OTTAWA LETTER

Further Particulars of the Iniquitous Gerrymander Bill.

Sir Wilfrid Has Violated the Principle of Representation by Population,

Without Establishing the Principle of Representation by Counties—His Sole Object the Increase of Grit Seats.

OTTAWA, May 19.— The points in the Drummond railway transaction are so familiar to readers of this paper that yesterday's debate covers much travelled ground. Resuming the discussion, Mr. Haggart admitted frankly enough that while minister of railways he had been impressed with the idea that the railway should have access to Montreal. He was not so much moved to this opinion by any difficulty which the C. P. R. imposed as through trouble in making any kind of decent traffic arrangements with the Grand Trunk. That corporation would not make convenient arrangements to transfer traffic at Chaudiere to the Intercolonial, and there were always delays and difficulties in making passenger connections. Mr. Haggart saw several ways to extend the line to Montreal, but was not quite satisfied with any of them. He talked over the question of acquiring the Drummond road, which he understood could be had for a half a million dollars. He mentioned the subject to some of his colleagues and afterwards made the discovery that the road had been hawked about for a lower price. The finance minister of that day did not favor the purchase, and the only other minister with whom a discussion took place was Mr. Ives, who does not seem to have been anxious enough about it to press the matter.

Mr. Haggart went into the question of the cost of the road, including $400,000 of capital alleged to be paid up and $176,000 borrowed. He did not believe that any part of this $400,000 was paid in cash, except perhaps $40,000. This $40,000, with $176,000 borrowed and the subsidies given by governments, represent the cost of the road at the time of the sale to the government. After allowing for the cost of completion, the price paid under this bill and the half million dollar higher price were so excessive that, in Mr. Haggart's words, "it savored of wrong and corruption." He had said this much in the previous debate and repeated it now. He had made no specific charge of corruption against any individual, and had so stated in the Drummond committee, but the facts themselves showed that the negotiators on the government side must either have been a set of fools or else they did it for a consideration.

Mr. Haggart takes direct issue with the minister of railways as to the posibility of keeping accounts for the Montreal extension separate from the rest of the Intercolonial. He declares that this system of accounting is easily possible, that it is done on many lines and was intended to be done in this case. He quotes Sir Oliver Mowat as stating in the senate when the annual lease of the Drummond railway was arranged that the operation of the road was experimental, and that the accounts would show whether it was a success or not. If the extension was found to pay, the arrangement could be made permanent. Mr. Blair, interrupting Mr. Haggart, made a rather extraordinary statement at this point. "I am not responsible," he said, "for statements made in the other house." This remarkable repudiation of his colleague of that time is a striking exhibition of the relations of the members of the cabinet to each other. It is usually assumed that the whole cabinet is responsible for a declaration made officially by any one of them. If one minister will not stand by what another says, they can hardly expect the country to accept the statements of any of them.

Mr. Haggart had another interesting computation. He capitalizes the $210,000 rental which Mr. Blair proposed originally to pay to the Grand Trunk company and Drummond company at something over $7,000,000. A bridge such as the C. P. R. has at Lachine crossing the St. Lawrence to Montreal can be built for $1,500,000. From the bridge to the Intercolonial railway opposite Quebec a double track railway could be built for $4,000,000, allowing the very highest figure claimed for any part of the road. This would leave about a million and a half to provide terminal buildings in Montreal, for which the government had a first class site of its own at Lachine. The whole extension with a double track instead of a single one, with an independent line instead of one shared by the Grand Trunk, with a bridge of its own instead of the right to use one, and with complete terminal establishment at Montreal could have been provided at the same charge that Mr. Blair sought to impose upon the country for the limited accommodation that he expected to get.

Mr. Haggart went into the testimony given before the committee, and then turned his attention to Mr. Blair's reflections upon him as a railway manager. Mr. Blair had intimated that Mr. Haggart made no record himself but was living on the success of Sir Mackenzie Bowell as minister of railways. Mr. Haggart himself commended Sir Mackenzie's Intercolonial management, but observed that he had accomplished a few things himself, including a substantial improvement in the finances. He pleasantly referred to the testimony Mr. Blair professed to have obtained from permanent officers who had been associated with Mr. Haggart. Mr. Blair claims to have learned of their opposition to Mr. Haggart's policy in respect to through traffic. But Mr. Haggart philosophically observed that the permanent Intercolonial men have some advantage over the evanescent minister. If they whispered to Mr. Blair that he was a much greater man than his predecessors they were liable to say the same thing to the next minister who followed Mr. Blair. In that department, as in all others, the permanent officer would not spend his time praising the predecessors of his present chief. When Mr. Blair took his leave it was possible that they would not have as pleasant things to say of him as he reported them to be saying now.

