the people he represented, were sometimes promoted by him. The fact, also, was against him that he had, at a time when his physical and intellectual powers were unimpaired, descended by easy but rapid stages from the position of an influential minister of the crown to that of a political nondescript and scold—fretful and too often engaged in merely blocking parliamentary work—and it gradually came home to them that there must be something radically wrong in a man who had thus failed to hold his grip of political influence and position.

In 1891, therefore, the people of the County had to choose between Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Adams. It cannot be said that Mr. Adams was a particularly popular man, in a general sense. He always had a number of very faithful adherents, with a fair proportion of excellent election workers amongst them, but the fact that he had only between four and five hundred majority over Mr. Mitchell, while the latter had had some eight hundred over him in the election of 1887, went to show that, even with the County tired of Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Adams was not, perhaps, the strongest man that could have been brought against him.

Mr Mitchell, we believe, polled a much larger vote in Northumberland in 1891 than he could possibly poll again, for he has since done nothing to promote Northumberland's business or political interests. It is fair to him to say that he does not base his alleged popularity as a coming candidate in Northumberland or any claim he has upon it, or because he believes such claims as he might have are paramount to those of men who live in the County. He assumes that Mr. Adams, who now represents it at Ottawa, has failed to meet the expectations of those who elected him and, apparently, falls into the error of further assuming that Mr Adams and himself are the only gentlemen having in them the material out of which a member of the House of Commons for Northumberland can be made. This, of itself, should be a potent factor in leading our younger men to the conclusion that Mr. Mitchell ought not again to be a candidate for Northumberland, for while it displays an egotism on his part which, being manifested generally in his career, has placed him in the position before the country which he now occupies, shows that notwithstanding his former pledges he is determined to intrude himself upon the County as a candidate whenever there is a Dominion election, and not to leave the honor of representing it to be competed for on fair and even terms by those who are as well equipped for the position as he was when he entered public life, and whose claims upon the constituency are now much better than his.

Northumberland, while it has a kindly feeling towards Mr. Mitchell, personally, has suffered too much in loss of prestige and the neglect of its interests through his idiosyncrasies as a representative to again send him to Ottawa. Our people's experience in recent years must surely have taught them that they require a representative there who will not devote himself to the manifestation of personal peculiarities, which make him interesting, perhaps, but strip him of influence. The man who represents them should be one who realises that in politics, as in other sciences, patience, study, the faculty of testing all available paths and means by which to obtain the object sought, are necessary; that his functions are best and most intelligently discharged when in laboring for his people he demonstrates his capacity for divesting himself of his own personality and employing the superior acumen which he should possess in living, thinking, speaking, acting and (if necessary) scheming to promote the interests of his county. Much can, of course, be said by those who choose to take strong grounds on the side of one or the other of the two great parties, but the man who can find any principle at stake in either of them, for the sake of which he is willing to forego the promotion of the material interests of the county he represents, is fit only for the use that is generally made of him, viz.—to be a rung in the ladder by which clear-headed men climb to influence and position, and leave him of little service for any other purpose than to be climbed over.

It is such considerations as these that lead our people to have no desire for Mr. Mitchell as a candidate for Ottawa. When another election is brought on those who are opposed to Mr. Adams will, doubtless, be very sorry should Mr. Mitchell again insist upon entering the contest, for in that event, Mr. Adams' re-election would be a foregone conclusion. Mr. Adams' friends are, theretore, more likely than anyone else to encourage Mr Mitchell and, after all, it is those of them who think it no harm to "pull the leg" of our former representative in this way, and a half dozen others who bitterly oppose, but thus unwittingly play into Mr. Adams' hands, who are responsible for Mr. Mitchell's apparent belief that he has a chance to again represent Northumberland in the House of Commons.

It's the English Way.

