

New Advertisements.

Miramichi Advance.

CHATHAM, N. B. MAY 28, 1891.

PAST ALL PRECEDENT! OVER TWO MILLIONS DISTRIBUTED.

Louisiana State Lottery Company.

Incorporated by the Legislature for Educational and Charitable purposes, and the franchise of the State Lottery Company, in 1879, by an overwhelming popular vote.

It is hereby certified that we supervise the drawings for all the Monthly and Semi-Monthly Drawings of the Louisiana State Lottery Company, and in person manage and control the Drawings themselves, and that the drawings are made with honesty, fairness, and in good faith toward all parties, and we authorize the company to use this certificate, with facsimile of our signatures attached, in its advertisements.

Commissioners.

R. M. WALMSLEY, Pres. Louisiana National Bank.

P. B. LANAUZ, Pres. State National Bank.

A. BALDWIN, Pres. New Orleans National Bank.

CARL KOHN, Pres. Union National Bank.

MAMMOTH DRAWING Capital Prize, \$600,000.

At the Academy of Music, New Orleans, Tuesday, June 16, 1891.

1 PRIZES OF \$500,000..... \$500,000

1 PRIZES OF \$100,000..... 100,000

1 PRIZES OF \$50,000..... 50,000

1 PRIZES OF \$25,000..... 25,000

1 PRIZES OF \$10,000..... 10,000

1 PRIZES OF \$5,000..... 5,000

1 PRIZES OF \$2,500..... 2,500

1 PRIZES OF \$1,000..... 1,000

1 PRIZES OF \$500..... 500

1 PRIZES OF \$250..... 250

1 PRIZES OF \$100..... 100

1 PRIZES OF \$50..... 50

1 PRIZES OF \$25..... 25

1 PRIZES OF \$10..... 10

1 PRIZES OF \$5..... 5

1 PRIZES OF \$2..... 2

1 PRIZES OF \$1..... 1

1 PRIZES OF \$0.50..... 0.50

1 PRIZES OF \$0.25..... 0.25

1 PRIZES OF \$0.10..... 0.10

1 PRIZES OF \$0.05..... 0.05

1 PRIZES OF \$0.02..... 0.02

1 PRIZES OF \$0.01..... 0.01

1 PRIZES OF \$0.005..... 0.005

1 PRIZES OF \$0.002..... 0.002

1 PRIZES OF \$0.001..... 0.001

1 PRIZES OF \$0.0005..... 0.0005

1 PRIZES OF \$0.0002..... 0.0002

1 PRIZES OF \$0.0001..... 0.0001

1 PRIZES OF \$0.00005..... 0.00005

1 PRIZES OF \$0.00002..... 0.00002

1 PRIZES OF \$0.00001..... 0.00001

It Won't Work.

Political papers sometimes resort to ingenious expedients to prejudice their opponents.

Referring to the governorship of New Brunswick, which is now very satisfactorily held by Sir Leonard Tilley, the Fredericton Herald says Judge Fraser's appointment would undoubtedly be a most popular one, and would remove the doubt which has for some years, seemingly existed in the minds of the Dominion government as to whether a dissenter could be safely appointed to that position.

That is, we suppose, intended to convey the impression that only gentlemen belonging to the Church of England will be appointed by the present government to the governorship of New Brunswick.

In the first place, Judge Fraser is a Presbyterian and cannot, therefore, be called a dissenter. Besides, as there is no established church in Canada, there are no dissenters.

The word has no meaning in this country. In Great Britain it has, but as the Presbyterian Church is an established one, dissenters are not dissenters, even there.

The Herald might also have remembered that the government of Canada appointed a Methodist citizen of Fredericton—the city in which it is published—to the governorship.

In the person of the late Hon. L. A. Wilnot, so that his little attempt to arouse religious prejudices seems to be a very ludicrous misfit.

The Herald ought to be able to do better, or go out of the "religious cry" business.

Chatham Public Building.

The amount placed in the estimates for the coming fiscal year for a new public building in Chatham, is satisfactory evidence of the intention of the Government to provide the accommodation so long needed for the Post Office, Custom House and other public offices here.

