

THE GOVERNMENT TICKET

IN YORK. ANDREW G. BLAIR, WILLIAM WILSON, RICHARD BELLAMY, JOHN ANDERSON.

THE HERALD.

FREDERICTON, MONDAY, JAN. 20, 1890.

GOOD ENOUGH FOR ONE DAY.

The government is to be congratulated with the results of nomination day. They are as follows:

In Charlotte, the Surveyor General and Messrs. Hibbard, Douglas and Russell are returned by acclamation. They are all government supporters.

In Kings the Solicitor General and Dr. Taylor and Mr. White, both government supporters, are returned by acclamation.

In Gloucester the Chief Commissioner and Mr. Foirier, a government supporter, are returned by acclamation.

In Restigouche Messrs. Murray and LaBillico, both government supporters, were returned by acclamation.

In Queens Messrs. Palmer and Hetherington, both government supporters, were returned by acclamation.

In Madawaska, Mr. Theriault, a government supporter, was returned by acclamation.

Total 14 seats by acclamation—all members of government or government supporters.

In Victoria two candidates are in the field both supporting the government.

In Sunbury three are in the field, two supporting the government, one independent.

In York six Candidates are in the field, four for the government, two in opposition.

In Carleton three Candidates—two government one opposition.

The government must therefore get five seats from those counties which give them nineteen seats sure as the result of nomination day. A thing unprecedented in New Brunswick politics.

A coalition ticket of four is nominated in Westmorland, and a straight opposition ticket of two. The opposition is principally aimed at Mr. Hanington, and the government is certain to get two from Westmorland, which gives them a majority of the house already secured.

Most gratifying accounts come from Albert and Kent County. In the latter county the return of Mr. Leblanc and Mr. McInerney (government) is a foregone conclusion. In Albert the fight is sharp; but everything is favorable to the government candidates, Emmons and Osman. Two square tickets are contesting Northumberland, but Mr. Tweedie, who leads the opposition ticket, concedes that the government will be sustained throughout the province.

The government tickets prospects are very bright in St. John. Nobody pretends, not even those opposed to the government, that the opposition can carry the constituency. The most they hope for is to gain a couple of seats through the instrumentality of the scattering vote.

Advices from Carleton and Sunbury are very favorable.

THE CHARGE OF OVER-EXPENDITURE

Notwithstanding the full explanations given by Messrs. Blair and Wilson in their speeches, the Gleaner repeats its charges of over-expenditure. The charge has been thoroughly exploded. The fullest proof has been given that not only has there been no over-expenditure, but on the contrary the government has during every year but two kept the expenditure well within the income of the office.

Notwithstanding the full explanations given by Messrs. Blair and Wilson in their speeches, the Gleaner repeats its charges of over-expenditure. The charge has been thoroughly exploded. The fullest proof has been given that not only has there been no over-expenditure, but on the contrary the government has during every year but two kept the expenditure well within the income of the office.

ABOUT POSTAGE.

The statesmanship that sets itself out to figure how many letters a certain number of postage stamps will prepay is not of a very high order. Where one hundred, two hundred or three hundred dollars worth of postage is used in an office during a year the inference is that there must be a great deal of correspondence. Mr. Gregory affects to be amazed that the Secretary for Agriculture requires for his office nearly \$100 a year in postage, and as much more for telegrams. He knows absolutely nothing about the correspondence of the office.

If he wants the facts let him go to the Post Office and Telegraph Office and enquire. So far as the Secretary for Agriculture is concerned the gentlemen in charge of those offices may tell all they know about his postal and telegraphic correspondence. A little incident may be here related. When the present Secretary for Agriculture was appointed, he spoke to Postmaster McPeake about a P. O. Box, and said that he supposed he would like to have a P. O. Box of the largest boxes in the office. "Since then the horses have been purchased, the system of crop reports instituted and other changes entailing large correspondence have been made. The department today has over two hundred regular correspondents throughout the province with whom it is in communication at short intervals all through the year. This is the regular correspondence with whom the Secretary communicates when he desires information or wishes to impart it. Besides which there is the ordinary correspondence of the office. In regard to telegraphing, there is one way in which the bill can be reduced more than half—that is by persons repaying their telegrams; but they don't do it and you cannot make them do it, and you cannot refuse to take their unpaid messages as they might be of importance and such as ought to be paid out of the public chest.

