

WHAT THEY DO.
The most successful business men are those that keep their goods before the public. The best way to keep before the public is by attractive announcements.

PROGRESS.

HOW THEY DO IT.
Illustrated announcements catch the eye every time, and fine cuts cost but little. Send for estimates to "Progress" Engraving Bureau. Any cut reproduced.

SOME MORE COLONISTS.

QUEENS COUNTY AS A HOME FOR THE INDEPENDENT VOTER.

A Hundred Dollars Will Buy a Hundred Acres of Land—Magical Rise in Value When Property is Acquired by St. John Liberals—Some Sample Cases.

The advantages and disadvantages of Queens county as a home for voters have been quite fully discussed by the daily papers during the past week. The debate was started by the assertion that a lot of 100 acres had been "colonized" by a number of Conservatives in the interest of Mr. Baird, and that the fraud was so transparent that the revising officer had refused to allow the names of the voters to be registered.

It has since transpired that the lot in question contains nearly 1000 acres, that it is valuable for various purposes, that 100 acres of it were sold not long ago for \$300, and that Mr. Baird has had nothing to do with the matter. The revising officer refused to accept the names because they were sent to Fredericton, instead of Gagetown, despite the fact that other names previously sent to Fredericton had been accepted without question.

There are some instances of colonization which the severely virtuous censors in this case have not thought proper to quote. Perhaps the fact that the colonists have been members of the pure and unimpeachable liberal party has something to do with the silence in regard to them.

For instance, certain St. John liberals own 100 acres of land at Caribou lake. One corner of the property, a very small corner, is in Queens county, but such good grists as William Keltie, George H. Tapley, Fenwick W. Tapley and George F. Brennan have thought it worth while to qualify on this comparatively worthless piece of ground, in order to be able to vote against Tory corruption. They qualified some time ago, before the liberal papers awoke to the fact that colonization was a crime which merited summary punishment.

Still further up the line is another 100 acre lot, for which \$100 was paid to the provincial government. It is owned by Daniel J. Purdy, A. D. G. Vanwart, D. H. Nase and three others. All but one of this party of six are liberals, and all are qualified voters in Queens county. Indeed, Colonel Purdy is more than a voter. At the last Dominion election, he and Colonel Keltie stood by the roadside in Queens and hustled for all they were worth in the interests of King, purty of elections, and home-rule for Queens county.

The colonists who reside in St. John, and do their fishing and voting in Queens, are said to be qualified on "farms." The "farm" bought by Colonel Purdy and his friends for \$100 is located in the woods, about fourteen miles from the railway. It is reached by a road through a most heart-breaking country of rocks and barrens. There is just one house on the way, and that is all there is likely to be for the next generation or so. The road originally ended at this house. It now ends at the lake, and the enterprising colonists have succeeded in getting \$300 from the government to make the path easy to their \$100 property, when they visit it. The sum total expended on the property by its owners and on the road by the government falls a good deal short of qualifying all the colonists. Doubtless they consider the property worth six times as much as they paid for it, and so satisfy their consciences.

The colonization of districts by non-resident liberal voters is not a wholly original idea. The experiment had been tried previously in Stanley ward, with very gratifying results. A lot of land, formerly owned by the Connors, has for a long time given votes to a faithful dozen, on a valuation of \$1,200. The owners are John L. Carleton, Edward J. Carleton, Henry Finnegan, William Bridgeo, J. W. V. Lawlor (the coal contractor), Thomas Kickham, Richard Martin, John McGoldrick, Thomas J. Morgan, Joseph Harley and Thomas Kyffin. There was another man, but he died.

These gentlemen are not colonists of the tory stripe. Some of the are very good liberals indeed. It has always been supposed that there were nineteen of them, but the records show only a dozen.

The lot on which they are assessed, and which they value at \$1,200, has no mines or minerals, granite quarries or fishing privileges. Nobody seems to know just what is on it, though some allege that there is an abundance of excellent bog water and barren.

Hurrah for the party of purity.

Music Hath Charms.
Some of the newspaper offices used to regard the band practice in their vicinity as a nuisance. One man, at least, has viewed it differently, for he has been making the room occupied by the Fusiliers his camping ground, entering at night, after the band had left, and vacating before the members came again. He was discovered last Sunday, and hereafter the key will be hung in a different place.

