OTTAWA LETTER.

In the Discussion on Mr. Flint's Prohibition Resolutions,

Mr. Sifton Frankly Admits That Quebec Rules the Roost.

Mr. Logan's Peculiar Course and Mr Mc Clure's Attitude—The West Huron Steal.

OTTAWA, July 28.—The sensation of the hours is of course the railway subsidy bill. This little sheet calls for the snug sum of six and a half millions, with great possibilities of enlargement. The calculation is made on a rate of $3,200 a mile except in respect of one road, where double that subsidy is provided. But in all cases the subsidy may come up to $6,400 if the cost of building the road exceeds $15,000 a mile. Our old friends Mackenzie and Mann come out of the affair pretty well, as the are supposed to be interested in the Rainy River railways, which are to cost $836,000 and $224,000; they are also supposed to be concerned in the Manitoba railways mentioned. The total number of new subsidies is 32, but many of those are beginning with the certainty that other subsidies are to follow. Of the new railroads, branches and spurs four are in Nova Scotia making 65 miles, and four in New Brunswick aggregating 62 miles. he Quebec bridge subsidy of a million dollars was bargained for some time ago and affords an interesting commentary on one of the arguments in favor of the Drummond railway contract.

When Sir Charles Tupper contended that the Intercolonial railway should be extended to Montreal by the North Shore of the St. Lawrence, thus taking in Quebec and opening up a large connection, it was urged to the contrary that this would imply a large expenditure for the bridge over the St. Lawrence. We are paying a sum equal to seven or eight millions for the Drummond-Grand Trunk extension and now we are to pay for the bridge also. Sir Wilfrid Laurier's home organ, LeSoleil, has been boasting beforehand about this bridge. It has informed the people of Quebec that Sir Wilfrid never forgets his own. It points out that Quebec city stood by Sir Wilfrid in the days of his adversity and that the whole Quebec district has sent a solid representation to support Sir Wilfrid at Ottawa. The Soleil points out that the premier owes his majority and his control of the country to the solid vote of his part of the province of Quebec, returning some 20 members, and that he recognizes his obligation to meet the requests of the brave people of that district.

This is not the first time nor the only source of the reminder that the liberal party of the country are in the control of Sir Wilfrid's compatriots. Of late there is a good deal of glorying over this circumstance. Mr. Bruneau's remarkable speech, pointing out that Canada was controlled by three Frenchmen, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Mr. Tarte and Mr. Bruneau, was a sample of the utterances which are becoming now quite familiar. They were uttered triumphantly after the plebiscite election, when the boast was made that the vote of Quebec had saved the country and the premier.

When this railway subsidy is passed this session will have voted $58,000,000, without counting the two or three millions voted to help the government out of last year's troubles. Over a million a week was the record before this railway vote came in, and now it is over eleven hundred thousand a week. It is a pity to break the symmetry of the thing by this new vote, as it was convenient to speak of the "million a week government."

Notwithstanding the million a week there are some reductions. The minister of agriculture has cut down his estimate for cold storage. Most of the members think that this was the one vote most beneficial to the farming community and one that ought to have been increased if there was to be an increase at all. Mr. Osler of Toronto says that this is the most useful appropriation of any. McDougall of Cape Breton points out that nothing has been done to provide for cold storage shipments from the Nova Scotia coast to points of consumption. Mr. Martin and Mr. McDonald of P. E. I. show that the products of that province have got scarcely any benefit as yet from the cold storage votes, and that the direct service from Charlottetown to England has been muddled and delayed so that the shippers have been put to great loss and inconvenience.