The postage and telegraphic bill of a department cannot be controlled. It will vary as the business of the office varies. If any body says he can run one of the departments for less postage and telegraphic charges than they now expend, he is simply talking about something he knows nothing about. Departmental officers do not write any more letters than they have to.

THE BRIDGE.

To reply to all the calumnies which a conscienceless opponent may make would be a wearisome task. It is sufficient to expose some of them to show thinking people how little reliance is to be placed in any of them. We take the Fredericton Bridge which the Gleaner alleges cost \$125,000 and insinuates that Mr. Blair corruptly misappropriated a third of the amount. What are the actual facts of the case? The following are the official figures and show every dollar paid on account of the bridge:

Table with 2 columns: Item, Amount. Cost of Bridge, \$73,662.40; Guard Piers, 7,130.00; Repairs in 1886, 1,879.93; Repairs, 3,000.00; Repairs in 1887, 1,940.00; Total, \$86,512.33.

This is absolutely every dollar paid by the department of public works on account of this bridge, or directly or indirectly chargeable to it. Not one dollar is covered up in any other expenditure. There are no figures or amounts published anywhere, or not published; no statement of cost official or non-official; no papers, books, memoranda or anything else which warrant as much as a suspicion that one dollar above \$86,512.33 was spent by the province directly or indirectly on account of the bridge. Mr. Blair in his references to this matter not having the figures by him has, to be on the safe side, put the cost as little above this; but these figures are official.

What reliance can be placed on the statements of an opposition which deals in false charges like that above referred to?

Mr. GREGORY seeks to make a point against Mr. Wilson because he is Registrar of the University. As Mr. Blair pointed out in his Marystown speech the government does not appoint the Registrar nor have any voice in his selection. He also points out the well known fact that the Hon. Charles Fisher was for many years Registrar of King's College and yet held his seat in the House. He might also have mentioned that Judge Stevens was elected to form the nucleus of a good opposition and this is his own principal argument. Now if what the Gleaner professes to believe is true, there will be opposition enough without Mr. Gregory and York will do well to stand by the ticket.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

A HOLLOW CRY.

No greater fallacy can be imagined than that which underlies the canvass that "we want an opposition." Who wants an opposition? Does the City of Fredericton? And if so, why? Does the County of York? And if so, why? These are practical questions, and if they admit of an affirmative answer the reasons for the answer ought to be given. Does this constituency need an opposition in order to secure its share of public money? Had opposition representatives from 1883 to 1886. Did they serve the county any good purpose? Estimable men both were Messrs. Wetmore and Colter, one of them had been a member of the government, the other was leader of the opposition. What service did they render the county by being in opposition? What service could they render the county, and did not the county decline to re-elect them because they could no longer be of service? They had taken an attitude hostile to the government, and the county felt it could do better without them. This was the view the Gleaner took in 1887. It was a sound view. It is the view the electors of York will take next Monday.

"An opposition is wanted" they say. Opposition to what? To oppose what measure, what line of policy? The so-called opposition are silent in this county on this point. In Northumberland the opposition have something to talk about. They are opposed to the stampage policy of the government. Does York want any opposition to the government on this point? In St. John the opposition is on account of Mr. Ritchie's appointment to the Police Magistrate. Is there a man in the County of York who cares a straw about that? The opposition in the other counties is avowedly personal. It is not opposition to the government, but to the individual members from those counties. Take Kent for example. Mr. Phinney who leads the opposition there is not opposed to the government particularly, but to Mr. LeBlanc who is a member of the government. Take Carleton, Dr. Atkinson is opposed to Mr. Ketchum on personal grounds and hence picked a quarrel with the government over a railway subsidy. So in York if Mr. Blair would give up his position to Mr. Gregory the latter would jump at the chance of joining the very government he now opposes. His opposition is personal opposition to Mr. Blair. Mr. Allen is in opposition because his brother-in-law did not get an office.

Thus it is obvious that no principle unites the opposition candidates. Put them on a platform together and they would quarrel among themselves. Is such an opposition wanted, and if so, who wants it?

ABOUT POSTAGE.

The statesmanship that sets itself out to figure how many letters a certain number of postage stamps will prepay is not of a very high order. Where one hundred, two hundred or three hundred dollars worth of postage is used in an office during a year the inference is that there must be a great deal of correspondence. Mr. Gregory affects to be amazed that the Secretary for Agriculture requires for his office nearly \$100 a year in postage, and as much more for telegrams. He knows absolutely nothing about the correspondence of the office.

