OTTAWA LETTERS.

Franchise Bill Amended to Meet Several Maritime Conditions.

John Connor's Twistings Throughout the Binder Twine Episode. Sometimes as Col Bros.' Representative, and Sometimes on Behalf of Their Rivals.

OTTAWA, April 28.—Yesterday's proceedings were much in the line of other days, except that at midnight the committee passtd four lines of the franchise bill. They were four rather important lines, for they commit the dominion parliament to the provincial control of the federal suffrage. The argument was completely against the government contention. The solicitor general was utterly at sea in his attempt to show that the original intention of the framers of the British North America act was to allow the provinces to deal with the federal franchises. The act of confederation itself furnished the answer to this contention. It declares in the clearest possible language that the franchise for dominion elections shall be only until parliament otherwise directs the franchises which the various provinces had at the time of union. The act of confederation is an imperial statute. When it was passed there was no parliament of Canada. It was necessary to elect the first parliament on some basis of franchise not established by that parliament. Confederation was not a miracle play, and therefore the actors could not appear on the stage "preparatory to being created." There was nothing for it but to adopt for the time being the provincial franchises, and this was done. Even then it was not enacted that the provincial franchises, as changed from time to time, should be used in federal elections until the enactment of a federal law. On the contrary it was declared that the franchise in force at the time should remain until the dominion should take action for itself. The franchises in force at the time of union were not laws of the provinces of Canada but laws of the colonies of British North America.

All these matters were discussed with clearness and force by Mr. McInerney, who has taken a leading part in the debate from the beginning, and yesterday by Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, Mr. Borden, and Mr. Powell, in whose hands the legal arguments were conducted with dignity and learned reserve. They did not claim to know it all, but presented their case carefully and with precision. Only Sir Louis Davies assumed to speak with certainty, and he was snuffed out by quotations from his absolute opinion expressed last year in regard to the Belgian treaty.

The latest development of the discussion is that the act now before the house is perhaps unconstitutional. Even the solicitor general does not appear to be quite certain on this point. It is admitted that the parliament has power to adopt any provincial franchise in existence as its own, but the question is whether it has power to say that every franchise which the provinces may enact in the future shall prevail for the dominion. The power of parliament to delegate its own functions to a different authority is questioned by Mr. Powell and Mr. Borden. The point seems to have been first raised by Mr. Haggart. Mr. Borden asked the solicitor general whether the parliament of Canada had a right to delegate to the local legislature the power to pass criminal statutes, which is one of the federal functions. The solicitor general would not say that the parliament had such power of delegation. Neither has he so far been able to show wherein lies the distinction between the transfer of criminal legislation and the delegation of another class of legislation which seems to be as much a part of the federal authority as that of criminal law. Professor Russell seems also rather impressed with this view of the case and is far less dogmatic than the minister of marine.

Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper made quick work in the afternoon of Mr. Belcourt's Australian analogy. So long as it appeared that the Australians were doing what the Canadian government now wants to do that example was useful for argument. But now that Sir Charles has shown that the second thought of the Australian people favors federal control of the franchise, we do not care much about Australia. The result of the recent Australian conferences supports in the full the claim of the opposition at Ottawa and condemns the action of our ministers and their supporters here.

For a man who has been in the Nova Scotia legislature and ought to know what happened between 1878 and 1882, it is singular that Dr. McLennan of Inverness should have attacked Mr. Mills of Annapolis and the Nova Scotia tories generally for their condemnation of the provincial franchise and its disqualifying clauses. Mr. McLennan wants to know why, if the law was bad, the conservatives in Nova Scotia did not repeal it when they were in power. Mr. McDougall was able to tell him the reason, since the doctor seems to have forgotten it. The conservatives did repeal the obnoxious clauses so far as the house of assembly was concerned, and did it by a large majority. But the legislative council, which is not conservative, threw the bill out, and so it remains.

