

NOTICE.

JOHN BROWN of Chatham in the County of Northumberland, Merchant, have sold and transferred all my stock and interest in the business lately carried on by me at Chatham, New Brunswick, to my son Andrew and Alexander Brown, who will collect and pay all debts due in respect thereto.

MILL PROPERTY FOR SALE.

That well known and conveniently situated Mill Property formerly known as the DesBrisay Mill, situated at Clark's Cove, about one and a half miles above Chatham, on the south side of the Miramichi River. It has the advantage of a convenient boom that will contain nearly two millions of logs safe from all weathers.

Miramichi Advance.

CHATHAM, N. B. - FEBRUARY 21, 1889

Prohibition in Parliament.

The Toronto Globe, in its parliamentary notes of 13th inst. says:-

There came up a debate on Mr. Jamieson's Prohibition resolution which is as follows:-

MONTEG, Feb. 17.-At the nomination at Hopewell Cape, yesterday, Sheriff Wells presided. Mr. H. R. Emmerson, Mr. Peter Duffy and ex-Judge of Probate Steadman were nominated, the latter withdrawing at the close of the speeches.

Mr. Emmerson spoke first for an hour and gave an eloquent address. He entered into a description of the reason why he was seeking re-election and laid great stress on the fact that Dr. Lewis, who was satisfied with last election, was personally opposed to a scrutiny. It was WESTMORELAND LAWYERS AND WESTMORELAND MONEY

with a nominal Albert County petitioner, who were at the back of the petition. His Westmoreland enemies took this stand out of personal revenge, because of his past course in that county's politics. But they would discover he was a man not to be easily downed, (cheers), and he believed the electors of Albert County were going to stand by him in this fight.

(Tremendous cheers.) He then quoted from an article in the Times the following epithets against him: "Robber of estates; a ferocious lawyer; a shark; a cheeky Dorchester lawyer; treacherous disloyalty; a discredited politician, besmirched and besmeared before he leaves his own backyard, becomes additionally filthy in crossing the mud flats of the Petitioners." etc.

Taking up that portion of the article in which he was accused of robbing over the estates of widows and orphans he warmly attacked Editor Stevens, who was present, and announced his determination as soon as the election was over of not prosecuting him for civil damages, but of

PLACING HIM IN THE DOCK on a charge of criminal libel. (Cheers.) The speaker then entered into a general discussion of his political program, and closed by appealing to the electors for a renewal of the confidence placed in him.

Mr. Duffy followed and said as other speakers had desired to address them, he would give his subsequent incidents showed that this was a put up job and that another party had a speech mainly show the cloven hoof of partyism.

Mr. Steadman then spoke for over two hours and attempted to talk every one out, and talked of everything but providing for the time was rapidly proceeding, and the audience would not hear him.

While Mr. Emmerson was denying the charges, Mr. Duffy rose and persisted in trying to speak the same time. This added to the confusion, but the electors would not hear Duffy, and Mr. Emmerson finished his remarks. The meeting was broken up by the time was rapidly proceeding, and the audience would not hear him.

Mr. Fisher criticised both the amendment and the amendment to the amendment as calculated only to confuse the question and prevent the bringing forward of a straight issue. These tactics, he said, would deceive nobody. He pointed out that Parliament as at present constituted had power to enact Prohibition, and that the resort to the public vote was to import a new element into Canadian constitutional methods. As to compensation, he was willing to consider that as a matter of detail, but thought it not right to complicate the straight issue of Prohibition with such a question. This sort of criticism angered Mr. Taylor, and after the manner of people whose crime and punishment is not so keen as their combativeness is great, his answer, while warm and personal, had little or no reference to the subject. He accused Mr. Fisher of importing partyism into this debate, his reason being, as well as it could be understood, that Mr. Fisher had failed to criticise the Ontario Government's administration of the Scott Act. He spoke of the Prohibition caucus of this morning and said that the Liberals there had sought to condemn the action of Governor Royal, which action Mr. Taylor by implication defended, or at least appeared to defend. By the way, it should be explained that Mr. Taylor was not allowed to speak (having already spoken) in presenting his amendment until Mr. Mitchell in a magnanimous way moved the adjournment of the debate, so as to give formal justification for Mr. Taylor's speaking. This proved the death of the resolution for the present. It was nearing six o'clock, and under the rules the Speaker must leave the chair at that time, and in the evening other business had to be taken up. If the voting had been begun, however, it would have continued until all three motions had been decided upon. After some further debate the vote was called for. The Speaker asked if the House was ready, took a viva voce vote, and declared the resolution carried. Many members were in doubt as to what had been carried, Mr. Mitchell's formal motion of adjournment having been forgotten, but there was a great laugh when it was realized that in this way the vote on the question itself had been put off. It is still early in the session, however, and if the men who have the resolution in charge really desire a vote there is no reason why one should not be had.