Sir Charles Tupper strongly urged upon the government the necessity of keeping up this line of usefulness. He showed that Mr. Fisher had borrowed the idea from the late government and had made a fair start to carry it forward. Now he was going back when he should be advancing, and the country was in danger not only of failing to continue the advance but of taking a backward step. Mr. Fisher, who was in a bumptious mood, was foolish enough to say that Sir Charles Tupper had been asleep and that he did not know what was going on. It happens that there is no man in the house of commons, or out of it, who is wider awake than the opposition leader, and Mr. Fisher found this out before the debate was finished. The minister of agriculture was told of his own shortcomings, and of his own record in the prohibition matter. It was shown that while he was impairing the cold storage service at a time when it was most urgently needed, he was consenting to buy up Quebec members by grants to wharves where there was no water. In the end Mr. Fisher became conciliatory and succeeded in getting his estimates through, but not until his leaders were informed that if they wanted to get their money voted they would have to restrain the impoliteness of their fancy farmer minister.

Sir Richard Cartwright had to make a confession during the day. He admitted that the fast line steamship scheme of this government was a complete failure. In 1897 Sir Richard denounced the fast line contract of the previous government and claimed that he was getting a much better service by the help of Mr. Dobell for very much less money. In that year Mr. Dobell fairly bubbled over with joy concerning his bottle necked ships, and the government press from the Atlantic to the Pacific piled panegyrics on the government for its cleverness in cancelling the old bargain and making a better one. In 1898 Sir Richard was still hopeful but less confident. He was reliably assured that Peterson and Tate were quite capable of carrying on the contract. They had only been delayed by strikes and other impediments. Mr. Dobell was full of words of encouragement. Later in 1898 there was a slight sinking of heart, but the minister had not yet quite given up the matter. In 1899 their whole programme was admitted to be a failure and Sir Richard admits himself to be completely at sea in the whole matter.

The senate reform resolutions will probably stand over till next year. The government is not so keen about reform now that the senate has refused to be bulldozed by threats. The bugaboo of the amphibious parliament has no terrors for anybody, and it is likely to be put back in the closet, to remain another year. If the resolution had been passed through the house the government might or might not have introduced it in the senate. Whether it did or not the senate would have taken notice of the performance and would have adopted a resolution stating the whole case from the point of view of that chamber. It could have been shown that the senate's action in nearly every case in which it rejected measures carried through the commons had been finally discovered to be right. Either the government has abandoned these measures or amended them so that in probably not more than two cases in the history of the country has the senate rejected the same bill after it has been twice passed through the commons.

The West Huron enquiry is going on morning and afternoon, and makes some progress in spite of the delay which the government is interposing. It is rather a difficult thing for a party to gather all its voters at one poll and prove that they voted for a certain candidate. But Mr. Borden is certain to prove that more votes were cast at the Colborne poll for Mr. McLean than were counted for him. There may be conservatives that have wandered away, there may be some who had voted for McLean without announcing it, but already the number examined is in excess of the number of votes counted for the candidate, and all the hammering of the lawyers defending the crime has not been able to shake the testimony of one of them. They have been asked what time of day they voted, whether they are sure they marked the ballot right, whether they promised to vote for McLean, to whom they mentioned the subject before and after, and when, and under what circumstances, and what they said, and what the other man said, and how he came to say it, and what they thought when they said it, and what they would have thought if they hadn't said it, and how they came to sign the declaration, and whether they told anybody about it, and whom, and when, and what they said, and what he said; and so on for a half an hour or more in each case. Usually some four lawyers repeated the same question, asking the witness if he hadn't sworn to something that he didn't swear to, and how he came to remember some things, when he couldn't remember some other things.

It is all rather tedious but the occurrences are lightened up occasionally with a laughable scene. Mr. Britton is a Kingston lawyer who regards himself a very insidious man. He caught a witness who seemed to be nervous and whose health was so weak that he fainted before the examination was over. Mr. Britton laid a trap for this witness and seemed to be very proud of it. The witness had sworn that he voted for McLean, placing his mark on the lower space on the ballot. Mr. Britton concocted a little ballot of his own, carefully placing McLean's name in the upper space. This he presented to the witness and asked him to show how he voted for McLean, expecting that the youth would put his cross in the lower spot opposite Holmes. The young man regarded the ballot attentively, took up a pencil and made an exceedingly neat cross in the upper space opposite McLean's name. Mr. Borden was watching the proceeding with interest, and raised a great laugh at the expense of Mr. Britton by asking that the ballot should be filed as an exhibit and become part of the evidence. So the record of this case so long as it remains will contain the ingeniously devised ballot of Mr. Britton.