It also shows that our present representative is not forgetful of his pledges in the matter and his success in securing the grant is a guarantee of his efficiency. We shall, also, no doubt, not be forgotten in the matter of the wharf accommodation needed down-river.

The amount of the Chatham public building grant—\$7,500—has been declared altogether inadequate for those who would, no doubt, be glad if nothing whatever were provided for that purpose, but it is not unusual to make a small appropriation at first for such purposes, the larger sums required being secured when sites, plans and other necessary facts are ascertained and satisfactory statements as to probable cost based thereon can be given to parliament by the minister of Public Works.

If a grant to cover the whole cost were asked for in the estimates the critics would, probably, be crying out against the money being voted before it was needed.

The growlers are, of course, supporters of the gentleman who opposed even a \$1,500 post office grant for Chatham last year, and who considered the old rookery for which he made the public pay \$10,000 good enough for Chatham.

The Gleaner says—

"If the Ottawa municipalities should succeed in having their railway subsidies repealed by the Dominion Government, the people of Fredericton and of the County of York will profit by their efforts, for of course all the municipalities which gave aid to railways must be treated alike. The city of Fredericton would get back \$50,000 and the County of York \$30,000 given as a bonus to the Fredericton Branch Railway and both City and County would be very glad to be repaid these large sums for which they are now paying interest."

And if justice and equity are proclaimed throughout the land, the \$175,000 exacted from the people of the North Shore counties to build railways in the southern counties of New Brunswick will also be repaid, with interest.

The Gleaner is in error as to the character of the delegation that presented its claims to the Government. It was a gathering of the township Reeves and deputy wardens of the counties, mostly from Ontario. They numbered two hundred and could not, therefore, be merely representatives of the Ottawa municipalities.

British Lumber Trade.

The British Board of Trade returns are out, and the portion of them relating to the lumber trade is thus referred to by the London Times: "The lumber trade returns for the year 1890, the import of wood material was abnormally large."

"The import of wood goods, from January 1st up to the end of April, 1891, compared with the corresponding period of the year preceding shows a very important decrease both of sawn and hewn. From Russia we have received less of the former by 33,633 loads, and of the latter 9,688 loads. Sweden and Norway in sawn goods show a decline of 41,205 loads and of hewn 11,399 loads, while the supply from Germany of hewn is 9,592 loads less."

"The East Indies likewise show a decreased import for the period named of 12,935 loads of hewn timber."

"On the other hand Canada and the United States have sent us more during the four months than they did last year, the former being credited with an increase of 1,968 loads of hewn and 8,343 loads of sawn, and the States 4,722 loads of hewn and 1,773 loads of sawn."

"The importation from other countries during the four months shows an increase on last year's figures of 13,941 loads hewn, and 836 loads of sawn, making a total decrease on the four months of 1890 of 64,193 loads sawn wood and 20,631 loads of hewn. The most marked decrease was in April."

"For the one month Russia sent less by 2,598 loads of hewn and 18,193 loads of sawn. Sweden and Norway 347 more of

hewn but a large decrease in sawn amounting to 59,887 loads. The United States are credited with 3,471 loads more of hewn but 3,018 less of sawn, but from Germany we have imported during April 3,821 loads more of hewn than April twelvemonth. The East Indian import exhibits 4,318 less hewn, but Canada, though supplying 217 loads less of hewn, is credited with 5,594 more of sawn, and other countries show an increase of both descriptions, viz. 4,344 loads hewn and 3,319 of sawn. The results of the April import give a total increase of 4,850 loads of hewn and 63,285 loads decrease of sawn. The largest decrease is from the North of Europe ports and may be attributed to the late opening this year, but anyway it is satisfactory to record this large decrease as affording a better opportunity for the markets to harden. He concludes: "Up to this hour I have stood between the church I love and the exposure of this whole scandalous Utah situation, but now I must let the truth be known." A nice lot.

NEWS AND NOTES.

CHRISTIAN MUNICIPALITY.

A New Yorker—supposed to be J. Pierpont Morgan—has given \$200,000 to St. George's Protestant Episcopal church in that city for the purpose of erecting church work among the down town people.

SWEAR NOT.