Too Bad.

There is an election for a seat in the local legislature pending in Albert County, Mr. H. R. Emmerson and Mr. Peter Duffy being the candidates. Mr. Emmerson is the Government candidate and is bitterly opposed by the Monteton Times. Its reason for opposing him is that he is a leading liberal, but it makes very vile attacks upon him and lays great stress upon the fact that he lives a few miles outside of the County he aspires to represent. In this connection it is interesting to remember that the same paper strenuously advocated the election by the same constituency of Dr. Weldon of Halifax to a seat in the House of Commons. The worst feature of the campaign is the unbecoming manner in which the Times carries it out against the other Monteton paper—the Transcript. The editor of the latter, who was impugned for contempt of court last year, is referred to by the Times as a "jail bird," a rascal, etc., while the Transcript retorts by reminding the editor of the Times of his interperate habits. What these matters have to do with the choice by the electors of Albert of a legislative representative does not appear, although the Times, whose

editor is an Albert County man, probably understands the tastes of his neighbors best. The nomination proceedings on Saturday last were of a piece with the canvas as led by the Times, and are such as few countries in the Province could afford to be responsible for. The Telegraph's account is as follows:-

MONTEG, Feb. 17.-At the nomination at Hopewell Cape, yesterday, Sheriff Wells presided. Mr. H. R. Emmerson, Mr. Peter Duffy and ex-Judge of Probate Steadman were nominated, the latter withdrawing at the close of the speeches.

Mr. Emmerson spoke first for an hour and gave an eloquent address. He entered into a description of the reason why he was seeking re-election and laid great stress on the fact that Dr. Lewis, who was satisfied with last election, was personally opposed to a scrutiny. It was WESTMORELAND LAWYERS AND WESTMORELAND MONEY

with a nominal Albert County petitioner, who were at the back of the petition. His Westmoreland enemies took this stand out of personal revenge, because of his past course in that county's politics. But they would discover he was a man not to be easily downed, (cheers), and he believed the electors of Albert County were going to stand by him in this fight.

(Tremendous cheers.) He then quoted from an article in the Times the following epithets against him: "Robber of estates; a ferocious lawyer; a shark; a cheeky Dorchester lawyer; treacherous disloyalty; a discredited politician, besmirched and besmeared before he leaves his own backyard, becomes additionally filthy in crossing the mud flats of the Petitioners." etc.

Taking up that portion of the article in which he was accused of robbing over the estates of widows and orphans he warmly attacked Editor Stevens, who was present, and announced his determination as soon as the election was over of not prosecuting him for civil damages, but of

PLACING HIM IN THE DOCK on a charge of criminal libel. (Cheers.) The speaker then entered into a general discussion of his political program, and closed by appealing to the electors for a renewal of the confidence placed in him.

Mr. Duffy followed and said as other speakers had desired to address them, he would give his subsequent incidents showed that this was a put up job and that another party had a speech mainly show the cloven hoof of partyism.

Mr. Steadman then spoke for over two hours and attempted to talk every one out, and talked of everything but providing for the time was rapidly proceeding, and the audience would not hear him.

While Mr. Emmerson was denying the charges, Mr. Duffy rose and persisted in trying to speak the same time. This added to the confusion, but the electors would not hear Duffy, and Mr. Emmerson finished his remarks. The meeting was broken up by the time was rapidly proceeding, and the audience would not hear him.