Senator Perley rather resents the statement of the St. John Telegraph that the seventeen conservatives who voted for his motion to hoist the Grand Trunk railway bill were dull and stupid persons. Mr. Perley is of the opinion that these senators have shown as good judgment and attained as much success in the affairs of life and in the business of the country as the author of this criticism. Whatever opinion may be held as to the course pursued, Mr. Perley and his colleagues can hardly be described as dull and stupid people. Among them are Senator Wood of New Brunswick, who is regarded as one of the ablest men in the senate, and Senator Miller of Nova Scotia, whose knowledge and ability are everywhere admitted. The other Nova Scotian senators, McDonald, Almon, McKay and Primrose are not usually regarded as dull men, nor is Senator Prowse of P. E. I. Mr. DeBoucherville has been a premier of his province, and the other dissidents are at least the equal in knowledge and ability with the average senator appointed by this administration.

Mr. Mills complains that the senate is giving him a hard time with government bills. He says they criticise them with great severity and suggest great numbers of amendments. The truth seems to be that Mr. Mills is himself very slovenly in preparing his legislation. He does not see the effect of things and is often only too glad to have corrections made so as to give some sense to the proposed legislation. Then he is often imposed upon by his colleagues, who send him all the crude legislation to introduce in the senate, so that it can be put into some kind of shape before it reaches the commons. Again, Mr. Mills fails to pursuade his colleagues of some things he wants to do. He had a measure prepared to add $500 to the salary of the divorce court judges in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. No doubt these judges have a good deal of extra work, but the colleagues of the minister of justice refuse to entertain his proposition and it does not come before parliament. S. D. S.

OTTAWA, July 29.—Mr. Flint got his day for provincial prohibition, but his resolution, after dragging on through the afternoon and evening and until three o'clock this morning, did not reach a vote. It had been intended to divide, but before midnight things had got so mixed on the government side of the house that the ministers were no doubt ready to have the matter postponed for further reflection. The ministerial position was pretty clear. We may acquit Mr. McClure of proposing his prohibition amendment to Mr. Flint's motion at the time and in the manner he did in order to help the government out of a hole. But the effect of his motion was that it enabled Mr. Parmalee to come in with a second amendment, which will have the support of the whole French-Canadian representation, and is expected to shut out the McClure motion altogether.

Mr. Flint is not over zealous in the advocacy of prohibition. He devoted almost as much time to the work of excusing the government for taking no action as he did to the rest of his argument. Whatever may be Mr. Flint's state of conscience, he can at least rest assured that he has not given any trouble to the government which has refused to carry out the mandate of the people. Mr. McClure takes sterner grounds. He condemns the government on this issue in the strongest way. Perhaps this condemnation has less terrors for Sir Wilfrid than it would if it came from some other member, and much less than it would if Mr. McClure had not taken the trouble to say that he condemned the opposition party equally, and that he still supported the government on all other issues. But Mr. McClure made a strong prohibition speech, and censured the ministry for refusing to take any action of any kind in consequence of the plebiscite vote. He insisted that even from the government point of view the vote called for some action, if not for a general prohibitory law. Mr. McClure intends to hold the government responsible for the performance of its duty, and will have nothing to do with individual projects brought in by members like Mr. Flint. If the ministers refuse to perform this obvious duty, Mr. McClure will scold them for it—and will continue to support them on all other issues.