Prof. Russell is acquiring a reputation as a subtle and ingenious reasoner. His arguments, according to Mr. McNeill, are too fine for the carnal mind to follow, and are available when the government case is desperate. The other day Mr. Russell paid Mr. McNeill a little compliment. He said that the member for North Bruce was always so earnest and sincere and lofty in his style that one derived some spiritual benefit from his discourses. In fact, he always felt after Mr. McNeill spoke as if he had been at church. Mr. McNeill had occasion to refer to Mr. Russell afterwards, and said that when he followed the subtle and involved arguments of the junior member for Halifax he afterwards felt as if he had been not to church, but to a place very different. He sometimes feared that as the sins of men in this world were made a whip to torture them hereafter, it might be their punishment in a future life for Mr. Russell to argue in his laborious way in support of a bad case and for himself, whose sins would need to be far greater, to have to follow him and try to understand. Such an awful possibility always led him to repentance.

Yesterday some papers were brought down. It turns out that Mr. Drolet, Sir Wilfrid Laurier's emissary to Rome, has got thirty miles of dredging rights on the North Saskatchewan, on a 20 year lease, at the magnificent rental of $50 a year for each dredge. He is compelled to employ not less than four dredges, so that his total charges for this monopoly are $200 a year. Chevalier Drolet got this bananza without competition. He was the only man that had such a chance, for after he got his claim everybody else had to tender for additional areas. There was competition when Mr. Drolet sold out his license. That is the way it came about that he was able to get $25,000 in cash and a large interest in the company which was formed to operate his areas.

S. D. S.

OTTAWA, April 29.—Hon. J. Israel Tarte has established a new monopoly. Rather he sought to establish one, but the commodity in which he dealt is apparently of too general production to admit of a corner. Mr. Tarte explains that he uttered a series of untruths in parliament last June in order to prevent the tory press from lying. If it seems to be rather strong language to accuse the minister of the crown of lying to the house, the charge is not a tory one. Mr. Tarte himself has sworn that Mr. Tarte deliberately made a false statement last session concerning Mr. Greenshields' share in the purchase of La Patrie newspaper.

The story last year was a very simple one. Mr. Tarte told it with an air of implicit candor. Mr. Greenshields was the lawyer of the party and purchased the paper for the party. As for the check to pay for it "there is no secret about it," and so Mr. Tarte explained what he said was the whole matter. "Mr. Greenshields had a check in his hand, not of his own money, but of the money of the party. He paid that check." Mr. Tarte now swears that Mr. Greenshields did not purchase the paper at all and did not go to the previous owners as a lawyer of the party. Mr. Tarte himself was the purchaser; he did not buy the paper for the party, but for his own two sons. Mr. Greenshields, so Mr. Tarte says now, had no money in his hands belonging to the party. Neither had he a check in his hand belonging to the party. On the contrary, he wrote out the check on the spot in his own name and on his own private account. Mr. Tarte swears that he borrowed the check, because neither he nor his boys were known at the bank in such a way that Mr. Beaugrand would take their check for his paper. In the morning, before the bank went into business, Mr. Tarte had raised the money among his political friends in Montreal and he then took up Mr. Greenshields' check and relieved that gentleman of responsibility for the $30,000.

So it appears that the story told so innocently and confidingly in the house in the closing days of last session was a pure invention. It was an untruth told by a minister of the crown, knowing it to be untrue, and intending to deceive the representatives of the people and the country. Mr. Tarte gives a grotesque reason for his deception. He says that he told the parliament that Mr. Greenshields did not pay his own money, and this was true. When he said that Mr. Greenshields did not pay his own money but a check of the liberal party that he had in his hand, he meant the accommodation check which Mr. Greenshields had in his hand after he made it, and it was therefore not his own check, because Mr. Tarte borrowed it. It was a check of the liberal party, because Mr. Tarte procured money from the liberal party some time afterwards to repay the obligation. And then in the simplicity of his heart Mr. Tarte adds the explanation: "It was at the end of the session, and if I had said that Mr. Greenshields gave his own check the tory press would have lied about me." So in order to keep the tory press from lying Mr. Tarte told the house that it was not Mr. Greenshields' check when it was his, and that it was a check of the liberal party when it was not. We come back to the original proposition that Mr. Tarte uttered these false statements in the house to keep the tory press from uttering falsehoods and apparently to establish a monopoly in this article of production. But the scheme, with all its great moral purposes, seems to have been a failure, for Mr. Tarte mournfully admits that the tory press went on lying about him as before. By this Mr. Tarte means that the tory press went on saying that Mr. Tarte gave his own check for La Patrie, a statement which Mr. Tarte contradicted last year, but which he now says on oath is true.