Mr. Fisher criticised both the amendment and the amendment to the amendment as calculated only to confuse the question and prevent the bringing forward of a straight issue. These tactics, he said, would deceive nobody. He pointed out that Parliament as at present constituted had power to enact Prohibition, and that the resort to the public vote was to import a new element into Canadian constitutional methods. As to compensation, he was willing to consider that as a matter of detail, but thought it not right to complicate the straight issue of Prohibition with such a question. This sort of criticism angered Mr. Taylor, and after the manner of people whose crime and punishment is not so keen as their combativeness is great, his answer, while warm and personal, had little or no reference to the subject. He accused Mr. Fisher of importing partyism into this debate, his reason being, as well as it could be understood, that Mr. Fisher had failed to criticise the Ontario Government's administration of the Scott Act. He spoke of the Prohibition caucus of this morning and said that the Liberals there had sought to condemn the action of Governor Royal, which action Mr. Taylor by implication defended, or at least appeared to defend. By the way, it should be explained that Mr. Taylor was not allowed to speak (having already spoken) in presenting his amendment until Mr. Mitchell in a magnanimous way moved the adjournment of the debate, so as to give formal justification for Mr. Taylor's speaking. This proved the death of the resolution for the present. It was nearing six o'clock, and under the rules the Speaker must leave the chair at that time, and in the evening other business had to be taken up. If the voting had been begun, however, it would have continued until all three motions had been decided upon. After some further debate the vote was called for. The Speaker asked if the House was ready, took a viva voce vote, and declared the resolution carried. Many members were in doubt as to what had been carried, Mr. Mitchell's formal motion of adjournment having been forgotten, but there was a great laugh when it was realized that in this way the vote on the question itself had been put off. It is still early in the session, however, and if the men who have the resolution in charge really desire a vote there is no reason why one should not be had.

Too Bad.

There is an election for a seat in the local legislature pending in Albert County, Mr. H. R. Emmerson and Mr. Peter Duffy being the candidates. Mr. Emmerson is the Government candidate and is bitterly opposed by the Monteton Times. Its reason for opposing him is that he is a leading liberal, but it makes very vile attacks upon him and lays great stress upon the fact that he lives a few miles outside of the County he aspires to represent. In this connection it is interesting to remember that the same paper strenuously advocated the election by the same constituency of Dr. Weldon of Halifax to a seat in the House of Commons. The worst feature of the campaign is the unbecoming manner in which the Times carries it out against the other Monteton paper—the Transcript. The editor of the latter, who was impugned for contempt of court last year, is referred to by the Times as a "jail bird," a rascal, etc., while the Transcript retorts by reminding the editor of the Times of his interperate habits. What these matters have to do with the choice by the electors of Albert of a legislative representative does not appear, although the Times, whose

editor is an Albert County man, probably understands the tastes of his neighbors best. The nomination proceedings on Saturday last were of a piece with the canvas as led by the Times, and are such as few countries in the Province could afford to be responsible for. The Telegraph's account is as follows:-

MONTEG, Feb. 17.-At the nomination at Hopewell Cape, yesterday, Sheriff Wells presided. Mr. H. R. Emmerson, Mr. Peter Duffy and ex-Judge of Probate Steadman were nominated, the latter withdrawing at the close of the speeches.

Mr. Emmerson spoke first for an hour and gave an eloquent address. He entered into a description of the reason why he was seeking re-election and laid great stress on the fact that Dr. Lewis, who was satisfied with last election, was personally opposed to a scrutiny. It was WESTMORELAND LAWYERS AND WESTMORELAND MONEY

with a nominal Albert County petitioner, who were at the back of the petition. His Westmoreland enemies took this stand out of personal revenge, because of his past course in that county's politics. But they would discover he was a man not to be easily downed, (cheers), and he believed the electors of Albert County were going to stand by him in this fight.

(Tremendous cheers.) He then quoted from an article in the Times the following epithets against him: "Robber of estates; a ferocious lawyer; a shark; a cheeky Dorchester lawyer; treacherous disloyalty; a discredited politician, besmirched and besmeared before he leaves his own backyard, becomes additionally filthy in crossing the mud flats of the Petitioners." etc.

Taking up that portion of the article in which he was accused of robbing over the estates of widows and orphans he warmly attacked Editor Stevens, who was present, and announced his determination as soon as the election was over of not prosecuting him for civil damages, but of

PLACING HIM IN THE DOCK on a charge of criminal libel. (Cheers.) The speaker then entered into a general discussion of his political program, and closed by appealing to the electors for a renewal of the confidence placed in him.

Mr. Duffy followed and said as other speakers had desired to address them, he would give his subsequent incidents showed that this was a put up job and that another party had a speech mainly show the cloven hoof of partyism.