Sir Charles Tupper does not think that Mr. Flint's project is any good. He prefers the Scott Act and declines to assist in bringing this new element into the case, with all the legal complications and commercial complications which must come with it. He reviewed the circumstances which had led up to the present situation, sympathising with Mr. Flint, who had closed his career as a prohibitionist by apologising for a government which had deluded the temperance people and all the people of Canada. Mr. Flint's resolution was simply designed to protect the ministry from the effects of its own treachery. In the course of his remarks Mr. Flint had gone out of his way to reflect on the late Sir George Cartier, who had said that the ideal parliament was one that would confine itself to voting estimates required by the government. Sir Charles was of the opinion that Cartier did not mean this seriously, but he pointed out that the ideal parliament of Cartier had arrived at last. The present government was so well satisfied with the work of its predecessor that it opened parliament this year with only two measures forecast. One was for senate reform, which had been withdrawn, and the other was a measure to gerrymander the country in order that the ministers might escape the rebuke of the constituency that had elected them. But when it came to voting estimates the parliament had reached a state which Cartier could never have dreamed of when it asked for $58,000,000 in one session. In this connection Sir Charles suggested a little more gerrymander and proposed that the temperance people be disfranchised in a block, so they could not punish this government for deceiving them.

The revenue argument has no terrors for the opposition leader. The $8,000,000 received from liquor taxes is in his mind an absolutely paltry consideration. A sober and industrious people could make up the amount without feeling it, and for that matter the $8,000,000 could be taken out of the extravagant supply bills without much loss to the country. Sir Charles pointed out that the liberal party had put the plebiscite plank in their platform to capture the temperance vote, and no doubt it had been largely successful. They had made the people believe that they intended to do something, and when the plebiscite bill was passed they gave out statements which were intended to make the temperance people think that the will of the majority of voters who went to the polls would be carried out. At the same time, as it was now admitted, there was a secret understanding that action would not follow the vote, even though there would be such a majority. The temperance people had gone to the polls, had spent their time and money in organizing, and all the time Sir Wilfrid kept in his breast the secret of his intention to disregard the result. If the people of Canada had known that the government was attaching an impossible condition to this vote they would have had nothing to do with the plebiscite.

Sir Charles read the view expressed by some of the churches and temperance bodies on this matter, and agreed with them that an unfair advantage had been taken of the temperance people.

To the surprise of the many members, Mr. Charlton, who in former days was a most insistent prohibitionist, and who made all the trouble he could for the late government on this issue, took the floor declaring the government had done all that could be expected. He believed that there was no authority in the plebiscite for a prohibitory law, and declared that the government had fulfilled all its pledges when it submitted the question to the people.

This is not the view of Mr. Brodeur of Dundas, who declared his intention to vote against every amendment which would take the responsibility from the government. It was he who called attention to the position of Mr. Fisher, who on his own statement had been made a minister on the strength of his prohibition principles, and who was now opposing prohibition as strongly as he had before supported it. Mr. Fisher is a member of the executive of the Dominion Alliance, which had condemned the government of which he was a member. Like the old bishop who was also a king, and who prayed in one capacity while he swore in another, Mr. Fisher as a member of the Alliance was condemning the course he was taking as a member of the government. When the plebiscite campaign was on and Mr. Fisher's colleagues in Quebec were doing all they could against prohibition, Mr. Fisher kept himself in cold storage in Ottawa.

Moore of Stanstead, one of the leading members of the Dominion Alliance, took the strongest possible ground against Mr. Flint's scheme. He objected to it on general principles, and in particular because that portion of Quebec in which he lived was strongly in favor of prohibition. Under Mr. Flint's scheme it would be absolutely shut out from all hopes of checking the liquor traffic for a generation to come. Mr. Moore gave some entertaining information in regard to the Quebec vote, quoting the results in a number of polls, where out of a hundred to one hundred and fifty registered voters the ballots cast were in some cases within three or four of the total number, and in some cases larger than the total number on the list. He gave a list of a dozen polls or thereabouts, in which the vote recorded was 1,330 out of a possible 1,357, which of course must have been a fraudulent vote.