A man at Fresno, Cal., named Hutchinson, refused to appear in court when summoned and was fined \$75. This made him so angry that he stood and swore at the judge until the penalties against him amounted to \$865 or as many days in the lockup, where he is now cooling off.

JAMAICA.

The Hon. Adam Brown, while in Jamaica, collected over one hundred photographs of the scenery of the island, which he will use in illustrating the lectures he intends delivering on Jamaica throughout Canada. Mr. Brown advertised Canada well in Jamaica, and as one good turn deserves another, he will now proceed to do the same for Jamaica in this country. Success to his efforts to give an impulse to trade!

THE WORLD'S END.

A despatch from Atlanta, Ga., says that E. B. Carwell, a noted Baptist evangelist, after a careful revision of the calculations of Daniel relative to the world coming to an end, has placed the final overthrow of all things in the year 1891. He makes an ingenious and interesting calculation, and there is a ring of certainty in his predictions that has taken hold of a number of persons.

GOAT'S BLOOD.

The Koch consumption cure is almost a thing of the past now, but the goat's blood treatment is not altogether discarded as yet. Professor Bernheim, in a report on the transfusion of goat's blood for tuberculosis, says that 14 patients have been treated, and two who were in the last stages of anemia, were cured. Ten of the remaining number were suffering from tuberculosis, and have greatly improved, and two, both in advanced stages of consumption, have died. The treatment is said to have an important effect in the first stages, but should not be used in the last stages of consumption.

AN EFFECTIVE REPRESENTATIVE.

It is highly gratifying to find the Jamaicans expressing such friendship for and admiration of Hon. Adam Brown, Canada's Honorary Commissioner to the Jamaica Exhibition. The Kingston Colonial Standard, of April 24th, speaks in the following terms of Mr. Brown: "While the Commissioners from other countries have gained the good will and the friendship of many of our people, there can be no doubt that the prime favorite as well as most prominent figure, so far as the Commissioners are concerned, is Mr. Adam Brown. Among the countries which have taken part in our International Exhibition the place of honor belongs to Canada, and we are sure that we give expression to the opinion not only of the people of Jamaica but of outside exhibitors and visitors when we say that the Commissioner for Canada occupies a similar position to that of the Dominion."

USES OF HOT WATER.

Hot water is one of the best among simple remedies. For instance, headache almost yields to the simultaneous application of hot water to the feet and back of the neck.

A towel folded several times, and dipped in hot water, and quickly wrung out and applied over the forehead or neuralgia, will generally afford prompt relief.

A strip of flannel, or muslin folded lengthwise, and dipped in hot water and then applied round the neck of a child that has the croup, will sometimes bring relief in ten minutes.

Hot water taken freely half an hour before bedtime, is helpful in the case of constipation and has a soothing effect upon the stomach.

A goblet of hot water taken just after rising, before breakfast, has cured thousands of indigestion, and no simple remedy is more widely recommended by physicians to dyspeptics.

A \$100,000 BRIDGE.

Last week's Scientific American says that the new suspension bridge which is to be constructed across the Hudson will start about Twenty-third street from the New York side and terminate near Twelfth street, Hoboken. There will be five divisions of the bridge, a central span, two land spans, and two approaches. The total length will be 6,500 feet. The central span will be 3,100 feet from centre to centre of piers, or 2,920 feet in clear. The structure is to be of steel for the roadway and towers, with stone and concrete foundations. Double steel towers 625 feet high, on foundations 180 by 350 feet will carry the cables. The cables, four in number, are to be arranged in pairs, one nearly vertically on the inside, and are to be 48 to 50 inches diameter each. They will be 55 feet apart vertically. These cables will be made of steel wire, laid parallel, and bound together at intervals, but they are not to be bound with wire, but are to be surrounded by a cylindrical sheet steel casing bolted on. The casing is to be water tight, and of such size as to provide a clear two inches of space between the cables so as to allow for the circulation of air and for the equalization of the temperature. Prop arrangements are to be made for expansion and contraction. It is thought that in the cold

est weather the height of the bridge at the centre may exceed the nominal height by four and a half feet. The maximum load which the bridge at any time may carry is only equal to one-quarter the ultimate strength. With 1,300 locomotives loading the bridge from end to end only one-third of its full strength will be called upon. A capital of one hundred millions of dollars is provided for the work. Ten years will be required for its completion.