Mr. Haggart defended the arrangement with the Canadian Pacific, which he says gave the company no advantages that were not enjoyed by the Grand Trunk. He had done what he could to get the Canadian Pacific to bring traffic to the Intercolonial, and had received a much larger share of the proceeds than Mr. Blair was likely to receive from the Grand Trunk on the through traffic that he would obtain from the present arrangements. As to the Intercolonial finances the best that Mr. Blair had yet to show for his completed system was a very large deficit, and until he could produce something better Mr. Haggart advised him to defer his boasting.

The discussion was continued by Mr. Morrison of British Columbia, who was a member of the Drummond committee last year. Mr. Morrison is a popular and affable young man, who was not taken too seriously in the role he assumed of a lecturer and adviser to "gentlemen opposite." He accused Mr. Haggart of not swearing the truth as a witness before the Drummond committee, and made the rather astonishing argument that from the time Mr. Haggart appeared as a witness every statement he made was on oath, even after he was discharged from the witness stand and resumed his position as a member of the committee. The argument was interesting, though there is no harm in it, for undoubtedly Mr. Haggart is bound to tell the truth as a public man whether he is on oath or not. Mr. Morrison contended that Mr. Blair bought the Drummond road cheap at $12,000 a mile. It is really worth, in Mr. Morrison's opinion, about $16,000 per mile. He congratulated the minister on the excellent bargain made. If Mr. Greenshields made a lot of money in the transaction, Mr. Morrison was glad of it, seeing that the country did not lose. He censured Mr. Haggart for not carrying out the scheme he seemed to have had in mind to move on Montreal, and in a general way was didactic and admonitory in his observations to the ex-minister.

Mr. Ross Robertson, speaking from the other side of the house, gave the government aid and comfort. Mr. Robertson was elected as an independent conservative in opposition to a regular conservative, but he has been a useful member of the opposition and always has the ear of the house. The member for Toronto has very little confidence in the present ministers, but there is one institution to which he is more strongly opposed than he is to any minister, even Mr. Sifton. He regards the Intercolonial extension to Montreal as an escape from the control of the C. P. R., which is the institution Mr. Robertson makes it the chief business of its political life to oppose. Mr. Robertson seems to be willing that the transfer of control should be made to the Grand Trunk, and in his choicest epigrammatic language congratulates the minister on the course taken whereby, as he puts it, the Intercolonial will no longer be a milch cow for the C. P. R., the people of Canada furnishing the hay and the railway corporation getting the milk.

The price to be paid seems to Mr. Robertson to be rather high, but this point also enables him to get a blow in on the C. P. R. The other day the Canadian Pacific secured bonding privileges for a Kootenay line at the rate of $30,000 a mile. Mr. Robertson fought that bill to the finish, and now remarks that the price paid for the Drummond is moderate compared with the bonding rate allowed to the Columbia and Western. Incidentally, Mr. Robertson observed that he was not able to understand the minister of railways. Some times Mr. Blair appears to him as an archangel and a deliverer of the people from the bondage of the great railway corporation. So far nothing but good words had been received in that direction, but even pleasant language was a good deal to get from a member of this ministry in response to appeals against the C. P. R. oppression.

Mr. Borden of Halifax began a discussion which he will resume next Thursday, after the Queen's birthday vacation. The first part of his speech was the vindication of the minority report of the Drummond county committee signed by himself, Mr. Haggart and Mr. Powell. He went over this report, justifying it in detail and particularly that part which referred to Mr. Tarte's admission that he attempted to mislead the house in respect to Mr. Greenshields' cheque used to purchase a newspaper for Mr. Tarte's sons. Another portion showing how Mr. Greenshields was making $400,000 on a $24,000 investment was justified.

As to the value of the Drummond road Mr. Borden submits four calculations:

1. On the basis of the offer made by the company for the sale of the uncompleted road. There were two of these offers, one at $500,000 and one at $400,000. Adding the cost of completing the road, the value of the completed line at the one price would be $1,050,000 and at the other $1,150,000.

2. On the basis of Mr. Greenshields' purchase of stock, adding the debt of the company at that time and the cost of completion of the line. On this basis the value would be some $900,000.

3. On the basis of the cost of the road. This was computed by Mr. Schreiber at $1,550,000. Deducting the amount of subsidy received the net cost would be about $1,000,000. Mr. Borden pointed out that if a road was bought on the basis of cost by a government the subsidies paid should be deducted, as they form no part of the cost to the builder. If the government paid subsidies and then paid for the property that the subsidies produced, they were simply subsidizing the road twice, or buying back their own gift.

4. On the basis of net income from the road, which at the time of the purchase was only represented to be $30,000. The value of the uncompleted line made up on that basis, plus the cost of completing the road, would make up about $1,000,000.