Mr. Steadman then spoke for over two hours and attempted to talk every one out, and talked of everything but providing for the time was rapidly proceeding, and the audience would not hear him.

While Mr. Emmerson was denying the charges, Mr. Duffy rose and persisted in trying to speak the same time. This added to the confusion, but the electors would not hear Duffy, and Mr. Emmerson finished his remarks. The meeting was broken up by the time was rapidly proceeding, and the audience would not hear him.

Mr. Fisher criticised both the amendment and the amendment to the amendment as calculated only to confuse the question and prevent the bringing forward of a straight issue. These tactics, he said, would deceive nobody. He pointed out that Parliament as at present constituted had power to enact Prohibition, and that the resort to the public vote was to import a new element into Canadian constitutional methods. As to compensation, he was willing to consider that as a matter of detail, but thought it not right to complicate the straight issue of Prohibition with such a question. This sort of criticism angered Mr. Taylor, and after the manner of people whose crime and punishment is not so keen as their combativeness is great, his answer, while warm and personal, had little or no reference to the subject. He accused Mr. Fisher of importing partyism into this debate, his reason being, as well as it could be understood, that Mr. Fisher had failed to criticise the Ontario Government's administration of the Scott Act. He spoke of the Prohibition caucus of this morning and said that the Liberals there had sought to condemn the action of Governor Royal, which action Mr. Taylor by implication defended, or at least appeared to defend. By the way, it should be explained that Mr. Taylor was not allowed to speak (having already spoken) in presenting his amendment until Mr. Mitchell in a magnanimous way moved the adjournment of the debate, so as to give formal justification for Mr. Taylor's speaking. This proved the death of the resolution for the present. It was nearing six o'clock, and under the rules the Speaker must leave the chair at that time, and in the evening other business had to be taken up. If the voting had been begun, however, it would have continued until all three motions had been decided upon. After some further debate the vote was called for. The Speaker asked if the House was ready, took a viva voce vote, and declared the resolution carried. Many members were in doubt as to what had been carried, Mr. Mitchell's formal motion of adjournment having been forgotten, but there was a great laugh when it was realized that in this way the vote on the question itself had been put off. It is still early in the session, however, and if the men who have the resolution in charge really desire a vote there is no reason why one should not be had.

Too Bad.

There is an election for a seat in the local legislature pending in Albert County, Mr. H. R. Emmerson and Mr. Peter Duffy being the candidates. Mr. Emmerson is the Government candidate and is bitterly opposed by the Monteton Times. Its reason for opposing him is that he is a leading liberal, but it makes very vile attacks upon him and lays great stress upon the fact that he lives a few miles outside of the County he aspires to represent. In this connection it is interesting to remember that the same paper strenuously advocated the election by the same constituency of Dr. Weldon of Halifax to a seat in the House of Commons. The worst feature of the campaign is the unbecoming manner in which the Times carries it out against the other Monteton paper—the Transcript. The editor of the latter, who was impugned for contempt of court last year, is referred to by the Times as a "jail bird," a rascal, etc., while the Transcript retorts by reminding the editor of the Times of his interperate habits. What these matters have to do with the choice by the electors of Albert of a legislative representative does not appear, although the Times, whose

editor is an Albert County man, probably understands the tastes of his neighbors best. The nomination proceedings on Saturday last were of a piece with the canvas as led by the Times, and are such as few countries in the Province could afford to be responsible for. The Telegraph's account is as follows:-

MONTEG, Feb. 17.-At the nomination at Hopewell Cape, yesterday, Sheriff Wells presided. Mr. H. R. Emmerson, Mr. Peter Duffy and ex-Judge of Probate Steadman were nominated, the latter withdrawing at the close of the speeches.

Mr. Emmerson spoke first for an hour and gave an eloquent address. He entered into a description of the reason why he was seeking re-election and laid great stress on the fact that Dr. Lewis, who was satisfied with last election, was personally opposed to a scrutiny. It was WESTMORELAND LAWYERS AND WESTMORELAND MONEY

with a nominal Albert County petitioner, who were at the back of the petition. His Westmoreland enemies took this stand out of personal revenge, because of his past course in that county's politics. But they would discover he was a man not to be easily downed, (cheers), and he believed the electors of Albert County were going to stand by him in this fight.