Liverpool Timber News says—

The other day we learned, second-hand, from a leading officer in the London Fire Brigade, that among the least combustible establishments in London would be the great paper warehouses if they consisted entirely of stacks of paper. Similarly it has been remarked that a library would be a really difficult thing to destroy by fire if it contained nothing but books. It is the shelves on which the volumes are stacked that are so inflammable. An inventor has just brought out a bookcase designed to obviate the risk of fire, and it certainly looks as though it would be very effectual. The material used is papier-mache, which is said to be cheap, light, easily wrought into any form, and absolutely non-inflammable. Everybody probably knows that it is simply paper pulp that has been subjected to an immense pressure, rendering it so extremely dense and hard that it cannot be made to take fire. A library with a fireproof floor and papier-mache bookshelve sought to be practically safe from all risk by fire.

Now, to all whose living and profits depend chiefly upon the use of timber, it is not pleasent to read or learn that substitutes for it are continually being invented and used. Long have we been accustomed to certain portions of buildings being constructed of other material than wood, where timber formerly was almost exclusively used. To-day we have mills, warehouses, and mansions built, in which the floors are constructed of metal girders and concrete arches, the roofs of iron, and, also, even the windows, staircases, and doors. In such buildings precious little timber indeed is used, with the result that the building trade generally in certain towns may be good while the joinery and timber trades are far from brisk. And now we learn that even wooden bookshelves are to go. When will this boycotting of timber stop?

The foregoing appears to be written by one of those English newspaper men whole technical knowledge is confined within very narrow limits indeed. One would think that he ought to know that in this age of the world "paper pulp," out of which the papier-mache complained of as superseding timber is made, is simply wood pulp, which is made of "timber." Where, therefore, does the "boycotting of timber" come in in connection with the making of bookcases of papier-mache? It seems to us like an application of timber to an old use in a new form, in which additional skill and scientific appliances are employed.

The Local Legislature.

Thursday next, 15th inst, is the date on which the Local Legislature is to meet. It is understood that the public business under control of the Government will be transacted with the promptness that has been a leading characteristic of the present administration.

The lamented death of the late governor Boyd will doubtless be one of the subjects of the address to be presented at the opening, and the increasing developement of our lumber, mining and agricultural resources may reasonably be expected to receive attention. Another subject that must, in the usual order, be referred to in the address will be the result of the enquiry into the Bathurst School matter by Judge Fraser, who was commissioned thereto under authority of a resolution of the Assembly at its last session. We observe that the St, John Record, which is usually well-informed in Orange matters says:

"The report of commissioner Fraser, it is stated, is in the hands of the government but as to what it is there is no intimation, among the orange body, though they believe that it is favorable to their side of the case, It is understood that as a result of this report the government have made a couple of school regulations with a view to putting an end to the conduct of any part of the Catholic service in the convent schools.

"There is debate as to whether the government will place before the House any measure on the question or whether they will let it hang for another year. It is stated that the latter course may be followed in view of the fact that there appears to be little disposition for settlement among opposed parties. Considerable heat still prevails and time is a cooler of prejudices. If this course is followed Mr. Pitts may not have an opportunity to perform the heroic and indulge in eloquence."

Any opinion that may have been formed as to the character of Judge Fraser's report under his commission must be purely speculative, for it will not be made known to anybody outside of the executive until the meeting of the legislature. Any new or changed regulation by the Board of Education also could hardly have been the outcome of Judge Fraser's report, for the Board of Education, as such, would have no more right to receive information in the subject than the general public, It has always seemed to us strange that many of the newspapers so often fall into the error of confounding the Government with the Board of Education, and we believe that it was this mistake on the part of those who are now the leaders in the Bathurst School agitation that aggravated the little troubles out of which the subject grew to its present dimensions as a political question in which a good deal of scum has risen to the surface, for it has even put Mr. Pitts into the Assembly.

By a coincidence quite remarkable, and, in which the death of a Lieutenant governor who never met the Legislature, as such, is included, the judge who was commissioned at the last session of the Assembly to make an important state enquiry, will open the legislature as lieutenant governor and in his "speech from the throne" refer to the work done by him in his capacity as a commissioner of the government of which he is now the head. It may be assumed that whatever he may say on the subject will be received by the people of the province with the respect due to Mr. Fraser's well established reputation for integrity and ability. At all events, the friends of the school law of New Brunswick cannot but have confidence in one who, next to Judge King, now of the Supreme Court of Canada, was instrumental in giving that law to the province, faulty as it is in principle.