SOME RIGHTS OF PASSENGERS.

Their Legal Position as the Owners of Trunks Checked as Baggage.

The people living along the line of one of the railroads are somewhat exercised at a recent attempt of some of the officials to decide what is and what is not passengers' baggage. In one instance, a station agent actually refused to deliver a trunk, which had been checked to his station, alleging that it contained "more than wearing apparel." He subsequently changed his mind, and allowed the trunk to be taken, with the intimation that the release was allowed by the manager for that time only.

The point in the matter is that some country people are in the habit of coming to the city with light trunks, and returning with heavy ones. The presumption is that they buy various articles for household use, and instead of sending them by freight or express take them with them as baggage. The express messenger is said to be "spotting" such trunks, and an effort has been made to suppress the economical, but fraudulent, custom of the travellers in question.

It may be well for both sides to know that railways, as a rule, have very much less power than they would make the public believe. They cannot refuse to check a trunk which the purchaser of a ticket declares contains articles for personal use. They cannot compel a traveller to open his trunk. It is enough, in a free country, that a customs official has such authority.

If A. declares that his trunk contains articles for personal use and convenience in connection with his journey, while it really contains valuable merchandise, A. is guilty of a fraud, and cannot recover damages if the trunk be lost. If a railroad official refuses to check a trunk because of his suspicions, he runs a risk of an action for damages, should his suspicions be wrong. When he has once checked it, he has bound the company to a contract to carry that trunk to its destination, and to deliver it when the owner produces the check for it. The check is a receipt, and as such an evidence of contract as the passenger's ticket. The station agent who refuses to deliver a trunk so checked takes a good deal bigger responsibility than he imagines, and should he make a demand that the trunk be opened in his presence, he asks that which is wholly beyond the bounds of his authority. It is none of his business what the trunk contains.

The officials in question must find some other way of making business than by "spotting" trunks. Otherwise, they may some day encounter a man who is inclined to litigation.

IT WAS A CLOSE SHAVE.

The Old-Time Druggist who Mistook Arsenic for Cream-Tartar.

The most marvellous escape from wholesale poisoning ever known in St. John occurred some years ago. About five o'clock one evening, a then well known druggist had a call from a little girl who wanted some cream-tartar. Her mother had sent her to the drug store, under the impression that the article would be pure than the cream-tartar of the groceries. She wanted the best, as there was "company to tea," and she was a woman who prided herself on her skill in making the abominable but tempting hot soda biscuit.

The druggist's clerk was absent, and a small boy with some knowledge of the business was acting as assistant. Finding the cream-tartar drawer empty, the druggist directed the boy where to find a package of the article upstairs, and it was brought by him to the counter.

There was no label on it, but it looked like cream-tartar, and it tasted like it. The druggist inquired particularly where it had been taken from, and satisfied that all was right, weighed out and delivered a quarter-pound of it. Before putting away the package he took another pinch of the stuff and swallowed it. It was one of his habits.

Scarcely had the girl gone than the druggist experienced a strange and terrible feeling. In a moment it dawned upon him that he had swallowed arsenic, and that a girl whose name and address he did not know was carrying a package of it which would infallibly poison about a dozen unsuspecting people. If the druggist had not been bald-headed his hair would have turned grey in the horror of the moment. As it was, he took the only course open to him.

First of all, he sent the boy for the nearest doctor, who by prompt action soon had the suffering man beyond danger. Then he gave a description of the girl, and his supposition as to the neighborhood in which she lived. On the strength of this, messengers were sent to prevent, if possible, the impending fatality. They had hard work, but they succeeded at last, and not an instant too soon. The arsenic-dosed biscuit had been baked, and the company was just preparing to sit down at the tea-table. It was a horribly close shave.

After that, the druggist took care that everything was labelled.

Newspaper Wrappers. For sale at McArthur's Bookstore, 80 King Street.

WATTS FREES HIS MIND.

HIS CANDID OPINION OF CLARK BRADEN AS AN OPPONENT.

Some Sharp Words From the Famous Exponent of Secularism—The Simple Conditions on Which He is Willing to Meet Mr. Braden in Public Debate.