THOUSANDS OF LIVES LOST.

Poets and novelists go into ecstasies over what they romantically call "beautiful spring" and "lovely spring," and while, no doubt, every day is a day to winter lovers, it is equally a day to the sufferer from catarrh. In the most deadly seasons of the year, sudden transitions from warmth to extreme cold, with piercing, chilling winds; from dry to "muggy" weather, all combine to make the season a most trying one, even to the hardiest constitution, while to those with weak constitutions this season is one of positive danger. Unluckily the greatest danger of this season of the year is from cold, which is very very very frequent, and which if not properly and thoroughly treated, develops into catarrh, with all its disagreeable and sometimes fatal effects. Catarrh, neglected, almost certainly develops into consumption, an early destroying thousands of lives. At this trying season no household should be without a bottle of N.S.B. Balm. In cases of cold in the head it gives almost instant relief and effects a speedy cure, thus checking the development of catarrh. Where the throat disease has already secured a hold it is equally efficacious, and with persistent use will cure the worst case. From the outset it softens the breath, stops the nauseous droppings into the throat and lungs, averts those dull headaches that afflict the sufferer from catarrh. N.S.B. Balm is not advertised as a cure-all—it is an honest remedy which never fails to cure cold in the head or catarrh which the directions are fully followed, and thousands throughout the country have reason to bless its discovery. N.S.B. Balm may be had from all dealers or sent post-paid on receipt of price (50 cents, small, or \$1 large size bottle) by addressing Fallois & Co., Brockville, Ont.

PARLIAMENT.

OTTAWA, May 29.—After routine business and questions by members, Mr. James O'Rourke, of Ontario, moved for the resolution in favor of the prohibition of the liquor traffic. This was a slight variation in the expected order of things, as the resolution of Mr. Cameron (Huron) for a repeal of the Prohibition Act, was first on the list. Mr. Jameson began by expressing the hope that the discussion and vote on his resolution might be kept clear of political and party bias. His motion was the natural and logical outcome of the action taken in previous years and of large numbers of resolutions presented to the house. A short review of previous parliamentary action was given with special reference to the occasion when the house affirmed the general principle of prohibition. Assuming it to have been decided that prohibition should come, Mr. Jameson proceeded to argue that the proper time had come. He referred to the fact that P. E. Island had endorsed prohibition by approving local option, that the great cities of New Scotland, New Brunswick and Manitoba were under the Prohibition Act. He explained the reasons why the Prohibition Act had not held its own in Ontario and Quebec, and expressed the opinion that while local prohibition might in some cases be successful, it was not a permanent or workable, yet the people of Canada were in favor of general prohibition throughout the whole country. Mr. Jameson closed his half hour speech by showing that the country would be immeasurably benefited by the prohibition of liquor. He referred to the fact that the Prohibition Act had not held its own in Ontario and Quebec, and expressed the opinion that while local prohibition might in some cases be successful, it was not a permanent or workable, yet the people of Canada were in favor of general prohibition throughout the whole country. Mr. Jameson closed his half hour speech by showing that the country would be immeasurably benefited by the prohibition of liquor. He referred to the fact that the Prohibition Act had not held its own in Ontario and Quebec, and expressed the opinion that while local prohibition might in some cases be successful, it was not a permanent or workable, yet the people of Canada were in favor of general prohibition throughout the whole country.

OTTAWA, May 29.—After routine business and questions by members, Mr. James O'Rourke, of Ontario, moved for the resolution in favor of the prohibition of the liquor traffic. This was a slight variation in the expected order of things, as the resolution of Mr. Cameron (Huron) for a repeal of the Prohibition Act, was first on the list. Mr. Jameson began by expressing the hope that the discussion and vote on his resolution might be kept clear of political and party bias. His motion was the natural and logical outcome of the action taken in previous years and of large numbers of resolutions presented to the house. A short review of previous parliamentary action was given with special reference to the occasion when the house affirmed the general principle of prohibition. Assuming it to have been decided that prohibition should come, Mr. Jameson proceeded to argue that the proper time had come. He referred to the fact that P. E. Island had endorsed prohibition by approving local option, that the great cities of New Scotland, New Brunswick and Manitoba were under the Prohibition Act. He explained the reasons why the Prohibition Act had not held its own in Ontario and Quebec, and expressed the opinion that while local prohibition might in some cases be successful, it was not a permanent or workable, yet the people of Canada were in favor of general prohibition throughout the whole country. Mr. Jameson closed his half hour speech by showing that the country would be immeasurably benefited by the prohibition of liquor. He referred to the fact that the Prohibition Act had not held its own in Ontario and Quebec, and expressed the opinion that while local prohibition might in some cases be successful, it was not a permanent or workable, yet the people of Canada were in favor of general prohibition throughout the whole country.