Mr. Bell of Prince Edward Island made a long and somewhat involved argument in defence of the course of the government. He held that the ministers were perfectly justified in refusing prohibition, dwelling particularly upon the adverse vote of Quebec. He also invented the fresh excuse that the government knew if they brought in a prohibitory bill the senate would throw it out. This produced some amusement, as it was apparent to every member in the house that the government would have been only too glad to have such a bill thrown out by the senators and thus have escaped the responsibility for both the enactment and the refusal of the measure.

The only minister who spoke on the discussion was Mr. Sifton, who declared himself a temperance man, but asserted that it would be the height of legislative folly to pass such a law with the province of Quebec against it. Such an injustice to Quebec would be doubly injurious and offensive coming from people of a different race and language, and naturally it would be resented by the French Canadians. This frank acknowledgement from a minister that it was never the intention to adopt liquor legislation unsatisfactory to Quebec is instructive. It would have been much more so if the declaration had been made last year. No member of the house, and probably no man or woman in Canada, expected that Quebec would give a majority in favor of prohibition. If the government had anounced that it was not intended to introduce the prohibitory law unless the majority of the people of Quebec asked for it, a great deal of anxiety and useless exertion would have been spared. The country would hardly have contributed a quarter of a million from the treasury and two or three times that sum from private sources to bring out a vote the result of which was known beforehand, especially since the plebiscite had already been taken in most of the English provinces.

Mr. Wilson of Lennox, conservative, a member of the Dominion Alliance, caused it to be understood that this resolution of Mr. Flint did not come from any body of temperance people as such. It had been submitted to the alliance and only the liberal members of that body had accepted it. From that hour the measure had been in charge of the grit members of the alliance altogether and was apparently used to take away the attention of the people from the main issue. Mr. Richardson of Lisgar, a government supporter, is in favor of prohibition and believes that the government was fully authorized to go on in that direction. Dr. Roche, conservative, for Manitoba, took the same view, and Mr. Henderson, conservative, of Halton, informed the house that his constituents had shown their disapproval of local option laws by rejecting the Scott Act, while by a large majority they had voted in favor of national prohibition. He intended to vote in the same direction. Mr. Davin expressed himself strongly in condemnation of the action of the government and read from Mr. Tarte's organ article after article, printed during the campaign, denouncing prohibition, and the whole organization of "water drinkers."

Mr. Bourassa was the only French member who took part in the discussion. He is the secretary of the international treaty commission, and defends his leaders with great earnestness. Mr. Bourassa insists that nothing less than a majority of the total registered vote would be authority for the government to act in a matter of this kind. The last speaker was Mr. Logan of Cumberland, who informed the house that his county had given the largest majority of any in favor of prohibition, and that he intended to carry out the promise made in Amherst that if the majority of qualified electors voted for prohibition he would support it in the house. Having thus squared himself with the people of Cumberland, Mr. Logan devoted the whole of his speech to the work of squaring himself with the government. He ransacked all the files he could find to collect utterances in favor of the view that nothing less than a majority vote of all the electors of Canada would be a mandate for the government to pass a prohibitory law. Most of his readings were from recent editorials in the Halifax Chronicle justifying the course of the government, so that while Mr. Logan promised to vote for prohibition, his whole speech was a commendation of the government for refusing prohibition, and a plea to other members not to vote as Mr. Logan voted.

Yesterday's episode in the West Huron enquiry opens up a new line of investigation. We have now heard something from three polls in that constituency. From one poll 41 electors have sworn and maintained in the face of the most severe and even brutal cross-examination that they voted for McLean, whereas only 30 ballots are accounted for. In this poll 16 ballots were found, evidently brought in from some foreign source. They differ from the other ballots, supposed to be taken from the same pad, are marked in ink, while the others are marked in pencil, and all bearing a cross opposite the name of the government candidate. It is found that not one officer at this poll was sworn in, that unauthorized persons were allowed to assist in counting the ballots, that a grit scrutineer was allowed to act as poll clerk, that the returning officer failed to mark the counterfoils, as the law requires, and put them in his pocket, which the law forbids.