Mr. Tarte declares on oath that none of the money he raised that April morning in Montreal was contributed by Mr. Greenshields, nor was any of it obtained from the Drummond county people. He declines to say from whom he obtained it. It was apparently a free gift from the contributors to Mr. Tarte's sons, for the minister declared that his boys are now the sole owners of Mr. Beaugrand's late interest in the paper. There are, he says, a few stray shares outside, but more than nine-tenths of it belongs to the young Tartes. Besides the $20,000 obtained in this way there were $10,000 paid in notes. Mr. Tarte at first seemed to be uncertain about these notes. Possibly Mr. Greenshields might have endorsed them for the young men. He could not say. A little later he was inclined to think Mr. Greenshields had endorsed them. Before he got through with his evidence Mr. Tarte testified that the notes were given by the sons and endorsed by himself with Mr. Greenshields as a second endorser. So it would appear that Mr. Tarte himself and Mr. Greenshields are jointly responsible for the obligation.

But Mr. Tarte persists in the statement that no Drummond county money went into that paper. How much of this statement is of the character of the one made last year cannot be known at present. Possibly Mr. Tarte is still carrying on his great spiritual campaign of reforming the tory press. However that may be, the undersigned is strongly of the opinion that if the contract of last year had not been thrown out by the senate a large amount of Drummond county money might have been used for the purchase of the great Montreal organ of Mr. Tarte and the liberal party. As the contract did not go through, and Mr. Greenshields did not get his million dollars, there may be a little more truth in Mr. Tarte's committee statement than in his parliamentary statement. It would probably be safer to say that Mr. Tarte's financial raise among the personal and political circle in Montreal was not wholly unconnected with other great railway corporations that have their headquarters in that town. As for the minister himself his reputation for candor has gone forever. The premier's word in parliament cannot always be accepted. In fact there is no member of parliament who seems to treat it more lightly than the premier himself. But many persons have been in the habit of thinking that Mr. Tarte's cynical bluntness and ingenuous way of admitting transactions, of which most public men would be ashamed, implied a certain candor and straightforwardness. This tradition is swept away, and hereafter Mr. Tarte's statements will be heard in the house as are those of the other members of a ministry which seems to embody more direct and habitual mendacity than that of any other governing body outside of Crete. When Tennyson spoke of "Jack on his alehouse bench with as many lies as a czar" he used the best illustration current at the time of the Crimean war. But the allusion would be weak and feeble in the light of recent knowledge.

The auditor general is still laboring with the public accounts committee to discover some way out of his difficulties with the ministers. His repeated objections to their payments of money, without what he thinks is proper parliamentary authority, are overruled by the treasury board, but they annoy the ministers. Sir Louis Davies broke away yesterday and declared that Mr. McDougall had been going far beyond his authority. The particular thing to which the auditor objected was the payment of $8,000 to the Lake St. John Railway Company. The parliament gave the previous year a vote "for immigration expenses." It was intended to be an appropriation for expenditure to be incurred by the government in bringing in people during the coming year. Now the minister of the interior took $8,000 out of this money and gave it to a railway company on the ground that during the two previous years that company had settled some people on its own land. There had been no bargain beforehand to pay the company anything. The settlers had been taken in there in order to increase the value of the company's lands and to bring traffic to the railway. Having performed this service without the request of the government and for its own benefit, the company coolly came to the government and asked for an allowance of $8,000 in consideration of this past service. It does not appear that the railway people had brought a single man from outside of Canada. In fact, the minister of the interior did not claim that it had. His deputy explains the position by saying, "while it has not been the policy of the government to meet expenditure connected with the removal of the residents of Canada from one part to another part of the dominion, you will acknowledge that the government has power to decide whether such work is valuable from an immigration standpoint or not."