Mr. Gladstone's Final Speech on the Parish Councils Bill.

Mr Gladstone addressed the House of Commons the other day speaking with marvellous energy and vigor. During the course of his speech he said the government felt that the operation of sending and re-sending a bill from one House to another had continued long enough. (Loud and prolonged cheering and much laughter.) When Mr. Gladstone was again able to resume speaking he said: "To continue the process would be a loss of dignity to both Houses and the government has decided to stop the operation and take a decided course." The government had the choice of rejecting the House of Lords' amendments and abandoning the hope of passing the bill, or to accept them under protest with the hope of soon reversing them. The government adopted the second course. (Cheers.) Mr. Gladstone then reviewed the action of the House of Lords in the past and said: "We have now reached the acute stage. It appears that the House of Lords desires to annihilate the whole work of the House of Commons. In regard to the present bill the government desires to save something from the wreck and therefore accepted the amendments, but with the declaration that the differences between the Houses are not of a temporary or casual nature. This state of things, I am compelled to say, cannot continue. The issues raised between the assembly elected by the voice of the people and the assembly occupied by many men of virtue and talents are of considerable variety. When once raised they must go into the issue. No doubt there is a higher authority than the House of Commons, namely, the authority of the nation—(loud cheers)—which must in the last resort decide. (Renewed cheers, and loud opposition cries of 'at once.') When that judgment is to be invited is a question which the Government alone can decide. We acquiesced in the loss of an important bill the other day, owing to an objectionable amendment and because we thought that the clause vitiated all the work expended on the bill here. However, an amendment, no matter how objectionable, is limited to a particular subject matter and does not interfere with the great extension of the principle of local government which the bill effects. The amendment is a gross mischief which will have to be removed at the earliest opportunity, but at the same time the mischief is limited to a certain portion of the objects and purposes of the bill, while it leaves the rest of the bill to work freely and undisturbed. We therefore have arrived at the conclusion that it would not be well to wreck the whole of the work for the session, for, with the exception of this bill, nearly the whole of the session has been wrecked. There are many members, and I sympathize with them in many respects, who have been ready to sacrifice the bill rather than allow the amendments to take their place in the statute book, but I must observe that to sacrifice the bill would be to form part of a very serious question, which I am very sorry to say has grown more and more serious with the lapse of time and which during the present session has reached a stage of peculiar acuteness and magnitude. We have therefore to look to the acceptance of those amendments, not as closing this controversy, but as handing it on, which, according to our judgement, it will be the duty of Parliament to continue until it has arrived at a satisfactory settlement. But if we were to attempt to destroy the whole work of the session by consigning this bill to the oblivion to which the Irish Government bill (loud opposition 'Ohs') and the Employers' Liability bill have been consigned"—

Mr. Gladstone here interrupted himself and referring to the opposition "Ohs" said, "I do not think this is a matter to be treated with levity."

After comparing the two houses Mr. Gladstone continued: "I do not like to say that the situation is intolerable, because it may seem a hard and dictatorial word, but I think some way or other a solution must be found for this tremendous controversy and inconsistent conflict on matters of high principle and profound importance. It is not for the Commons to pronounce judgment on this. The ministry, however, would have no difficulty in pronouncing frankly and fully and finally on the side of the Commons."

At the conclusion of his speech Mr. Gladstone asked the House to accept the House of Lords' amendments to the bill.

After speeches by Balfour, Churchill and Samuel Storey the Radicals called for a division on the question of the amendments, with the following result: For agreeing, 273; against, 37; majority for it, 236.

The other amendments were then agreed to without a division and the House adjourned.