(Tremendous cheers.) He then quoted from an article in the Times the following epithets against him: "Robber of estates; a ferocious lawyer; a shark; a cheeky Dorchester lawyer; treacherous disloyalty; a discredited politician, besmirched and besmeared before he leaves his own backyard, becomes additionally filthy in crossing the mud flats of the Petitioners." etc.

Taking up that portion of the article in which he was accused of robbing over the estates of widows and orphans he warmly attacked Editor Stevens, who was present, and announced his determination as soon as the election was over of not prosecuting him for civil damages, but of

PLACING HIM IN THE DOCK on a charge of criminal libel. (Cheers.) The speaker then entered into a general discussion of his political program, and closed by appealing to the electors for a renewal of the confidence placed in him.

Mr. Duffy followed and said as other speakers had desired to address them, he would give his subsequent incidents showed that this was a put up job and that another party had a speech mainly show the cloven hoof of partyism.

Mr. Steadman then spoke for over two hours and attempted to talk every one out, and talked of everything but providing for the time was rapidly proceeding, and the audience would not hear him.

While Mr. Emmerson was denying the charges, Mr. Duffy rose and persisted in trying to speak the same time. This added to the confusion, but the electors would not hear Duffy, and Mr. Emmerson finished his remarks. The meeting was broken up by the time was rapidly proceeding, and the audience would not hear him.

Mr. Fisher criticised both the amendment and the amendment to the amendment as calculated only to confuse the question and prevent the bringing forward of a straight issue. These tactics, he said, would deceive nobody. He pointed out that Parliament as at present constituted had power to enact Prohibition, and that the resort to the public vote was to import a new element into Canadian constitutional methods. As to compensation, he was willing to consider that as a matter of detail, but thought it not right to complicate the straight issue of Prohibition with such a question. This sort of criticism angered Mr. Taylor, and after the manner of people whose crime and punishment is not so keen as their combativeness is great, his answer, while warm and personal, had little or no reference to the subject. He accused Mr. Fisher of importing partyism into this debate, his reason being, as well as it could be understood, that Mr. Fisher had failed to criticise the Ontario Government's administration of the Scott Act. He spoke of the Prohibition caucus of this morning and said that the Liberals there had sought to condemn the action of Governor Royal, which action Mr. Taylor by implication defended, or at least appeared to defend. By the way, it should be explained that Mr. Taylor was not allowed to speak (having already spoken) in presenting his amendment until Mr. Mitchell in a magnanimous way moved the adjournment of the debate, so as to give formal justification for Mr. Taylor's speaking. This proved the death of the resolution for the present. It was nearing six o'clock, and under the rules the Speaker must leave the chair at that time, and in the evening other business had to be taken up. If the voting had been begun, however, it would have continued until all three motions had been decided upon. After some further debate the vote was called for. The Speaker asked if the House was ready, took a viva voce vote, and declared the resolution carried. Many members were in doubt as to what had been carried, Mr. Mitchell's formal motion of adjournment having been forgotten, but there was a great laugh when it was realized that in this way the vote on the question itself had been put off. It is still early in the session, however, and if the men who have the resolution in charge really desire a vote there is no reason why one should not be had.

Too Bad.

There is an election for a seat in the local legislature pending in Albert County, Mr. H. R. Emmerson and Mr. Peter Duffy being the candidates. Mr. Emmerson is the Government candidate and is bitterly opposed by the Monteton Times. Its reason for opposing him is that he is a leading liberal, but it makes very vile attacks upon him and lays great stress upon the fact that he lives a few miles outside of the County he aspires to represent. In this connection it is interesting to remember that the same paper strenuously advocated the election by the same constituency of Dr. Weldon of Halifax to a seat in the House of Commons. The worst feature of the campaign is the unbecoming manner in which the Times carries it out against the other Monteton paper—the Transcript. The editor of the latter, who was impugned for contempt of court last year, is referred to by the Times as a "jail bird," a rascal, etc., while the Transcript retorts by reminding the editor of the Times of his interperate habits. What these matters have to do with the choice by the electors of Albert of a legislative representative does not appear, although the Times, whose

editor is an Albert County man, probably understands the tastes of his neighbors best. The nomination proceedings on Saturday last were of a piece with the canvas as led by the Times, and are such as few countries in the Province could afford to be responsible for. The Telegraph's account is as follows:-

MONTEG, Feb. 17.-At the nomination at Hopewell Cape, yesterday, Sheriff Wells presided. Mr. H. R. Emmerson, Mr. Peter Duffy and ex-Judge of Probate Steadman were nominated, the latter withdrawing at the close of the speeches.