OTTAWA, May 29.—After routine business and questions by members, Mr. James O'Rourke, of Ontario, moved for the resolution in favor of the prohibition of the liquor traffic. This was a slight variation in the expected order of things, as the resolution of Mr. Cameron (Huron) for a repeal of the Prohibition Act, was first on the list. Mr. Jameson began by expressing the hope that the discussion and vote on his resolution might be kept clear of political and party bias. His motion was the natural and logical outcome of the action taken in previous years and of large numbers of resolutions presented to the house. A short review of previous parliamentary action was given with special reference to the occasion when the house affirmed the general principle of prohibition. Assuming it to have been decided that prohibition should come, Mr. Jameson proceeded to argue that the proper time had come. He referred to the fact that P. E. Island had endorsed prohibition by approving local option, that the great cities of New Scotland, New Brunswick and Manitoba were under the Prohibition Act. He explained the reasons why the Prohibition Act had not held its own in Ontario and Quebec, and expressed the opinion that while local prohibition might in some cases be successful, it was not a permanent or workable, yet the people of Canada were in favor of general prohibition throughout the whole country. Mr. Jameson closed his half hour speech by showing that the country would be immeasurably benefited by the prohibition of liquor. He referred to the fact that the Prohibition Act had not held its own in Ontario and Quebec, and expressed the opinion that while local prohibition might in some cases be successful, it was not a permanent or workable, yet the people of Canada were in favor of general prohibition throughout the whole country.

OTTAWA, May 29.—After routine business and questions by members, Mr. James O'Rourke, of Ontario, moved for the resolution in favor of the prohibition of the liquor traffic. This was a slight variation in the expected order of things, as the resolution of Mr. Cameron (Huron) for a repeal of the Prohibition Act, was first on the list. Mr. Jameson began by expressing the hope that the discussion and vote on his resolution might be kept clear of political and party bias. His motion was the natural and logical outcome of the action taken in previous years and of large numbers of resolutions presented to the house. A short review of previous parliamentary action was given with special reference to the occasion when the house affirmed the general principle of prohibition. Assuming it to have been decided that prohibition should come, Mr. Jameson proceeded to argue that the proper time had come. He referred to the fact that P. E. Island had endorsed prohibition by approving local option, that the great cities of New Scotland, New Brunswick and Manitoba were under the Prohibition Act. He explained the reasons why the Prohibition Act had not held its own in Ontario and Quebec, and expressed the opinion that while local prohibition might in some cases be successful, it was not a permanent or workable, yet the people of Canada were in favor of general prohibition throughout the whole country. Mr. Jameson closed his half hour speech by showing that the country would be immeasurably benefited by the prohibition of liquor. He referred to the fact that the Prohibition Act had not held its own in Ontario and Quebec, and expressed the opinion that while local prohibition might in some cases be successful, it was not a permanent or workable, yet the people of Canada were in favor of general prohibition throughout the whole country.