Referring to the passage of the bill and the strained relations between the Houses of Lords and Commons the New York Herald says "Mr. Gladstone has gained a victory, not a great one, it is true, but still a victory over the House of Lords in inducing it to accept the Parish Councils bill with only slight alterations. When this measure, which is extremely popular, was first introduced into the House of Commons there were rumors afloat that the Upper Chamber would throw it out neck and crop. Its principle, it was claimed, struck at the hereditary privileges of the peers, and that would never do in a constitutional monarchy like England. At any rate the bill was passed in the Commons and sent to the Lords. The peers mutilated the bill in many vital particulars and on February 13 it was read a third time in the House of Lords, after protest by the Earl of Wemyss that the poor law clauses had been allowed to pass practically without amendment.

Then began an attack upon the hereditary legislative body all over England, engineered primarily by the Radicals. The day after, at Portsmouth, Sir William Harcourt, Chancellor of the Exchequer, made a remarkable speech at a political meeting, in which he said:—

"Nothing to my mind is more deplorable in all this business than the attitude which has been taken up in the House of Lords by the bench of Bishops. Property, property, property! is the chant of the Lords temporal. Amen! the cry of the Lords spiritual. Property, property, property! Privilege, privilege, privilege! Exclusion, exclusion, exclusions! is the matin and the evensong of the Lords spiritual. It was not always so. I can remember the days of Archbishop Tait—not so long ago—and of Wilberforce—when the character of an English Bishop was not inconsistent with liberal sympathies. The distrust of the rural population, this fear that Lord Salisbury describes, that they are, or might be, their enemies, against whom they must ever be on their guard; this eagerness for sectarian ascendancy; this jealousy of ecclesiastical privilege, has characterized the conduct of the Bishops all through this bill. They have throughout been among the most militant and aggressive antagonists of popular rights. ('Turn them out.' 'Send General Booth to them!' and laughter.) Look at the way they had treated London in this bill. Well, London will take care of itself, and I venture to say that the electors of London will have something to say to the Lords at the next election.

"You may depend upon us that we will deal with these amendments faithfully. Lord Salisbury has thrown down the gage of battle. It is not we who have challenged this conflict. We take the nation to witness it has been forced upon us—('Hear, hear!') and depend upon it we will not shrink. We have to face, probably, the rashest and most reckless leader that has ever been at the head of the tory party. So extreme have been the counsels of Lord Salisbury that even his own followers have shrunk from his violence. He failed in his great attempt to disfranchise the great body of the rural laborers by the abolition of compounding; he failed in his desire to force the parish councils into the public houses! Even Lord Derby and Lord Cranbrook, sitting by his side, took up their parable against him, therefore, we know what we have to deal with. Misery acquaints a man with strange bedfellows. He presents himself as amicus curiae. What a court! What a friend! Birds of a feather flock together. Lord Salisbury has done his utmost to raise the great issue, which is this: Is the legislation of the nation to be at the mercy of the House of Lords—acting in the spirit which they have just displayed. Is that what you desire? Is that the will of the people? The amicus curiae tells us that if we are not satisfied with the conduct of the House of Lords we are bound to dissolve.

"I am not going to take the doctrine of the constitution of this country from a politician who one day bespatters the Lords with vituperation and beslavers them with his adulation on the next. (Referring to Mr. Chamberlain.) I will answer him in language more worthy of attention in that of his own leader. About ten years ago the House of Lords then, as now, had by dilatory and dishonest amendments defeated the bill for the enfranchisement of county householders, and meetings were held thoughout the country denouncing the conduct of the peers. Perhaps the most remarkable of these meetings was that held by the population of the Midlands in tens of thousands, by the invitation of Lord Hartington, at the gates of Chatworth."

On the 16th, when the House of Commons discussed the Lords' amendments a number were rejected, some without division. In the first division dealing with the suggestion to fix the limit of the parish meeting to 500 instead of 200, the Ministerial majority was 69, and subsequently the majority was as high as 116 in a house of 450. In one instance, however, it fell to 47. The subjects dealt with included the use of schools, the administration charities compound householders, and allotments.

Our cable despatch of yesterday told of he final compromise in which Mr. Gladstone had the advantage, and so he can now gracefully retire and leave his younger colleagues to fight the Lord if they be so minded."

Mr. Gladstone's Resignation.