The auditor takes the ground that the money was not voted for this purpose, and therefore it was his business to interfere with the payment, seeing that it is his authority to guard against the payment of money for purposes for which it is not voted. He says "the railway company went into this expenditure on its own account without expectation that any portion of it would be paid by the government." And again he asks, "does it not appear to you to be opening a rather wide door when you are ready to consider the application for even partial reimbursement of any expenditure made without the knowledge of the government and as a purely business speculation? If one claimant meets with success it is to be supposed that every other who thinks he has worked even an indirect advantage, or can induce some once to pretend that he has, will not press for a payment from the government." Mr. McDougall also urges "that the government has power to pay from the immigration vote the expenses connected with moving residents of Canada from one part of the dominion to the other."

Sir Oliver Mowat did not think that the auditor' point was well taken. His dictum was expressed in plain words, "I think that the government may expend this vote for immigration expenses in such manner as they may think best adapted to promote immigration. * * * * I see no reason why they may not as a matter of law grant out of the vote for immigration expenses a reward for past meritorious useful work or a subsidy to encourage future work, if they think such a grant or subsidy would be promotive of immigration." Sir Louis Davies and some of his friends denounce the auditor general for presuming to differ from the minister of justice, though the fact is that the government paid the money, over the auditor's objection, before the minister of justice's opinion was even obtained. Now it will be for the gentle reader to decide whether the auditor went too far in stating his views.

The view taken by the late minister of justice is entirely new. The auditor says that no other government has acted on that idea. But it teaches parliament a lesson. If the government can use a general immigration vote to reward past meritorious services, it can take this year's general vote and give it all to Mr. Greenshields for his meritorious service in years gone by in building the Drummond railway through an unsettled country. Or it can make a present of $10,000 to Mr. Sifton or some of his numerous relatives for the past meritorious services of the family. The lesson is that there should be no more general votes, but that parliament, having regard to the power that ministers are now taking, should carefully designate the exact purpose for which the money is to be used. If the house does not want the immigration money to be parceled out as rewards of merit, it will have to say so in the vote.

S. D. S.

OTTAWA, April 30.—The long and painful progress of the franchise bill through the committee of the whole has ended and the creature has at length emerged in a battered condition. The solicitor general has added a good many amendments of his own and has accepted many others. He would have taken more suggestions from the other side if he could have had his way. Mr. Fitzpatrick has managed the discussion with skill and displayed much patience. Nobody makes any complaint of his treatment of the case. He has tried to be fair and accurate. But there is no denying that the bill itself as he presented it was a bungled affair. It undertook to adopt the provincial systems with a few general regulations. But so carelessly was the draft made that the regulations did not fit the conditions. It was found especially difficult to apply them to the maritime provinces' systems. For instance, the solicitor general would not have allowed an elector to vote unless his name, sur-name and addition were found on the list. Now the New Brunswick lists, as Mr. Powell pointed out, do not contain the occupation of the voter, so that by one fell clause Mr. Fitzpatrick would have disfranchised all New Brunswick. Then in Prince Edward Island they have no voters' lists at all, but proceed on the primitive fashion of passing an examination if necessary when they go to poll their vote. A special amendment had to be put in to meet these two cases, when Mr. Powell and Mr. Martin called attention to them. There were numerous other conditions in New Brunswick which required an overhauling of the bill at the hands of Mr. McInerney and Mr. Powell.