It is rather interesting to notice that all these calculations bring the value of the road as completed between $900,000 and $1,200,000 and generally in the neighborhood of $1,000,000 or $1,100,000. It is this property for which the public is now asked to pay $1,600,000 and was originally asked to pay $2,090,000. S. D. S.

OTTAWA, May 20.—Sir Charles Tupper's vigorous attack on the government's gerrymander bill, followed as it was by equally strong denunciations from the Ontario opposition members, represents the feeling of the liberal conservatives in the house. There is a strong sense of injustice on the part of the members from the province chiefly affected, who feel that an unfair blow has been struck and that the government under a pretence of justice is committing an outrageous act of injustice. In the first place there seems to be no excuse whatever for interference at this time. In two years the next census will be taken and then a readjustment of representation will be required. In the meantime the Ontario constituencies are divided as near as possible into ridings of some 22,000 population each. These constituencies have given Sir Wilfrid Laurier's government a majority in the present house, though he had no majority in the popular vote of the province. This fact alone shows that there is no unfairness in the operation of the present system.

Now see what Sir Wilfrid is pretending to do. He declares that it is essential to restore county boundaries, so that a constituency will not contain parts of more than one county. It is difficult to establish this principle without making some constituencies much larger than others, and the late government thought it better to adopt the system of representation by population rather than by municipal districts. But the queer feature of the proposed arrangement is that Sir Wilfrid has violated the principle of representation by population without establishing the principle of representation by counties. The bill does not in nearly all the cases make the county boundaries coincide with the boundaries of constituencies. One good principle is abolished without esablishing the other. The fact is that under a hypocritical defence respecting county boundaries the government respects them only where political exigencies suggest it, and no respect at all is paid to the doctrine that one man's vote ought to be as good as another's. Ontario constituencies which have existed in most cases for seventeen years and in some for a life time are torn in pieces by this bill, though the work will all have to be done over again in two years more.

And what is the result of this change? We shall have constituencies of all the way from 15,000 to 30,000 people. We shall have constituencies returning three members which are nearly twice as large as others returning the same number. We shall have constituencies returning two members with a smaller population than others which are allowed only one. We shall have 200,000 people in one place (mostly conservatives) with four members and 200,000 people elsewhere with ten members. We shall see constituencies abolished that have existed for a quarter of a century. All these elements of confusion are introduced for the alleged purpose of restoring county lines that are not restored, and of doing justice to the liberal party which has already a larger representation than is justified by the popular vote.

So the Ontario conservatives, and especially those whom the government is trying to gerrymander out of their seats, have some excuse for their anger. Here for instance is Mr. Clancy representing the constituency called Bothwell, a riding familiar by name to two generations of Canadians, who finds that there will be no more Bothwell. This government decrees that it is an injustice to have a riding called Bothwell when there is no county of that name. If Mr. Clancy had not beaten Mr. Mills in the late election we may assume that Mr. Mills would have some respect for the traditions of the old constituency. But Bothwell caused Mr. Mills to go, and so Bothwell must go. Mr. Clancy may come back as one of the members for Kent, but if he does it will be contrary to the intention of the gerrymander. Then there is Mr. McCleary, who at the last election captured a constituency previously liberal. Mr. McCleary woke up yesterday to find in his constituency an additional township which usually gives several hundred majority to the grit candidate. If he holds this seat he can only do it by overcoming a very large grit majority heretofore polled against his party in the remainder of his riding. These liberal districts are in most cases taken over from other places where the grit majority is large enough to spare them.

Turn now to Simcoe. This is a large and populous county of over 83,000 people. It is entitled on the basis of population to four members, but it is a conservative county and if cut up into four districts would probably return four conservative members. But it can be made into three districts, of which the liberals may give themselves one. It takes 28,000 people in conservative Simcoe to elect a member. Brant is a liberal county with much less than half the population of Simcoe. But Brant is allowed two members, both of whom, it is assumed by the bill, are to be liberals. Still more remarkable is the dealing with York.

York county includes the city of Toronto. Toronto now returns four members, though on the basis of population it would be entitled to six. East York and West York are old constituencies, one of which has not been changed for fifty years. They now include a number of districts which have been incorporated into the municipal city of Toronto. These wards are strongly conservative, while the country portions of East and West York are liberal. Now the bill takes away the portions that lie in the city and adds them to the Toronto constituencies. It leaves East and West York rural constituencies only, and on the basis of the last election deprives Mr. McLean, the conservative member for East York of his majority. In Clarke Wallace's constituency there was no liberal opposition last election, but in previous contests he obtained his majority in the districts that this bill takes away from him. These are cases where no wrongs are righted, for the constituencies are old ones. There was no disturbance of county boundaries, for they are all in the county of York, and the result is that while East and West York are left rather small constituencies the four city constituencies are raised to an average population of 60,000 each. The four conservative constituencies at Toronto will contain as many people as twelve liberal constituencies which may be selected from other parts of Ontario and five times as many as the two York ridings. This re-arrangement would have been on a basis of population if the two Yorks had been made one and five members given to Toronto. Each riding would have had 40,000 people. But the chance to steal a seat would have been lost.