It is not surprising—after the action of the House of Lords in rejecting the Home Rule bill of the government, and the reappearance of factional warfare between the two great branches of the original Irish home rule party, which rendered the hope of securing self-government for Ireland abortive—that Mr. Gladstone should retire from participation in parliamentary business. Nearly twenty years ago he issued a card, in which he declared that the increasing infirmities of age rendered his retirement from the leadership of his party a necessity, and he indicated that his purpose was to abandon public life and prepare for the next world. The defeat of his government the preceding year at the polls and the discouraging immediate outlook of his party had, doubtless, much to do with that event, but in view of his age (he will be eighty-five on 29th December next) it may be presumed that he will not again return to the leadership.

Mr. Gladstone having resigned, his recommendation to Her Majesty of Lord Rosebery, as his successor in the leadership of the government, has been acted upon, and that gifted young statesman and prospective husband of the duchess of Albany is now Premier of Great Britain.

FOUR TIMES LEADER OF THE GOVERNMENT—HIS RELATIONS WITH THE QUEEN.

This is the fourth time that Mr, Gladstone has laid down the Premiership. The first time he held the office of Premier was in 1868, when he succeeded Benjamin Disraeli on December 9. His government lasted five years and seventy-four days. He again succeeded Disraeli on April 28, 1880, and this term of office lasted five years and fifty-seven days. His successor was Lord Salisbury, whom Mr. Gladstone followed on February 6, 1886. This third term of office was only 178 days. Mr. Gladstone then remained in opposition for six years. He won in the general election of 1892, taking office on August 18,

Mr Gladstone's first prominent appearance in a Cabinet was in 1852 as Chancellor of the Exchequer under the Earl of Aberdeen. He held the same position in the Palmerston administration of 1855 and 1859, the Russell administration of 1865 and in his own administrations of 1868 and 1880.

THE QUEEN AND MR. GLADSTONE.

It would be interesting to know what Her Majesty thinks of the resignation of Mr Gladstone. Last year she ardently desired it, so it is said, when there was some talk of the liberal Ministry going on the rejection of the Irish Home Rule bill. The Queen was known to have awaited with unwonted anxiety Mr. Gladstone's decision as to his course after the rejection of that bill. The royal idea was that Mr. Gladstone should appeal at once to the country. and the determination understood to have been expressed by Mr. Gladstone in a special despatch to the Queen to hold on indefinitely did not suit Her Majesty at all. According to constitutional precedents the Queen had reason to expect that, after the overwhelming majority of Lords spiritual and temporal had condemned him, the aged Premier would resign and ask the electors again to justify his policy. It was surmised that Mr. Gladstone intimated in the despatch carried to Balmoral on that occasion the readiness of the Cabinet to submit to the Queen's prerogative to dismiss her present Ministers. This intimation meant little, however, as he knew he could rely on the Queen's discretion to take no step involving the Crown in the popular outcry against the House of Lords.

At that time a large and influential part of the ultra-tory party expected much direct intervention from the Queen, but, as we know, she declined to exercise her prerogative. It has been rumored that the Prince of Wales gave his royal mother some respectful advice in this matter. Years ago it had been reported that Queen Victoria did not like Mr. Gladstone because of his strong liberalism.

When a Ministry resigns it is the function of the Sovereign to call upon some person to form another administration. There is no restriction upon the royal choice, but the statesman usually selected is the leader of the opposing party in one of the two houses. In this case, as it is the Premier and not the Ministry which resigns, the choice falls, of course, upon one of the same party. If the individual chosen undertakes the task of forming a Ministry he commences by nominating his Cabinet, taking himself the principal position, which is variously designated as head of the government or First Minister or Prime Minister or Premier. The offices which invariably give the holder Cabinet rank are those of First Lord of the Treasury, Lord Chancellor, Lord President of the Council, the Secretaries of State for the Home Department, Foreign Affairs, the Colonies, for War and for India, Chancellor of the Exchequer and First Lord of the Admiralty. The Prime Minister may be First Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer or First Lord of the Treasury and Lord Privy Seal.

A Stupid Business.