TO THE EDITOR OF PROGRESS: In your issue of Oct. 12, you intimate that an explanation from me in reference to Clark Braden's allegations which appeared in the same number of your journal, would be in order. I therefore propose, with your permission, to make a brief statement upon the subject. It must be distinctly understood that I shall hold no controversy with this Braden through the press, as knowing his record so well, I am justified in saying that he is neither a christian nor a gentleman, but one who endeavors to live by posing as a representative of a certain kind of christianity in small districts where he is not known, and by the use of "strange encorsements" as to character, etc. Some years since he proposed to me and to Mr. B. F. Underwood, to go with him through the small places of Canada to discuss "secularism and christianity." "We could," said he, "make one hundred dollars per week by this plan." My reply was that when I debated it was upon principle and not as a showman, merely for money. His article in your issue of Oct. 12 is a tissue of falsehoods, written after his old style with a view to mislead the public and cover his own shame.

My original challenge, published in Halifax, was addressed to any of the clergy or their representatives, to discuss the alleged Divine origin of Christianity and the reasonableness of Secularism and its adaptability to human needs. To that challenge I adhere to the very letter. If Braden is put forward as the representative of the clergy of Halifax or St. John, I will meet him in debate upon the subjects named. But as yet he has been unable to get such endorsement. I have never insisted that Braden be endorsed by the ministers as representative of their views." This is an utter perversion of the facts. My demand was, and is, that my opponent shall have a ministerial endorsement as a representative of Christianity, as taught in the Bible.

With his usual proclivity for trying to hide the real point at issue, Braden says that the Evangelical Alliance and the ministers of Halifax did endorse him. For what? As a representative of christianity in a discussion with me? I have never heard of such an endorsement. If it exists let it be produced, and I am ready for the debate. That will settle the question at once, without any further subterfuge. Let the public mark the issue of this one point. The endorsement of the ministers of Braden was open at first to him as a lecturer, but not as a debater with me. But even this favor the clergy apparently regretted, for at Braden's last lectures in Halifax, to the credit of the local clergy he said, they did not even attend his meeting.

Whatever my endorsements are it does not effect the question. I am not asking this Braden to meet me in discussion. I hope never to fall so low as to do that. If I did make such a request of him it would be quite in order upon his part to demand endorsements from me. Now, inasmuch as I know his impure record and that hitherto no evidence has been furnished me that he would represent in debate any one but Braden, and that very indifferently, I can only regard him as a nonentity. If it is thought that I am too exacting in this matter, let those who care to test the veracity of this man, write to the persons whose names he gives as endorsing him. Particularly, I would advise them to correspond with those gentlemen mentioned by him in the second edition of his book *Problem of Problems*. As one out of many specimens I can give as to "the kind of man Braden is," I quote the following from a christian paper of recent date published in Prince Edward Island:

"We are in receipt of papers from Peoria, which contain articles on Clarke Braden's charges against Ingersoll. Both deny Braden's charges in very strong language; and both use very strong language in condemnation of Braden. As to the denials, we quote from the *Journal of Peoria*: 'As a whole, the charge is a monstrous and villainous lie, cunningly concocted and villainously planned.' And again: 'Mr. Ingersoll's domestic and private life is singularly frank and open, his devotion to his family and friends is not exceeded by that of any recorded, he is saint or sinner. . . . To represent him as belonging to a degraded and vicious class of the community is a great wrong to one who is the embodiment of generosity.' The *Peoria Daily Transcript* says: 'If the other charges in relation to Mr. Ingersoll's life and conduct at other places rest on no more substantial basis than do the ones concerning his conduct here, Mr. Braden is simply a monster of lying.' We quote as above in simple justice to Ingersoll. The denunciation of Ingersoll's personal character was not at all necessary to Mr. Braden's argument in favor of christianity and the bible. There were some old heathens in ancient times; and it would be strange, indeed, if there were not in modern times; and in America—where we breathe the atmosphere of christianity—some unbelievers of excellent personal character.'—*The Examiner*, (Charlottetown, P. E. I.), Oct. 7th, 1889.