Mr. Emmerson spoke first for an hour and gave an eloquent address. He entered into a description of the reason why he was seeking re-election and laid great stress on the fact that Dr. Lewis, who was satisfied with last election, was personally opposed to a scrutiny. It was WESTMORELAND LAWYERS AND WESTMORELAND MONEY

with a nominal Albert County petitioner, who were at the back of the petition. His Westmoreland enemies took this stand out of personal revenge, because of his past course in that county's politics. But they would discover he was a man not to be easily downed, (cheers), and he believed the electors of Albert County were going to stand by him in this fight.

(Tremendous cheers.) He then quoted from an article in the Times the following epithets against him: "Robber of estates; a ferocious lawyer; a shark; a cheeky Dorchester lawyer; treacherous disloyalty; a discredited politician, besmirched and besmeared before he leaves his own backyard, becomes additionally filthy in crossing the mud flats of the Petitioners." etc.

Taking up that portion of the article in which he was accused of robbing over the estates of widows and orphans he warmly attacked Editor Stevens, who was present, and announced his determination as soon as the election was over of not prosecuting him for civil damages, but of

PLACING HIM IN THE DOCK on a charge of criminal libel. (Cheers.) The speaker then entered into a general discussion of his political program, and closed by appealing to the electors for a renewal of the confidence placed in him.

Mr. Duffy followed and said as other speakers had desired to address them, he would give his subsequent incidents showed that this was a put up job and that another party had a speech mainly show the cloven hoof of partyism.

Mr. Steadman then spoke for over two hours and attempted to talk every one out, and talked of everything but providing for the time was rapidly proceeding, and the audience would not hear him.

While Mr. Emmerson was denying the charges, Mr. Duffy rose and persisted in trying to speak the same time. This added to the confusion, but the electors would not hear Duffy, and Mr. Emmerson finished his remarks. The meeting was broken up by the time was rapidly proceeding, and the audience would not hear him.

Mr. Fisher criticised both the amendment and the amendment to the amendment as calculated only to confuse the question and prevent the bringing forward of a straight issue. These tactics, he said, would deceive nobody. He pointed out that Parliament as at present constituted had power to enact Prohibition, and that the resort to the public vote was to import a new element into Canadian constitutional methods. As to compensation, he was willing to consider that as a matter of detail, but thought it not right to complicate the straight issue of Prohibition with such a question. This sort of criticism angered Mr. Taylor, and after the manner of people whose crime and punishment is not so keen as their combativeness is great, his answer, while warm and personal, had little or no reference to the subject. He accused Mr. Fisher of importing partyism into this debate, his reason being, as well as it could be understood, that Mr. Fisher had failed to criticise the Ontario Government's administration of the Scott Act. He spoke of the Prohibition caucus of this morning and said that the Liberals there had sought to condemn the action of Governor Royal, which action Mr. Taylor by implication defended, or at least appeared to defend. By the way, it should be explained that Mr. Taylor was not allowed to speak (having already spoken) in presenting his amendment until Mr. Mitchell in a magnanimous way moved the adjournment of the debate, so as to give formal justification for Mr. Taylor's speaking. This proved the death of the resolution for the present. It was nearing six o'clock, and under the rules the Speaker must leave the chair at that time, and in the evening other business had to be taken up. If the voting had been begun, however, it would have continued until all three motions had been decided upon. After some further debate the vote was called for. The Speaker asked if the House was ready, took a viva voce vote, and declared the resolution carried. Many members were in doubt as to what had been carried, Mr. Mitchell's formal motion of adjournment having been forgotten, but there was a great laugh when it was realized that in this way the vote on the question itself had been put off. It is still early in the session, however, and if the men who have the resolution in charge really desire a vote there is no reason why one should not be had.

Too Bad.