The Post Office Department is advertising in a hole-and-corner-way for tenders for the conveyance of the mails between Tracadie and Newcastle, instead of making the Miramichi terminus of the route at Chatham, as it has been heretofore. It is not to be wondered at that they are seeking to make the change in such a quiet manner, for they are doubtless ashamed of the stupidity of it and hope to have the contract made and the new order of things in operation before the business public fully realise what is going on. There is no demand on the part of either community chiefly affected for the change and it is simply a piece of official hocus-pocus in which the public interest is being ignored and the people inconvenienced. Our representative at Ottawa ought to prevent such bungling as this.

The Lazaretto Tenders.

Many builders will be glad to observe that copies of the plans and specification for the Tracadie Lazaretto are to be seen at the Inland Revenue office, Chatham, in addition to the places named in the advertisement for tenders first published last week. The ADVANCE directed attention to the necessity for the plans being on view here, and we are glad that the Department has made up, as far as possible, for its first omission in the matter.

Up to yesterday, however, there were no plans or specification here and it will be readily understood by practical people that the time set for receiving tenders is very inadequate, considering the fact that the proposed building is to be of stone and its general dimensions are 190x40 feet with central wing, and its heating, plumbing and other features require the obtaining of much special information as to prices, etc.,—all of which the department seem to believe Chatham builders may get in less than a week and others in less than a fortnight. If intending contractors were given more time by the Department in which to prepare their estimates, it is probable that there would not be so many of those who secure government works not finishing their contracts until months, and sometimes years, after the specified time. The Department should be more reasonable in giving time to prepare estimates. There ought to be an extension, now, in the case of the Tracadie Lazaretto.

News and Notes.

A NOTED AVENUE.

A strange avenue of trees is owned by the Duke of Argyll, and it is year by year growing longer. Each of the trees in this avenue has been planted by some notable person, and a brass plate is fastened to the iron fencing surrounding the trees, signifying by whom it was planted. Whenever any remarkable guest visits Inverary Castle he is invited by the Duke to plant a tree in this avenue, which is situated on the banks of Loch Fyne.

AN AWFUL AFFAIR.

On Wednesday night of last week two negroes, named Henry Baker and William Thompson, entered the residence of Moore Baker at Franklin Park, N. J. for the purpose of robbery. Being discovered by Mrs. Baker, who was up with a sick child, the robbers killed both mother and child, stabbing them to death. Mr. Baker, who was aroused shot one of the negroes dead; the other attacked Baker with a knife and cut his nose off. Baker then seized the axe that the negroes had brought with them and struck his assailant, splitting his head open. Baker was reported to have a large sum of money in the house.

A LARGE ISLAND DISAPPEARS.

According to the maps, Expedition Island lies off the northwest coast of Australia. According to the geographies the island is an exceedingly beautiful and fertile tract of country thirteen miles long by twelve miles broad, and, according to scientists, many rare plants and birds are to be found on its wooded shores. All of these facts were true until some time during last autumn, when, without warning, the island sunk forty eight feet below the surface of the ocean. The last men known to have visited the island were a number of Dutch naturalists who spent several weeks there during the past summer. They noticed no volcanic or other disturbances, and it was only by accident and by careful soundings that the island was missed and accounted for. The scientific world is much excited over the cause of this sudden subsidence.

STEAM BEHIND THE PISTON.

There are doubtless a few young engineers who take an interest in the steam which enters their engine, and at times a secular another it pours in steadily like a solid column, or rushes in impetuously. Another interesting point is that relating to the condensation of the steam upon the cylinder walls and surface opened up as the piston recedes in the barrel. Some assert that a thin film of the steam condenses almost immediately it touches and clings to the metal, while the remainder of the column is not affected. This, it has been suggested might perhaps be remedied by heating the cylinder to a higher degree than the steam, for which purpose steam jackets and other appliances have been adopted, but recent experiments would seem to indicate that the cylinder walls are never heated enough to reach a point at which they will not extract heat, but big drops of water are deposited all over the cold sides and gradually trickle to the bottom. The steam enters with an impetuous rush and a species of hurricane rages inside the barrel until the interior is filled with a storm-tossed cloud. This at once disappears on the opening of the exhaust, violent ebullitions take place and a good deal of the water made up of the big drops alluded to disappears into the atmosphere or lingers in the exhaust pipes. It is therefore important to have these latter thin at a slight angle sufficient to let the water trickle out.