Personally, I refuse under any circumstance to meet Braden in public debate merely upon his own responsibility, and I

am willing to submit my reasons for this resolve to a committee of the leading ministers of St. John and the editor of PROGRESS, leaving them to decide whether or not I am justified in my refusal.

It is amusing to read the following childlike boast of Braden, worthy truly of a Falstaff:

But when he [Watts] learned that a man had been selected to meet him who had held thirty debates with infidels—had backed out champions of infidelity thirty-eight times,—who, during the last thirty years has delivered over five thousand lectures on the topics to be discussed—who had defeated Mr. Watts three times, and who laid a challenge on Mr. Watts' table, at the close of the debate in Waynsburg, Pa., when Mr. Watts grabbed up his grip-sack and ran off the stage and out of the hall, the audience hooting him as he ran—when Watts learned that it was this person that was to meet him, like Bob Acres, "he felt his courage oozing out at his fingers' ends."

What sublime modesty! Vanity and self-conceit evidently are not deficient in Braden's composition. These qualities take the place of the love of truth and modesty which is sadly deficient in this self-styled "Second Daniel." The statement as to my having "run off the stage" ect, is a pure fiction. There is not the slightest truth in it. It is the base and wicked invention of Braden's diseased brain and perverted head. I am "not made that way." As to my "defeat," that is news to me. Evidently it was not in our debate at Salt Lake City, as the subjoined notice of the discussion will testify:

A THEOLOGICAL DISPUTE.

Some weeks ago Mr. Charles Watts, of Canada, began a course of lectures in this city on Liberalism and Free thought. Being a gentleman, his language and deportment have been those of a gentleman during his stay in the city, where he has given many new ideas to those seeking for truth, and created a very favorable impression among all classes. Willingly offering to debate with any or all exponents of the Bible, he extended an invitation to them to bring about a debate, when along comes a fellow well known as a "theological crank," who was anxious for the christian people to endorse him as an opponent of Mr. Watts in debating the question from a christian standpoint. At this juncture Mr. Watts produced evidence that this shouter for glory and staff, called Clark Braden, was as untruthful as he was insincere in his professed christianity, yet at the earnest solicitation of Mr. Watts' friends a meeting was arranged for at the M. E. church. The first night Braden was made a fit subject for shouter transportation. On the second night he fared no better, and much to the disgust of reputable christian men and women of the city. The debate finished last evening, but Clark Braden was finished the first night. He says in his rantings that, "if men were sinful forever, they would be punished forever." If this were true, another stock of bells would have to be arranged for at once to give him what he claims to be his just dues.—*Salt Lake Times*, Feb. 28th, 1889.

Permit me to say in conclusion (for I shall take no further notice of this man without the necessary endorsement), that if Braden can get the required credentials, either in St. John or Halifax, I will meet him upon the following propositions only:

- (1) That the bible is of human origin and that some of its teachings are erroneous, and would, if acted upon, be injurious to the well-being of society.
- (2) That secularism is based on human reason and is sufficient to meet the needs of mankind.
- (3) That christianity is of divine origin and contains all that is necessary to satisfy human needs.
- (4) That christianity is superior to secularism for this or any other life?

I take the negative of these last two propositions.

I object to discuss his worn out propositions, which only afford him an opportunity to read his old MS. upon "The Great Ideas and General Principles Inculcated," etc., which MS. he has made do duty for the last 20 years, and may mean anything or nothing. If I am to again discuss with Braden, it shall be upon definite propositions, involving the superiority of Secularism over Christianity, and the advantage of the secular view of the Bible to that held by the orthodox party. Be it understood that the above propositions cover my opposition to the popular theology of the day, and I am not concerned to do more. "The great ideas and general principles" of the Bible and Christianity, so far as they are good and true (and there are many such), I accept. But some of them are, in my opinion, defective, and I claim the right to say so. CHARLES WATTS.

Toronto, Oct. 21.

With Honorable Record.

Messrs. Barry & MacLaughlan have the sympathy of everybody, in their recent failure. Their embarrassment has been due to their enterprise and their pluck in trying to push business without a surplus of capital. Had they been able to realize as they expected they could, their position would have been perfectly sound. As it is, their assignment is without a preference, and is above suspicion. Their record has been honorable to the last.