As for Nova Scotia, the greatest opposition triumph was securing the removal of the local disqualifications. Mr. Mills, whose criticism of the bill was of the most aggressive and effective character, has earned the gratitude of his party in the province. Mr. Gillies, Mr. McDougall, Mr. Bell and Mr. Kaulbach all got in good work. It was largely a maritime province debate from the beginning. Of course Sir Charles Tupper, Mr. Foster and Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper took a conspicuous part in the general discussion. Sir Charles Hibbert performed excellent service in working out the details. The fine legal minds and clear methods of exposition of Mr. Borden and Mr. Powell were exhibited to advantage, especially in the constitutional discussion. From the other provinces the most conspicuous debaters on the question were Mr. Monk of Jacques Cartier, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clancy, Dr. Sproule, Dr. Montague, and, of course, Mr. Davin. Dr. Roche defended the interests of his party in Manitoba and the liberties of the people there with earnestness, but without obtaining many concessions from the government.

It is impossible to say where the dispute between the government and the auditor general will end. The ministers seem to have turned against this officer of whom they were once devoted admirers. One recalls the discussion of previous years when he hears Sir Louis Davies and other ministers attacking the auditor for his "outrageous interference" with the power of the government. A hasty glance over the Hansard shows how seriously the ministers have changed their views within the past two or three years. In fact, it was only three years ago that the present minister of justice, speaking of the auditor general, said: "He must be at liberty to set his opinions against the ministers and over-ride the authority of ministers except on the cases mentioned in the statute." And again: "Unless it can be shown that the audit is dishonest, that the facts are perverted, that they are intended to convey an erroneous impression, then it seems to me there is nothing of which a government should complain in the audit of the public accounts."

In the same session Sir Richard Cartwright, referring to a complaint that had been made against the auditor's big book, said: "The real offence is that the auditor general has given for many years back a huge amount of information to the people of Canada which is inconvenient to the hon. gentleman and his followers. The auditor general has brought to light a vast number of expenditures which reflected no credit on the government. I think the auditor general has done his duty very fully."

And here we have the opinion of Sir Louis Davies himself: "So far as my intercourse with the auditor general has gone I have found him scrupulously careful to keep himself absolutely within the terms of his duty. He is a man who has conducted himself in a way that deserves commendation at the hands of members of parliament on both sides. He is an officer whose hands should be strengthened by this house on all proper occasions." And now Sir Louis is leading the attack on the auditor general and trying to weaken his hands. Since three years ago the criticism of the auditor general has been directed to expenditures of Sir Louis and his friends. As the auditor general is a liberal of the liberals, and is known to have exceedingly strong political views, it is very certain that he is not more severe on the present ministers than he was on their predecessors. It is true that he has occasion to point out that the ministers now in charge are attempting high handed proceedings, such as no Canadian government, grit or tory, ever undertook before. But that is not the auditor's fault.

In the meanwhile the public accounts committee goes on with its investigations. The binder twine episode was unraveled a little more yesterday. All the documentary evidence is before the public, and reveals the fact that while there were supposed to be two tenders, one from Coll Bros. and the other from the Hobbs firm, there was really only one. Mr. John Connor, who seems to be inevitable, appears to have managed both tenders. The number of letters and telegrams sent by him from various places, sometimes as representing Coll Bros. and sometimes on behalf of the rival tenderers, is astonishing. But the outcome of it, so the inspector of penitentiaries says, is that the department made a very good sale. Mr. Connor, as representing Coll Bros., did not take the contract, but Mr. John Connor, as associated with the Hobbs firm, was more fortunate. Whether the contract finally made was the best one possible would be difficult to say. The inspector testifies that he knew there was collusion between the alleged competitors, that he accepted Mr. Connor's assurances and announcements with a certain degree of reserve, but that in view of a falling market and the possibility that if he called for new tenders the price would be lower, he advised the minister to close the contract with Hobbs. While therefore it appears to be a sale of twine to Mr. Hobbs, it is really a sale to Mr. Hobbs and Mr. Connor, who are partners in the transaction.