In another poll it is found that the grit heeler who was made returning officer had escaped to the United States to avoid giving evidence, and that conservative ballots marked for the conservative candidates were found scattered on the floor where he held the poll. In the third polling place the returning officer was not sworn in. Neither were any of the other officials. Two forged ballots have been discovered, and it has been found that Cap. Sullivan, of the machine garg of pluggers and desperadoes, was engaged at this point of operations. Everywhere that the enquiry had touched it had found something wrong, and in view of what has been discovered the only surprising thing is that Mr. Holmes, who sits in the house and commends the government for refusing to carry out its promises, did not have a majority of a thousand.

Sir Henri Joly is not a witty man, but can make the house laugh at the expense of the coutry. A government bill for the regulation of penitentiaries was under discussion yesterday, and one of the features of the measure dealt with the use of tobacco for the convicts. Mr. Mills is not disposed to allow tobacco to be used, and the legislation is in support of his policy. To the surprise of the house, and especially of the premier, Sir Henri rose to plead for the prisoner, pointing out that tobacco was a great solace and comfort to a man in trouble and that it was cruel to deprive a well behaved prisoner of this one last consolation. Mr. Foster welcomed Sir Henri to the ranks of the opposition, but suggested that it was vain for him to appeal to the house against the cabinet measure which Sir Henri himself must have approved. The minister, amid great laughter at his expense, explained that Mr. Mills did not smoke and that it was impossible to move him to pity. S. D. S.

OTTAWA, July 31.—It may be assumed that prohibition, provincial or national, will not be heard from any more this year. On the whole the government has managed this business rather adroitly. It was late before the ministers announced that they would do nothing. It was much later before Mr. Flint, whose principal function appears to be to help the government out of its difficulties with the temperance people, discovered his remedy. Then he took his time getting it on the order paper, and it was crowded down so that the private members' time was about exhausted before the order was reached. But Mr. Flint thought it was necessary to say something, so he got the premier to assign a day for the discussion of Mr. Flint's way of escape. The motion came up on Friday and brought out two amendments with several expressions of opinion which showed that a division of the house might bring about some awkwardness. It is true that Mr. Charlton, Mr. Holmes (whose election is being investigated in the privileges committee), Mr. Parmelee, Mr. Logan, Mr. Flint himself and Mr. Sifton and other government supporters came to the rescue of the ministers with excuses and reasons, but on the other hand Mr. McClure, Mr. Richardson and even Mr. Logan anounced that they would have to vote for straight prohibition.

It became necessary to head off the vote and this was done by the simple expedient of adjourning the debate and leaving it adjourned until after the members had gone home. The eloquent member for Gaspe, Mr. Lemieux, who has no patience with the "water drinkers," at the suggestion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier proposed the adjournment, and it was adopted. The churches, the temperance societies, and all other religious and temperance bodies and individuals may now resolve and resolve, but the government is safe for another year, unless the prohibitionists choose to get in their work in the by-elections, but the government does not appear to be much afraid of that. The "threshing machine" is probably considered more than a sufficient offset to anything that the temperance people can say or do.

Saturday's discussion on the question of ministers' salaries affords a pleasant example of the fluctuations of ministerial policy. Everybody is willing that Mr. Paterson, who roars louder than any other minister, and can break more desks with his fist in a day than all the rest of the cabinet can break in a session, should have as much say as his colleagues. Sir Henri Joly is not so fierce in his moods as the minister of customs, but he is more entertaining. It is absolutely refreshing to see him come into the house with a mild protest against the government bill which is supposed to be his own. When the minister of inland revenue gravely appeals to the chamber against the anti-tobacco legislation of the minister of justice, the house is not convulsed with laughter, but is radiant with smiles. Since government by cabinet has been established the spectacle has not been seen of a minister criticizing a government bill until Sir Henri established the practice. If he will do that two or three times a session his opponents at least will be willing that he shall not be docked two thousand dollars of the regulation salary.