If he wants the facts let him go to the Post Office and Telegraph Office and enquire. So far as the Secretary for Agriculture is concerned the gentlemen in charge of those offices may tell all they know about his postal and telegraphic correspondence. A little incident may be here related. When the present Secretary for Agriculture was appointed, he spoke to Postmaster McPeake about a P. O. Box, and said that he supposed he would like to have a P. O. Box of the largest boxes in the office. "Since then the horses have been purchased, the system of crop reports instituted and other changes entailing large correspondence have been made. The department today has over two hundred regular correspondents throughout the province with whom it is in communication at short intervals all through the year. This is the regular correspondence with whom the Secretary communicates when he desires information or wishes to impart it. Besides which there is the ordinary correspondence of the office. In regard to telegraphing, there is one way in which the bill can be reduced more than half—that is by persons repaying their telegrams; but they don't do it and you cannot make them do it, and you cannot refuse to take their unpaid messages as they might be of importance and such as ought to be paid out of the public chest.

The postage and telegraphic bill of a department cannot be controlled. It will vary as the business of the office varies. If any body says he can run one of the departments for less postage and telegraphic charges than they now expend, he is simply talking about something he knows nothing about. Departmental officers do not write any more letters than they have to.

THE BRIDGE.

To reply to all the calumnies which a conscienceless opponent may make would be a wearisome task. It is sufficient to expose some of them to show thinking people how little reliance is to be placed in any of them. We take the Fredericton Bridge which the Gleaner alleges cost \$125,000 and insinuates that Mr. Blair corruptly misappropriated a third of the amount. What are the actual facts of the case? The following are the official figures and show every dollar paid on account of the bridge:

Table with 2 columns: Item, Amount. Cost of Bridge, \$73,662.40; Guard Piers, 7,130.00; Repairs in 1886, 1,879.93; Repairs, 3,000.00; Repairs in 1887, 1,940.00; Total, \$86,512.33.

This is absolutely every dollar paid by the department of public works on account of this bridge, or directly or indirectly chargeable to it. Not one dollar is covered up in any other expenditure. There are no figures or amounts published anywhere, or not published; no statement of cost official or non-official; no papers, books, memoranda or anything else which warrant as much as a suspicion that one dollar above \$86,512.33 was spent by the province directly or indirectly on account of the bridge. Mr. Blair in his references to this matter not having the figures by him has, to be on the safe side, put the cost as little above this; but these figures are official.

What reliance can be placed on the statements of an opposition which deals in false charges like that above referred to?

Mr. GREGORY seeks to make a point against Mr. Wilson because he is Registrar of the University. As Mr. Blair pointed out in his Marystown speech the government does not appoint the Registrar nor have any voice in his selection. He also points out the well known fact that the Hon. Charles Fisher was for many years Registrar of King's College and yet held his seat in the House. He might also have mentioned that Judge Stevens was elected to form the nucleus of a good opposition and this is his own principal argument. Now if what the Gleaner professes to believe is true, there will be opposition enough without Mr. Gregory and York will do well to stand by the ticket.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

THE DUNGARVON MATTER.

These facts are unquestioned: The Renous and Dungarvon were offered for sale for several years in succession. Messrs. Tupper, Wiley and others, without consulting the Attorney General, applied for permission to lease the streams for less than the upset price, and were informed they could have them only at the upset price.

The lease was made out to them and the rental paid.

Up to that time the Attorney General had no connection with the fishing club and did not contemplate having connection with it, and since he joined it the only transaction the club has had with the government was to pay the rent as it fell due.

Was there anything wrong in the government leasing the rivers at the upset price seeing that no one would give any more?

Was there anything wrong in the Attorney General joining the club after the lease was obtained?

No sane man can answer these questions in the affirmative.

Then where does the wrong come in? "Oh," says Mr. Gregory, "the club sub-let one of the streams for a larger rental than they pay for both."

Granted. Suppose the Attorney General had not joined the club, would anybody have suggested that there was anything wrong in this? If the streams proved more valuable than people thought, who should have the benefit if not the lessees?