S. D. S.

OTTAWA, May 2.—There will be another attempt to obtain the judicial revision of the voters' lists. This is the most important contention made by the opposition in respect to the details of the measure which has not been conceded. It was well understood, in fact it was expressed by the solicitor general, that he would have been willing to make this concession, and the same view was expressed by Mr. Russell and some other government supporters. But none of them were willing to vote against the cabinet on the question and the solicitor general, who is not in the government, does not appear in this matter to represent the view of his superiors. Still, as Ontario and Quebec by their local law provide for an appeal to judges in many if not most cases of dispute, it seems reasonable that the dominion parliament should provide such an appeal in provinces such as Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, which do not have it. The main objection from the government standpoint would be the invasion of what they claim to be the provincial authority, but this objection lacks force now that they have intervened in so many clauses of this same franchise bill.

If this small act of justice is declined by parliament the senate may amend the bill to that extent. Of course it is sometimes hinted that the senate as a tory body may throw out the bill altogether. The conservative senators have indeed as good a right to vote for a six months' hoist as Senators Scott and his grit followers had to vote unanimously, as they did, for the six months' hoist to the franchise bill introduced by the late government in 1885. But it is hardly probable that the thing will be done. There is no imperative necessity calling for it such as operated in the case of the Drummond deal and the Yukon deal, on both of which matters the senate has already been amply vindicated. The franchise act can be repealed by any future parliament which desires to restore to the federal authority the power that properly belongs to it. If the act itself is unconstitutional it will fall without the senate's assistance. There is an essential difference between an act which can be repealed and a gift of public lands or a sacrifice of public interest such as can never be recalled by the subsequent action of parliament. If the senate had allowed the Yukon deal to go through no subsequent parliament could have undone the act. If the senate had adopted the Drummond sacrifice the evil would have been committed past redress.

Nevertheless there is a duty imposed upon the senate to put the bill into proper shape if it shall reach them in an unworkable condition, as seems likely to be the case. The senators ought to rectify any injustices in matters of detail, and in general should exercise the complete power of revision. There is, according to present appearances, an ample field for the exercise of this power in regard to the franchise bill.

The little controversy between Mr. Blair and Mr. McInerney attracted some attention. Mr. Blair had undertaken to show that in dominion elections heretofore the lists had been arranged alphabetically, that is, all voters say from A to M voted in one booth and those whose names began with a later letter of the alphabet went to another. Mr. Blair made this statement with an air of certainty, stating that he perfectly remembered voing under this system in St. John. Mr. McInerney showed him that he was wrong, and the matter rested until a few days later Mr. Blair addressed a lecture of some length, and rather patronizing in manner to the member for Kent. In the course of this discourse the minister of railways stated that the incident occurred not in St. John, but in Fredericton, and presumably in a local election. Mr. McInerney observed that he did not require to go to the minister of railways for instruction as to the way in which he should discuss matters in the Canadian house of commons, and proceeded to show that Mr. Blair's mistakes in the discussion of the question had been many and various. The dying request of King Charles the First of England was "remember." Mr. McInerney says that the request Mr. Blair shall always have to make to his friends is embraced in the one word "forget."

The disappearance of Mr. McInnis from the Canadian parliament takes away the last hope Mr. Fraser of Guysboro may have had of the chief justiceship of British Columbia. The young and energetic member for Nanaimo was the chief promoter of the Fraser boom. He recognized, as all do, that Mr. Fraser has rendered great political service to his party and has always been ready to respond to their appeal for help in a campaign. Whether the appointment would have been suitable or not from a local standpoint, it would have had the sympathy of many members here. But it cannot now take place.

S. D. S.

WHERE WITCHCRAFT FLOURISHED.

Witchcraft is still rife among the Matabele natives, although the result of the "black art" now seldom goes so far as murder. The unfortunates who are "smelled out" usually suffer now by having their huts burnt down, and smoking ruins are no uncommon sights, although the crime is carried out in such a manner that it is very difficult to convict the offender.—Umtata Herald.

YE EDDYTOR AND YE MERCHANT.