[Popular Science Monthly.]

Abolish all Prohibitive Liquor Laws.

BY APPLETON MORGAN.

The creation of crimes by means of statutes providing for their punishment has generally proved itself bad policy. In the days of Henry VIII it was the maxim that "a tinker was a rogue by statute;" and in Queen Elizabeth's time actors and "stage-players" were put into the same category as tinkers. But it came in time to be understood that the soldering of tin kettles was not a crime because a tinker here and here had robbed a hen-roost, and that the profession which had produced a Shakespeare was not, by any salutary public policy, a criminal profession.

The absolute, unqualified and distinguished failure of all laws for the abolishment of the traffic in liquors is speedily convincing even the most sanguine prohibitionist of the expediency of wiping them from every statute-book in the land. Their failure has not been so much a protest against interference with the personal liberty of the citizen as an illustration of the veneration maxim that no law can exist without, or can survive, a reason for its existence. These laws, indeed, never had any adequate or logical reason for existing at all. They have had their origin always and without exception in sparsely settled communities where personal liberty was so absolute and unquestioned that it became irksome, where liquor was almost unknown and the user of it a curiosity, and where the only knowledge of the horrors of intoxication the village possessed was derived from itinerant temperance orators who dilated upon the terrible consequences of the rum habit to a roomful of tearful old women, none of whom knew the taste of liquor or of anything stronger than green tea. The early Puritans of New England, who enacted the most ferocious of blue laws, who would not let a man step over a stone in his path or kiss—not his neighbor's, but—his own wife on a seventh day, no more thought of prohibiting the drinking of liquor than of prohibiting the preaching of eight and ten hours' sermons. When they settled a town, they built, first of all, a meeting house and, next to it, a jail. The jail was for those who did not want to go to the meeting house. But the pint of "new" rum per laborer in the hayfield was as much a matter of course as the minister's madeira or sherry, or the magistrate's metheglin or eggnog or toddy. In the wainscoting around every fireplace was the sunken toddy-shelf to be drawn out of evenings, and when a meeting house was to be raised, the community were expected to drink as freely as Heaven had blessed them in good things or the means to pay for them. So lately as 1804, when the frame of the new meeting house in Brimfield, Mass., was to be raised, the town voted $121.22 for "rum, sugar, brandy, lemons and wine" for the occasion. And there are but few towns in Massachusetts that are smaller than Brimfield. The Puritans, in their courts of justice, cited edicts and precedents, not from the reporters, but from the Pentateuch, and sent men to the jail or to the gibbet according to the laws of Rehoboam or Jeroboam. But, because the sons of Rechab drank no wine or strong drink, it no more occurred to them to forego wine and strong drink themselves than it did to forsake their substantial frame dwellings and camp out because these same Rechabites had foresworn houses and lived in tents on the plains of Arabia thirty centuries previously!