There is an election for a seat in the local legislature pending in Albert County, Mr. H. R. Emmerson and Mr. Peter Duffy being the candidates. Mr. Emmerson is the Government candidate and is bitterly opposed by the Monteton Times. Its reason for opposing him is that he is a leading liberal, but it makes very vile attacks upon him and lays great stress upon the fact that he lives a few miles outside of the County he aspires to represent. In this connection it is interesting to remember that the same paper strenuously advocated the election by the same constituency of Dr. Weldon of Halifax to a seat in the House of Commons. The worst feature of the campaign is the unbecoming manner in which the Times carries it out against the other Monteton paper—the Transcript. The editor of the latter, who was impugned for contempt of court last year, is referred to by the Times as a "jail bird," a rascal, etc., while the Transcript retorts by reminding the editor of the Times of his interperate habits. What these matters have to do with the choice by the electors of Albert of a legislative representative does not appear, although the Times, whose

editor is an Albert County man, probably understands the tastes of his neighbors best. The nomination proceedings on Saturday last were of a piece with the canvas as led by the Times, and are such as few countries in the Province could afford to be responsible for. The Telegraph's account is as follows:-

MONTEG, Feb. 17.-At the nomination at Hopewell Cape, yesterday, Sheriff Wells presided. Mr. H. R. Emmerson, Mr. Peter Duffy and ex-Judge of Probate Steadman were nominated, the latter withdrawing at the close of the speeches.

Mr. Emmerson spoke first for an hour and gave an eloquent address. He entered into a description of the reason why he was seeking re-election and laid great stress on the fact that Dr. Lewis, who was satisfied with last election, was personally opposed to a scrutiny. It was WESTMORELAND LAWYERS AND WESTMORELAND MONEY

with a nominal Albert County petitioner, who were at the back of the petition. His Westmoreland enemies took this stand out of personal revenge, because of his past course in that county's politics. But they would discover he was a man not to be easily downed, (cheers), and he believed the electors of Albert County were going to stand by him in this fight.

(Tremendous cheers.) He then quoted from an article in the Times the following epithets against him: "Robber of estates; a ferocious lawyer; a shark; a cheeky Dorchester lawyer; treacherous disloyalty; a discredited politician, besmirched and besmeared before he leaves his own backyard, becomes additionally filthy in crossing the mud flats of the Petitioners." etc.

Taking up that portion of the article in which he was accused of robbing over the estates of widows and orphans he warmly attacked Editor Stevens, who was present, and announced his determination as soon as the election was over of not prosecuting him for civil damages, but of

PLACING HIM IN THE DOCK on a charge of criminal libel. (Cheers.) The speaker then entered into a general discussion of his political program, and closed by appealing to the electors for a renewal of the confidence placed in him.

Mr. Duffy followed and said as other speakers had desired to address them, he would give his subsequent incidents showed that this was a put up job and that another party had a speech mainly show the cloven hoof of partyism.

Mr. Steadman then spoke for over two hours and attempted to talk every one out, and talked of everything but providing for the time was rapidly proceeding, and the audience would not hear him.

While Mr. Emmerson was denying the charges, Mr. Duffy rose and persisted in trying to speak the same time. This added to the confusion, but the electors would not hear Duffy, and Mr. Emmerson finished his remarks. The meeting was broken up by the time was rapidly proceeding, and the audience would not hear him.

Mr. Fisher criticised both the amendment and the amendment to the amendment as calculated only to confuse the question and prevent the bringing forward of a straight issue. These tactics, he said, would deceive nobody. He pointed out that Parliament as at present constituted had power to enact Prohibition, and that the resort to the public vote was to import a new element into Canadian constitutional methods. As to compensation, he was willing to consider that as a matter of detail, but thought it not right to complicate the straight issue of Prohibition with such a question. This sort of criticism angered Mr. Taylor, and after the manner of people whose crime and punishment is not so keen as their combativeness is great, his answer, while warm and personal, had little or no reference to the subject. He accused Mr. Fisher of importing partyism into this debate, his reason being, as well as it could be understood, that Mr. Fisher had failed to criticise the Ontario Government's administration of the Scott Act. He spoke of the Prohibition caucus of this morning and said that the Liberals there had sought to condemn the action of Governor Royal, which action Mr. Taylor by implication defended, or at least appeared to defend. By the way, it should be explained that Mr. Taylor was not allowed to speak (having already spoken) in presenting his amendment until Mr. Mitchell in a magnanimous way moved the adjournment of the debate, so as to give formal justification for Mr. Taylor's speaking. This proved the death of the resolution for the present. It was nearing six o'clock, and under the rules the Speaker must leave the chair at that time, and in the evening other business had to be taken up. If the voting had been begun, however, it would have continued until all three motions had been decided upon. After some further debate the vote was called for. The Speaker asked if the House was ready, took a viva voce vote, and declared the resolution carried. Many members were in doubt as to what had been carried, Mr. Mitchell's formal motion of adjournment having been forgotten, but there was a great laugh when it was realized that in this way the vote on the question itself had been put off. It is still early in the session, however, and if the men who have the resolution in charge really desire a vote there is no reason why one should not be had.