Rather Mixed.

The engineers of the Fire department in the old city get \$45 a month where they formerly got \$50. The Portland engineers get \$41.60. The city drivers of double teams have \$36 where they had \$40 once, and the drivers of single teams receive \$31.60 in place of the \$36 given them formerly. The pay of both classes of drivers in Portland is \$33.33. The wages seem to be a good deal mixed, and it would strike the ordinary mind that the men are all getting less than they are worth.

RUSSELL SAGE'S ROAD.

THE FIFTY-MILLIONAIRE SHOULD TAKE A RIDE ON IT.

And He Should Carry Some Cash to Pay the Men—Their Improvidence in Eating Fresh Meat Last Year Should Not be Visited too Severely Upon Them.

The *Forum* for November gives a list of 70 men who represent an aggregate of \$2,700,000,000. Sixteen of these men are worth fifty million dollars each, and one of these happy sixteen is Mr. J. Russell Sage, of New York.

Mr. Sage is thus one of the owners of the United States—one of the peers in the great plutocracy where "government by the people" has become a name, and government by gold a fact. He is also the principal owner of the Shore Line railway, from St. John to St. Stephen, along which people are all too plenty and gold, or silver, all too scarce.

Mr. Sage was on a visit to New Brunswick the other day. He did not arrive or depart by his own line. It is not recorded that he went any nearer to it than the track of the New Brunswick road reaches in passing around the Bay Shore. Mr. Sage values his comfort, and he let the Shore Line severely alone.

He should have gone over it, stopped at the various stations, and chatted with the people. It would have pleased them to see a fifty-millionaire, and it would have been instructive for him to have seen his dependents without the jingle of two coins in their pockets. It would have reminded him of his own city, where the contrasts between great wealth and abject poverty are as common as they are severe.

The employees of Mr. Sage's railroad have not been paid for the last two months, or more. In that time, with a laudable view to economy, a goodly number of hands have been discharged, but even they have not been paid off. They have no idea when they will be. They are all dissatisfied, and some of them, doubtless, are hungry.

Perhaps they deserve to be hungry, because they have been improvident. With the experience they had when Greene, Lynott and Holt ran the road, they should be able to get along very well without any pay. Unfortunately, a receiver was appointed, and he paid them so promptly every month that they fell into luxurious ways. Some of them actually ate fresh meat and bought full suits of ready-made clothes. It may be argued by Mr. Sage that in the time of plenty they should have prepared for the years of famine, and subsisted on oatmeal and salt pork, but they did not, and the famine strikes them hard.

It is not so hard on the men who are now working as on those who have been discharged. The man who has a job can get credit, but the man who is in debt already and has no prospects for the future, is in hard luck without the ready cash. He can't get a job anywhere else, for he has no money to take him anywhere. In the meantime, if he has a taste for figures, he can improve his mind by calculating what he would do if he had the interest on the interest of fifty million dollars.

If he had that, and owned a railroad, he would probably pay the hands.

NO TROUBLE IN TRINITY.

The Surplused Choir Not a Cause of Disension Among the Parishioners.

A good deal of misapprehension has been caused by some ill-advised paragraphs in the papers in regard to a proposed surplused choir for Trinity church. While it is probable that such a choir will be a thing of the near future, the plans are in a crude state at present and it must necessarily be some time before any change can be made. In the meantime, there has been no feeling against the present choir, and no desire to dispense with the services of those who have been such willing workers. Nor, so far as is known, is there any feeling that a surplused choir would savor of "high church," as asserted. Every well informed episcopalian knows better than to talk in that way. The information sent to an outside paper, that Mr. A. H. Hanington had resigned from his position as superintendent of the Sunday school, because of the surplused choir, is simply untrue. For some time past Mr. Hanington has been anxious to be relieved of his duties, as engagements will not allow him to give them the attention he would like to give. His determination was made previous to any efforts being made for the mooted changes, and his recent action has "nothing to do with the case."

They Did Not Find It.

An Ottawa dispatch to the *New York Sun* says that, a year ago, two men found a chest of treasure at Mace's Bay, N. B., and that one of them has begun the erection of a fine house near St. Stephen. This, like most of the stuff sent from Ottawa to the United States papers, is a fake. The chest in question has been searched after for the last forty years, PROGRESS is in a position to state that the searches for the past two years have met with no success.