Wrong can only be made out of this by supposing that the Attorney General knew the property was of great value (which it is not, being of no real value at all, for the protection costs more than the income) and sought to let his friends have it in an underhand way. If this is the case the wonder is that the lease was granted to Messrs. Tupper, Wiley and others, and not to the Attorney General. Besides the fact that the lease was offered year after year at auction without eliciting a bid, shows that no one thought it was worth anything, and proves there was nothing under-hand in the transaction.

The Gleaner pretends to have had a discussion with THE HERALD on the finances of the province and that the latter has withdrawn from it. There has been no such discussion. Mr. Wilson's masterly presentation of the financial record of the province as published in THE HERALD extra last week gave the fullest possible refutation to the Gleaner's charges. He showed that instead of over-expending, the government in the five years it has been in power has kept the expenditure \$36,000 within the income, and yet has made great expenditures than any of its predecessors. It could do this because it had a greater income than any of its predecessors, and surely the county expects the income to be expended.

Briefly the position is this. The present government found the province in debt on open account \$390,000. It paid off \$250,000 by issuing bonds and undertook to pay off the remaining \$80,000 out of revenue. It has done this. It has increased many important public works. It has had to pay interest on new railway subsidies. It has enlarged the Lunatic Asylum, bought and built upon the Asylum Annex Farm, built the Fredericton bridge, bought the government horses, built the government stables, built the new Departmental Buildings and kept the public service up to the standard and has to-day cash in its credit in the bank. The showing is a splendid one, and the facts cannot be controverted.

CHARLOTTE SENES the Surveyor General back with three colleagues; King's, the Solicitor General and two colleagues; Gloucester, the Chief Commissioner and one colleague. These counties vote confidence in the government by sending a full contingent in its support. Is it good policy for York to divide its support—to send enemies of the government to represent it? Is Mr. Blair too strong in the government for the interests of York? Charlotte, King's and Gloucester have themselves solid with the government, and will York publish to the province that she has too much influence with the administration? It would be bad policy, the worst of policy in the light of what these counties have done, counties represented in the government for York to return a full ticket. For the government will be sustained throughout the province. Make no mistake about that; it will be handsomely sustained. Therefore it is the interest of York to strengthen the hands of its representatives in the government, and to other counties may not be able to say: We have given the government a better support than York and have stronger claims upon it.

In St. John and elsewhere a constant canvass against the government is that it is "too much for York." The opposition proclaim it wherever they go that Blair gets too much for his county. Is it true, electors of York? Have you had more than your just share? Have you had the game of the opponents of York by weakening the hands of the Attorney General? What is to be gained by sending a man to the House, who day and night, in season and out of season, will plot and plan to injure your representatives in the government? Mr. Gregory represents no principle. He promises no reform. He advocates no new measures. He simply seeks to get where he can annoy the leader of the government. Defeat him he cannot; but has York no better return for the conduct of its representatives during the past four years than to send their most bitter opponent to the assembly? The election of George F. Gregory would be a calamity for York. He can do the county no good. He seeks only to do Mr. Blair harm.

FOR TWO YEARS the county has been deluged with falsehoods concerning the Attorney General and his friends. Every slander which ingenuity can devise has been spread far and near, and the man in whom the whole province has confidence, who has gone through session after session of the legislature without the slightest imputation upon his integrity, is held up to the county of York as recreant to every trust, as corrupt and dishonest. Does the county of York believe these things of Mr. Blair? Can they point to an act of his which will not stand scrutiny? Who are the men who assail him? Under which obligation have they ever laid this county? What guarantee have they ever given of honor and political wisdom? Compare the records of Mr. Blair with those of Messrs. Wetmore and Colter, Mr. Gregory and Judge for yourselves, electors of York, which of them will be your fittest representative?

THE Gleaner says: "Unless all signs fall five counties alone, Northumberland, Kent, Westmorland, Albert and St. John, will return electors members pledged to defend the government." If this is true (it is not true but suppose it is) does not the Gleaner's main argument fall to the ground? That paper wants Mr. Gregory elected to form the nucleus of a good opposition and this is his own principal argument. Now if what the Gleaner professes to believe is true, there will be opposition enough without Mr. Gregory and York will do well to stand by the ticket.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.

There is not an opposition in the province which was not criticized by the opposition which was not submitted to the committee on public accounts, examined by that body and reported correct. Not one item that every member of the Legislature has not had the fullest opportunity to examine.