Liquor is legitimately and logically a subject of excise, and excise laws, which may operate *in rem*—that is, against the thing itself—are proper and constitutional. But it would puzzle writers upon constitutional law to find an origin for law prohibiting the manufacture or purchase or sale of an article of commerce, though laws regulating all three are neither unconstitutional nor improper. Besides unwritten and written or statute law, there is also what is called the "police power" of a state or a community, that is, the power of keeping the public peace. All three of these jurisdictions may deal with the individual out of whom too much liquor may have made a law-breaker. That is to say, the drunkard has fractured the unwritten or moral law by breaking the rule of temperance in all things. He has broken the written law by becoming a public nuisance or a public charge, and the police power of the State may lay hands upon him up for being disorderly, or for lying drunk and so blocking up the public streets that ordinary persons may not pass and repass. But in what manner or form the commodity we call liquor has broken or come under the penal force of any one of these three jurisdictions, it is difficult to imagine; and, therefore, because this is a hard question to answer, it is difficult to find a legal or logical origin for a prohibitory liquor law. Publicists assure us that all salutary laws and statutes which have proved to be for the general good are found to have invariably come from a demand for protection, or for warrant from an individual or a class asking either for protection or for franchise to benefit the state and himself by carrying on some useful business, art, or trade; or they have been enacted for the revenue, or (as I have said above) for the conservation of the public peace. But not of such have been the origins of the various statutes against the selling of liquor which are on the statute books of a great many, indeed of most of, our American States. These laws, when not copied *verbatim* or adopted substantially from other States—as the Kansas law was from the Maine law—have originated, not with a class of citizens who asked for protection, but with a class who proposed to protect some other class against its will. I fancy it would be difficult to find a prohibitive liquor law which was not in the first instance proposed by one who was himself either a teetotaler by preference, or one without himself any taste for anything stronger than water, and therefore without the slightest practical experience of the evils of intoxication; or by one whose knowledge of the terrors of liquor drinking came at second hand from the description of the itinerant "temperance" orator; or possibly by witnessing effects of the abuse of liquor upon some weak-minded brother. In other words, it was exactly as if all the persons who preferred to go to bed at nine o'clock should revive the old law of curfew and get it back upon the statute books; or, as if all those who loved to go to Sunday school should legislate to make it criminal not to go to Sunday school. So far as the records go (and I consult only those published by the prohibitionists themselves), not one single proposition for the policy of prohibiting the sales of liquor has originated from a demand for protection, or from cause of necessity, or even of expediency; or in a locality where the evils of such sales were apparent or largely experienced, or indeed experienced at all. In a rural community, however, absolutely without amusements, where personal liberty resembles, as somebody has well said, "the desolate freedom of the wild," and so becomes absolutely irksome—where a man with a theory or a crank with a hobby is welcome as a diversion—it is necessary to burrow in unusual paths for a relaxation. In such a precinct as this, a proposition to forbid somebody something, to prohibit something—it might be the wearing of crinoline or of birds in ladies' hats, or card playing, round dancing, Sunday newspapers, or the eating of animal food—anything, so long as it is something any one enjoys—will become fortuitously popular. Any one of the above would furnish a topic for conversation, a call for a conference in a meeting house after singing school, might appear in the choice of a selectman, or in the election for the member, and so speedily become "practical politics," especially in a state where a Governor is chosen every year, and so which lives in a state of perpetual gubernatorial canvass! If laws preventing the sale of liquors should be demanded in a petition of those who used and habitually purchased liquor, but who desired to be relieved from the temptation of purchasing it, a wise public policy might have decreed that the petition prevail. Or, if the best sense of the most enlightened citizens of a community (and it is usually its most enlightened citizens who best appreciate the value and understand the judicious use of liquor) had felt the need of a law prohibiting the sale of cheap and poisonous adulterations of liquor to those who were unable to buy the pure article and whose healths were being deteriorated thereby—in any one of these cases these laws might have wisely been forthcoming, under the general pursuit of the greatest good for the greatest number. But for the non-users and non-purchasers of liquor, finding themselves in a majority, to resolve on their own motion that the minority of their fellow-citizens needed a protection, for which they had not asked, from temptations against which they had not protested, but which were not temptations to the majority, savors rather more of what old Butler characterized as "compounding sins one had a mind to by damning those one's not inclined to," than of legislation for the greatest good of the greatest number; of paternal rather than of popular government!

[*To be continued next week.*]

Monster Temperance Crusade.

DESIGNED TO UNITE ALL THE COUNTRIES OF THE WORLD IN A WAR AGAINST VICE.

The World's Women's Christian Temperance Union has been preparing during the last seven years a monster polyglot petition against the traffic in alcohol, opium and against legalized vice, to be presented to all the governments of the world.

Lady Henry Somerset and Miss Willard have been appointed as the deputation to convey this petition to the different governments.

The petition itself has now reached the unprecedented length of more than two million signatures and with the attestation of certain great societies not less