A GOOD MAN'S BET.

Which, Inter Alia, Will Occupy the Attention of the County Court.

The county court is likely to have an unusually interesting suit before it next week, in which Mr. Charles H. Fisher, proprietor of the news room, is plaintiff and a leading merchant, prominent in many religious and benevolent movements, is defendant. The facts are as follows:

Early in 1887, Mr. Fisher, being then a minor, made a note in favor of the benevolent gentleman's firm, for \$20. It was not met at maturity, and the head of the firm became possessed of the idea that Mr. Fisher would plead infancy and, escape liability. So, four days later, he wrote him a letter, warning him against the pernicious effects of such a course. "The involved is so small," said the letter, "that it concerns us very little whether you choose to pay it or not, but we do feel some concern for your character, . . . and we now ask you, in all seriousness, standing as you do on the threshold of life, can you respect yourself if you repudiate your promise, or can you any one else, knowing the facts, respect you? Then there is a lower view of the question, but with too many, we fear, regarded as the greater. Can you afford to repudiate? Is the good opinion of those whose good opinion is worth having of no value to you, and will it pay, do you think, in the long run to act in such a way that no reliance whatever can be placed on your promises? . . . Though the law may have no terrors for you, it is in our power to arraign you before another tribunal, namely, public opinion, and we may feel it our duty to do so. . . . Trusting that what we have said may be taken to heart and do you lasting good, we are, ect."

Mr. Fisher replied to this fatherly letter by alleging that the gentleman who volunteered such good advice had himself been guilty of going back on his word, and violating a solemn written promise.

This stirred up the benevolent gentleman, and the next letter was not so fatherly. "Produce that repudiated agreement," it said, "and I will hand you a check for \$50. More than that, whatever you have lost by the repudiation, I will restore to you fourfold. Now, young man, it is only necessary for me to ask you to produce that repudiated agreement at once, and to say, if you do not, that there is but one inference to be drawn. . . . Blaming you much, but pitying you more, I am, truly yours."

Mr. Fisher thereupon hunted up an agreement of a number of citizens to subscribe for the support of the newsroom. It bore the benevolent gentleman's name, but it was alleged that he had never come down with the cash.

Contrary to his hope, Mr. Fisher did not receive the check for \$50, nor was he paid four-fold the amount for which the subscription called. Thereupon he paid the \$20 note, and sought a lawyer to bring suit for the sum involved in the agreement.

It is understood that he does not seek to recover the \$50, offered by the benevolent gentleman. That is considered in the nature of a bet, which is looked upon by the law as immoral and contrary to religion, and public policy.

THE MEANEST IN CANADA.

Dr. Robertson's Opinion of Heathens, Mari-time Provincialists, and Such.

Rev. Dr. Robertson gave some startling facts about our great Northwest, while he was in the city. He showed conclusively that we had too many heathens at home, and that they were not receiving the attention they should. In one of his addresses he urged all young men, who thought of leaving home, to "go west," not to the neighboring republic, but to our own Canadian Northwest. In the same lecture he told how men who had lived Christian lives from boyhood, in the east, had settled in the territory, and had proved to be little better than heathen after spending a few years there. His descriptions of how men adapt themselves to their surroundings were a revelation to most of his hearers. They were enough to put all thoughts of settling in the Canadian Northwest out of the mind of any young man. The need of missionaries in the Northwest could not be more forcibly set forth, and nothing else he could have said or done would have enlisted more sympathy in behalf of the work; but when Dr. Robertson told his hearers that they were the meanest people in Canada, and that when he saw coppers on the collection plate in an Upper Canadian church, he always knew there were some provincialists present, PROGRESS thinks his remarks lost considerable force.

No Immorality Alleged.

A worthy Baptist who has construed an article in PROGRESS last week as a reflection on the moral character of the pastor of his church, has called to enquire about the matter. PROGRESS hastens to inform him that any such construction of the article in question is the work of a perverted imagination. There was no intention to convey the impression that the question of immorality was at issue in the fight. It seems rather a matter of who is to boss the church.