Advertisement Which Was a Turning Point in John Jones's Life.

(American Grocer.)

Once in ye very olden time a merchant sayd to an eddytor: "I don't think advertising payes."

"Let me show you," said ye eddytor. "I will pytte a lyne in my paper and not charge you a pennie."

"All right," replied ye merchant, "and we will see."

So ye eddytor pytte ys lyne in his paper:

WANTED.—A DOGGE. JOHN JONES, 253 Old street.

Now, yt happened that 400 people eache brought a dogge on the nevt dye thereafter so that Mr. Jones (which was ye merchant's nayme) was overrunne with dogges.

"Since there are so manye dogges," sayd he, "I think I myght make some bvsiness, and will give you a pennie for each dogge."

Ye people took ye pennie each for his dogge, becvase there were so manye dogges, and Mister Jones skynned ye 400 dogges, and made boots and gloves from ye 400 hydes and thvs mayd

A BYG FORTVNE,

and thereafter added to it by advertising in ye eddytor's' paper.

The athletic woman is the woman of the day. The past twenty years has seen wonderful progress in this respect. That this tendency will result in a more robust womanhood, better able to bear the burdens and duties and pleasures of life, there can be no question. But this result will be accomplished by the building up of those women already in reasonably robust health, and the killing off of their weaker sisters. Athletics will make a naturally strong woman stronger and healthier; they will make a naturally weak, sickly woman weaker and more sickly, and if indulged in to excess, may result fatally.

A woman who suffers from weakness and disease of the delicate and important organs distinctly feminine, cannot hope to recover her general health through athletics, so long as she remains locally weak. A woman suffering in this way is unfitted to bear the strain of athletics just as much as she is unfitted to bear the duties and burdens of wifehood and motherhood. There is a sure, safe, speedy and permanent cure for all disorders of this description. It is Dr. Pierce's Favorite Prescription. It acts directly on the organs concerned in wifehood and maternity, making them strong and healthy and vigorous. It soothes pain, allays inflammation, heals ulceration and tones the nerves. It fits a woman to indulge in, and be benefited by, athletics. All good medicine stores sell it.

"Your valuable 'Favorite Prescription' cured me of female weakness and a catarrhal discharge from the lining membrane of the special parts," writes Mrs. T. H. Parker, of Brooklyn, Jackson Co., Mich. "I am now perfectly well."

Dr. Pierce's Pleasant Pellets cure constipation. Constipation is the cause of many diseases. Cure the cause and you cure the disease. One "Pellet" is a gentle laxative, and two a mild cathartic. Druggists sell them, and nothing is "just as good."

SOOTHES THE THROAT. QUIETS THE COUGH. ALLAYS INFLAMMATION OF THE LUNGS AND BRONCHIAL TUBES.

DR CHASE'S SYRUP OF LINSEED AND TURPENTINE

PRICE 25¢

MR. CHAS. BAILEY, of Close Ave., Toronto, and Manager celebrated Jessop Steel Works, Manchester, Eng., says: "As a quick cough cure for family use, I consider Dr. Chase's Syrup of Linseed and Turpentine the most wonderful mixture conceivable. This medicine cured me of a severe attack of La Grippe very promptly. My wife would not consider our child safe from croup and coughs without this preparation in the house.

Sold by all dealers, or Edmanson, Bates & Co., Toronto, Ont.

Rev. Chas. Fish, Methodist Minister, 192 Dunn Ave., Toronto, Cured of Eczema.

About ten years ago I felt the beginnings of what is commonly known as Eczema. The disease commenced in my ears and spread entirely over both sides of my head and also developed on my hands. During those ten years I was a great sufferer. Specialists on skin diseases treated me. As I write this I am commencing on the fifth box of Dr. Chase's Ointment, and, judging from the rapid improvement effected, I am certain that before the box is used I shall be completely cured.

CHAS. FISH, Methodist Minister, 192 Dunn Ave., Toronto.

Advertise in the WEEKLY SUN.