But what do the great liberal party think about it? For years we have been hearing that the ministers cost too much and that there were too many of them. Mr. Mulock has delivered numerous orations on the subject, affirming that seven ministers are all that is necessary. Sir Richard Cartwright has pointed out that the Canadian government has twice as many ministers as the United States government, and a large part of the campaign against the late ministry was that the people were paying entirely too much in ministerial salaries.

When this government was organized no reduction was made in the number of portfolios. But the two controllers were elevated to the rank of ministers. The excuse offered was that the reduction of portfolios could not be made at once, but that it would be done gradually. The heads of the department of customs and excise were left with the controller's salary, with the assurance that when a portfolio was abolished they would be brought up to full status. So confirmed was the government in its intention that the act now on the statute book making ministers out of the controllers contained the clause that their salaries would be increased as soon as the number of ministers was reduced by one.

Now we have the next step. The salaries are increased and the number of ministers is not reduced by one. We have fourteen ministers in full pay, which is an increase over the number at any previous time, and therefore it intensifies the evil, which so worked upon the feelings of Sir Richard Cartwright and Mr. Mulock in other days. Sir Richard's case is the most humiliating of any, for he holds a portfolio which he has himself declared to be useless, and which has had taken from it all the responsibility it had when he made this declaration. Sir Charles Tupper now agrees with him that the department ought to be abolished, and the only defence the premier has is found in the statement that Sir Richard Cartwright is useful as a sort of a general assistant in other departments. Sir Wilfrid himself says that he does not remember having advocated a reduction in the number of ministers, and in so saying he condemns and repudiates the denunciations of the gentlemen who are now his chief colleagues. It is beautiful to see with what cheerfulness Sir Richard accepts the situation. He does not pretend that he has no work to do in his present situation. His only record, as Sir Charles Tupper points out, is the destruction

Few men understand women. When a woman is weak, sickly, nervous, fretful, irritable and despondent, the average husband imagines that she is simply out of temper. An average husband will probably simply go out and leave her alone for awhile, "to have it out with herself." A bad husband is liable to go off and get drunk. The fact is that the poor wife is suffering from illness of a description that breaks a woman down sooner than any thing else. Her back is weak and aches. Her "sides stitch." She has pains and a dragging sensation in the abdomen. Her appetite is touchy and she suffers from nausea. She has sick headaches, giddiness, dizziness, cold chills, flutterings of heat, shortness of breath, palpitation, disturbed sleep, frightful dreams, irregularities and nervous and trembling sensations. Her pain-racked nerves are a continual torture.

A woman in this condition is suffering from weakness and disease of the delicate and important organs concerned in wifehood and motherhood. Dr. Pierce's Favorite Prescription makes these organs strong and well. It allays inflammation, heals ulceration and soothes pain. It has transformed thousands of sickly, nervous, petulant, childless and unhappy women into happy, healthy, helpful, amiable wives and mothers. It banishes the discomforts of the period of prospective maternity and makes baby's advent easy and almost painless. Good medicine dealers sell it and an honest druggist does not try to urge upon you an inferior substitute for a little extra profit.

Dr. Pierce's Common Sense Medical Adviser, a 1008-page home doctor-book, paper-covered, sent for 21 one-cent stamps, to cover customs and mailing only, or French cloth binding 50 stamps. Address Dr. R. V. Pierce, Buffalo, N. Y.

SURPRISE

IS THE NAME OF THE SOAP that has peculiar qualities for washing clothes and is good for all uses.

HIGHEST IN QUALITY.

Cook's Cotton Root Compound

Is successfully used monthly by over 10,000 Ladies. Safe, effectual. Ladies ask your druggist for Cook's Cotton Root Compound. Take no other, as all Mixtures, pills and imitations are dangerous. Price, No. 1, $1 per box, No. 2, 10 degrees stronger, $3 per box. No. 1 or 2, mailed on receipt of price and two 2-cent stamps. The Cook Company, Windsor, Ont. Nos. 1 and 2 sold and recommended by all responsible Druggists in Canada.

Sold in St. John by all responsible druggists, and W. C. Wilson, St. John, West.