OTTAWA, May 29.—After routine business and questions by members, Mr. James O'Rourke, of Ontario, moved for the resolution in favor of the prohibition of the liquor traffic. This was a slight variation in the expected order of things, as the resolution of Mr. Cameron (Huron) for a repeal of the Prohibition Act, was first on the list. Mr. Jameson began by expressing the hope that the discussion and vote on his resolution might be kept clear of political and party bias. His motion was the natural and logical outcome of the action taken in previous years and of large numbers of resolutions presented to the house. A short review of previous parliamentary action was given with special reference to the occasion when the house affirmed the general principle of prohibition. Assuming it to have been decided that prohibition should come, Mr. Jameson proceeded to argue that the proper time had come. He referred to the fact that P. E. Island had endorsed prohibition by approving local option, that the great cities of New Scotland, New Brunswick and Manitoba were under the Prohibition Act. He explained the reasons why the Prohibition Act had not held its own in Ontario and Quebec, and expressed the opinion that while local prohibition might in some cases be successful, it was not a permanent or workable, yet the people of Canada were in favor of general prohibition throughout the whole country. Mr. Jameson closed his half hour speech by showing that the country would be immeasurably benefited by the prohibition of liquor. He referred to the fact that the Prohibition Act had not held its own in Ontario and Quebec, and expressed the opinion that while local prohibition might in some cases be successful, it was not a permanent or workable, yet the people of Canada were in favor of general prohibition throughout the whole country.

OTTAWA, May 29.—After routine business and questions by members, Mr. James O'Rourke, of Ontario, moved for the resolution in favor of the prohibition of the liquor traffic. This was a slight variation in the expected order of things, as the resolution of Mr. Cameron (Huron) for a repeal of the Prohibition Act, was first on the list. Mr. Jameson began by expressing the hope that the discussion and vote on his resolution might be kept clear of political and party bias. His motion was the natural and logical outcome of the action taken in previous years and of large numbers of resolutions presented to the house. A short review of previous parliamentary action was given with special reference to the occasion when the house affirmed the general principle of prohibition. Assuming it to have been decided that prohibition should come, Mr. Jameson proceeded to argue that the proper time had come. He referred to the fact that P. E. Island had endorsed prohibition by approving local option, that the great cities of New Scotland, New Brunswick and Manitoba were under the Prohibition Act. He explained the reasons why the Prohibition Act had not held its own in Ontario and Quebec, and expressed the opinion that while local prohibition might in some cases be successful, it was not a permanent or workable, yet the people of Canada were in favor of general prohibition throughout the whole country. Mr. Jameson closed his half hour speech by showing that the country would be immeasurably benefited by the prohibition of liquor. He referred to the fact that the Prohibition Act had not held its own in Ontario and Quebec, and expressed the opinion that while local prohibition might in some cases be successful, it was not a permanent or workable, yet the people of Canada were in favor of general prohibition throughout the whole country.

OTTAWA, May 29.—After routine business and questions by members, Mr. James O'Rourke, of Ontario, moved for the resolution in favor of the prohibition of the liquor traffic. This was a slight variation in the expected order of things, as the resolution of Mr. Cameron (Huron) for a repeal of the Prohibition Act, was first on the list. Mr. Jameson began by expressing the hope that the discussion and vote on his resolution might be kept clear of political and party bias. His motion was the natural and logical outcome of the action taken in previous years and of large numbers of resolutions presented to the house. A short review of previous parliamentary action was given with special reference to the occasion when the house affirmed the general principle of prohibition. Assuming it to have been decided that prohibition should come, Mr. Jameson proceeded to argue that the proper time had come. He referred to the fact that P. E. Island had endorsed prohibition by approving local option, that the great cities of New Scotland, New Brunswick and Manitoba were under the Prohibition Act. He explained the reasons why the Prohibition Act had not held its own in Ontario and Quebec, and expressed the opinion that while local prohibition might in some cases be successful, it was not a permanent or workable, yet the people of Canada were in favor of general prohibition throughout the whole country. Mr. Jameson closed his half hour speech by showing that the country would be immeasurably benefited by the prohibition of liquor. He referred to the fact that the Prohibition Act had not held its own in Ontario and Quebec, and expressed the opinion that while local prohibition might in some cases be successful, it was not a permanent or workable, yet the people of Canada were in favor of general prohibition throughout the whole country.