Too Bad.

stomach. To correct all this if not effect a cure try Green's August Flower.

Alms-House Supplies.

To the Editor of the Advance.

Sir.—Permit me a small space in your valuable paper to state a few facts in reference to the management and supplying of the Alms-house, as I see, by the World of Feb. 6th, that Mr. McLachlan is out again on the potato racket. The potato must be the only article he supplies to the Alms-house, and one would think, by the number of barrels bought by the Commissioner, that it was the only article of food the inmates were fed on. It would like to ask Mr. McLachlan if there is any necessity for buying one hundred barrels of potatoes and paying from 90 cents to one dollar per barrel for them in October or November when they can be bought at that price at any time of the year, or at least, in April or May. I will also inform him that if they were tendered for last fall our good country potatoes could have been supplied for seventy-five cents per barrel, if paid for in cash. I might also state here by his information that if he would read the report of the Council, or if he could not, to get the person who writes his letters to do so for him, then he would not be so often misled; as, by his statements he made in the Council; which is incorrect, although as correct as any of his other assertions, as they are nothing less than misstatements from beginning to end. One of his first statements is he doesn't make one red cent out of the supplying the Alms-house. On that point I don't intend to say much, but I can, at least, say one would presume he was doing it for charity, but on looking over his accounts you will find that an extra dollar and seventy-five cents per barrel was not much in the way of profit in supplying that institution. I will state here for the benefit of the taxpayers some of his prices:-

Sept. 1st—1 bl. beef, called plate beef, \$13.75.

1210 lbs. green codfish, \$3.50 per 110 lbs. 1 barrel of green fish \$4.00.

10 barrels straight grade flour, \$6.75.

Nov.—181 lbs. beef at 6 cents—and such like.

Dec. 19—Two half-chests tea, 119 lbs., at 22 cents—worth 10 cts.

Soap by the box at 40 cts—20 lbs.

These are only specimens of his prices, as I do not want to take up too much space in your paper and also want to bring to your notice where he states that the principal part of the wood supplied to the institution is bought at one dollar and fifty cents per cord. That is true, but he should also have stated that it consists of poplar, fir, spruce and pine. He forgot to tell us that he gets wood from Blackville and that it cost \$2.25 per cord at the Station, one dollar per cord for hauling and seventy-five cents per cord for cutting—only four dollars a cord! I am sure he would buy a lot of wood at that price for his own use. Then, he goes on to give us the bill of fare for the inmates; he says at a meeting of the Board in February last the keeper was asked what the bill of fare for the inmates was? His statement showed that meat was given three days of each week, and fish on the rest. He forgot to tell us that was not unit I, as one of a Committee, only three years ago last January sitting, visited the house and found the bill of fare was two meals of meat out of the twenty-one, and butter once a week, and that on Sunday, I brought the matter before the Council and recommended that we have four meals of meat a week, but cost no more than fish, and also that butter be used once a day when meat was not. I might ask him also if the keeper ordered two half-chests of tea at one time, or is there any necessity for sending 119 lbs. of tea at once. He states he sends the weight and quantity when sending goods to the Alms-house. That is not just what is required of him. It is his bill as well as weight to enable the committee to know what he is doing. As a matter of fact, I need not go into detail about his statements as he gets the truckman to take a full account of all the articles delivered, so we can easily understand how particular he is in his business management.

Now, a few words in reference to the management of the farm. When he first got control of the farm it was in good condition and raised one year one hundred and eighty barrels potatoes. Now it is entirely run out. Is that good management? If I knew nothing about farming I might be led to believe it was, but I have not forgotten how to farm yet. He says farming don't pay. How do people live on farms, and how is it that they are the most independent people in the world? When Mr. McLachlan undertook to give us all the information about the running of the Alms-house, he did not inform us that, on several occasions, he bought beef and took it home until he feared there was danger of its spoiling, and he then sent the steak out