OTTAWA, May 29.—After routine business and questions by members, Mr. James O'Rourke, of Ontario, moved for the resolution in favor of the prohibition of the liquor traffic. This was a slight variation in the expected order of things, as the resolution of Mr. Cameron (Huron) for a repeal of the Prohibition Act, was first on the list. Mr. Jameson began by expressing the hope that the discussion and vote on his resolution might be kept clear of political and party bias. His motion was the natural and logical outcome of the action taken in previous years and of large numbers of resolutions presented to the house. A short review of previous parliamentary action was given with special reference to the occasion when the house affirmed the general principle of prohibition. Assuming it to have been decided that prohibition should come, Mr. Jameson proceeded to argue that the proper time had come. He referred to the fact that P. E. Island had endorsed prohibition by approving local option, that the great cities of New Scotland, New Brunswick and Manitoba were under the Prohibition Act. He explained the reasons why the Prohibition Act had not held its own in Ontario and Quebec, and expressed the opinion that while local prohibition might in some cases be successful, it was not a permanent or workable, yet the people of Canada were in favor of general prohibition throughout the whole country. Mr. Jameson closed his half hour speech by showing that the country would be immeasurably benefited by the prohibition of liquor. He referred to the fact that the Prohibition Act had not held its own in Ontario and Quebec, and expressed the opinion that while local prohibition might in some cases be successful, it was not a permanent or workable, yet the people of Canada were in favor of general prohibition throughout the whole country.

OTTAWA, May 29.—After routine business and questions by members, Mr. James O'Rourke, of Ontario, moved for the resolution in favor of the prohibition of the liquor traffic. This was a slight variation in the expected order of things, as the resolution of Mr. Cameron (Huron) for a repeal of the Prohibition Act, was first on the list. Mr. Jameson began by expressing the hope that the discussion and vote on his resolution might be kept clear of political and party bias. His motion was the natural and logical outcome of the action taken in previous years and of large numbers of resolutions presented to the house. A short review of previous parliamentary action was given with special reference to the occasion when the house affirmed the general principle of prohibition. Assuming it to have been decided that prohibition should come, Mr. Jameson proceeded to argue that the proper time had come. He referred to the fact that P. E. Island had endorsed prohibition by approving local option, that the great cities of New Scotland, New Brunswick and Manitoba were under the Prohibition Act. He explained the reasons why the Prohibition Act had not held its own in Ontario and Quebec, and expressed the opinion that while local prohibition might in some cases be successful, it was not a permanent or workable, yet the people of Canada were in favor of general prohibition throughout the whole country. Mr. Jameson closed his half hour speech by showing that the country would be immeasurably benefited by the prohibition of liquor. He referred to the fact that the Prohibition Act had not held its own in Ontario and Quebec, and expressed the opinion that while local prohibition might in some cases be successful, it was not a permanent or workable, yet the people of Canada were in favor of general prohibition throughout the whole country.

OTTAWA, May 29.—After routine business and questions by members, Mr. James O'Rourke, of Ontario, moved for the resolution in favor of the prohibition of the liquor traffic. This was a slight variation in the expected order of things, as the resolution of Mr. Cameron (Huron) for a repeal of the Prohibition Act, was first on the list. Mr. Jameson began by expressing the hope that the discussion and vote on his resolution might be kept clear of political and party bias. His motion was the natural and logical outcome of the action taken in previous years and of large numbers of resolutions presented to the house. A short review of previous parliamentary action was given with special reference to the occasion when the house affirmed the general principle of prohibition. Assuming it to have been decided that prohibition should come, Mr. Jameson proceeded to argue that the proper time had come. He referred to the fact that P. E. Island had endorsed prohibition by approving local option, that the great cities of New Scotland, New Brunswick and Manitoba were under the Prohibition Act. He explained the reasons why the Prohibition Act had not held its own in Ontario and Quebec, and expressed the opinion that while local prohibition might in some cases be successful, it was not a permanent or workable, yet the people of Canada were in favor of general prohibition throughout the whole country. Mr. Jameson closed his half hour speech by showing that the country would be immeasurably benefited by the prohibition of liquor. He referred to the fact that the Prohibition Act had not held its own in Ontario and Quebec, and expressed the opinion that while local prohibition might in some cases be successful, it was not a permanent or workable, yet the people of Canada were in favor of general prohibition throughout the whole country.

OTTAWA, May 29.—After routine business and questions by members, Mr. James O'Rourke, of Ontario, moved for the resolution in favor of the prohibition of the liquor traffic. This was a slight variation in the expected order of things, as the resolution of Mr. Cameron (Huron) for a repeal of the Prohibition Act, was first on the list. Mr. Jameson began by expressing the hope that the discussion and vote on his resolution might be kept clear of political and party bias. His motion was the natural and logical outcome of the action taken in previous years and of large numbers of resolutions presented to the house. A short review of previous parliamentary action was given with special reference to the occasion when the house affirmed the general principle of prohibition. Assuming it to have been decided that prohibition should come, Mr. Jameson proceeded to argue that the proper time had come. He referred to the fact that P. E. Island had endorsed prohibition by approving local option, that the great cities of New Scotland, New Brunswick and Manitoba were under the Prohibition Act. He explained the reasons why the Prohibition Act had not held its own in Ontario and Quebec, and expressed the opinion that while local prohibition might in some cases be successful, it was not a permanent or workable, yet the people of Canada were in favor of general prohibition throughout the whole country. Mr. Jameson closed his half hour speech by showing that the country would be immeasurably benefited by the prohibition of liquor. He referred to the fact that the Prohibition Act had not held its own in Ontario and Quebec, and expressed the opinion that while local prohibition might in some cases be successful, it was not a permanent or workable, yet the people of Canada were in favor of general prohibition throughout the whole country.

OTTAWA, May 29.—After routine business and questions by members, Mr. James O'Rourke, of Ontario, moved for the resolution in favor of the prohibition of the liquor traffic. This was a slight variation in the expected order of things, as the resolution of Mr. Cameron (Huron) for a repeal of the Prohibition Act, was first on the list. Mr. Jameson began by expressing the hope that the discussion and vote on his resolution might be kept clear of political and party bias. His motion was the natural and logical outcome of the action taken in previous years and of large numbers of resolutions presented to the house. A short review of previous parliamentary action was given with special reference to the occasion when the house affirmed the general principle of prohibition. Assuming it to have been decided that prohibition should come, Mr. Jameson proceeded to argue that the proper time had come. He referred to the fact that P. E. Island had endorsed prohibition by approving local option, that the great cities of New Scotland, New Brunswick and Manitoba were under the Prohibition Act. He explained the reasons why the Prohibition Act had not held its own in Ontario and Quebec, and expressed the opinion that while local prohibition might in some cases be successful, it was not a permanent or workable, yet the people of Canada were in favor of general prohibition throughout the whole country. Mr. Jameson closed his half hour speech by showing that the country would be immeasurably benefited by the prohibition of liquor. He referred to the fact that the Prohibition Act had not held its own in Ontario and Quebec, and expressed the opinion that while local prohibition might in some cases be successful, it was not a permanent or workable, yet the people of Canada were in favor of general prohibition throughout the whole country.

OTTAWA, May 29.—After routine business and questions by members, Mr. James O'Rourke, of Ontario, moved for the resolution in favor of the prohibition of the liquor traffic. This was a slight variation in the expected order of things, as the resolution of Mr. Cameron (Huron) for a repeal of the Prohibition Act, was first on the list. Mr. Jameson began by expressing the hope that the discussion and vote on his resolution might be kept clear of political and party bias. His motion was the natural and logical outcome of the action taken in previous years and of large numbers of resolutions presented to the house. A short review of previous parliamentary action was given with special reference to the occasion when the house affirmed the general principle of prohibition. Assuming it to have been decided that prohibition should come, Mr. Jameson proceeded to argue that the proper time had come. He referred to the fact that P. E. Island had endorsed prohibition by approving local option, that the great cities of New Scotland, New Brunswick and Manitoba were under the Prohibition Act. He explained the reasons why the Prohibition Act had not held its own in Ontario and Quebec, and expressed the opinion that while local prohibition might in some cases be successful, it was not a permanent or workable, yet the people of Canada were in favor of general prohibition throughout the whole country. Mr. Jameson closed his half hour speech by showing that the country would be immeasurably benefited by the prohibition of liquor. He referred to the fact that the Prohibition Act had not held its own in Ontario and Quebec, and expressed the opinion that while local prohibition might in some cases be successful, it was not a permanent or workable, yet the people of Canada were in favor of general prohibition throughout the whole country.