With this general principle established, that liberal counties shall have more representation than conservative counties and that county lines shall be respected only in certain specified and suitable cases, the calling in of the judges is a grotesque hypocrisy. The judges cannot undo that portion of the measure that gives the liberal party its advantage. They are merely called in, as Col. Tisdale says, "to perform the act of decapitation after the government has pronounced sentence." The gallant colonel, who expects to have most of his conservative majority transferred to North Norfolk, where it will be swamped by Mr. Charlton's liberal margin, recommends that the judges should be instructed to put on black caps when they perform their solemn duties.

Sir Charles Tupper objects that the bill is unconstitutional, but still more strongly protests against its unfairness. He finds in it an admission that the government is afraid of the province of Ontario. The influences which have been operated in by-elections are not so useful in a general contest. The government has captured the control of the federal franchise for the local government, its friends have operated West Huron and Brockville, in such a way that some of them are in jail in Brockville, while in Huron 43 men in one polling district swore they voted for a conservative candidate while only 30 conservative ballots were found in the box.

Clarke Wallace pointed out that his own constituency had retained the same boundary for fifty years, and the government, under the pretence of righting a wrong done in 1882, had taken away a number of conservative wards, leaving West York with 20,000 people and giving the wards to a constituency that would have 50,000. Dr. Montague wanted to know why county boundaries were respected in some cases and not in all. But Sir Wilfrid gave him no information. Dr. Sproule pronounced the bill "the most disgraceful measure yet submitted to the house." He also speaks with some feeling. His county of Grey is "reorganized."

Mr. Bergeron offered some remarks on the changes to be made in Quebec province. They are not so numerous as in Ontario, for the reason, as Sir Charles suggests, that the government is very well satisfied with the results from Quebec as it is. But Mr. Bergeron explains that the measure strengthens the liberal party in three or four counties on the south shore of the St. Lawrence, to which the government made great promises that have been broken. The people are rather indignant over the treatment, which accounts for the readjustment.

Mr. Bennett, who does not expect to suffer by the gerrymander, protests against its unfairness to other members. He said he had felt uneasy when Sir Wilfrid protested that the measure would be an absolutely fair one, and "when the premier called high heaven to witness that there would be no loaded dice in the game, I grew doubly suspicious." "I really do not think," he added, "that high heaven should be invoked in such a measure as this." Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper closed the discussion with the suggestion that the measure had better be withheld until after the next census. It was evident that the measure gave the people no fairer representation than they have now, and if there were no malign purpose to be served, there was no reason for the bill. Never before had a redistribution measure been introduced except when called for as a result of a census. And so the bill was read a first time and stands for a longer and fuller discussion upon the second reading.

In the morning of Friday, the public accounts committee tried to get down to work. A number of motions were made for papers and witnesses, in the midst of which a singular reluctance to secure information was discovered. Sir Louis Davies supported by Mr. Gibson and other ministerial members began to offer objections to the call of witnesses unless the members who wanted them would tell what they were expected to do. Now, the public accounts committee is not called for the purpose of proving people guilty nor innocent, but to investigate accounts. The public accounts are open and if a member wants to see the vouchers and ascertain the particulars about a transaction in the public interest, he has always been allowed to do so. Now for the first time the rule has been set up that an enquirer must of necessity be an accuser. For example, Dr. Roche read in the house a statement made by a former officer of the government in regard to affairs of the inland revenue office at Winnipeg. The house referred the matter to the public accounts committee. Dr. Roche is not on the committee, and Mr. Taylor moved that the original accuser be summoned to testify. An hour or so was taken up by ministers and their supporters in the attempt to force the mover to make charges in regard to the matter, and to say what this Mr. Christie was expected to prove. Mr. Christie is expected to tell what he knows about irregularities which were at least of sufficient importance to cause the suspension of Collector Costigan at Winnipeg. If the committee knew what he would prove it would hardly be necessary to call him. When he has stated the facts one would suppose it would be time enough to ascertain what they proved. Similarly Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, who asked for a witness connected with the bogus prosecutions in Manitoba, was invited to say what the man would prove. Sir Charles simply affirmed that he regards him as a material witness and practically defies the government to interpose to prevent his appearance. Inquiries are to be made into the cost of supplies for Sir Louis Davies' fleet, into the purchases for the Intercolonial railway, into the immigration management, the sale of binder twine and various other matters of public business, including the supply of provisions to the army in the Yukon. S. D. S.

JUVENILE BURGLARS.

Who Have Been a Terror to Moncton People.

DORCHESTER, N. B., May 22.—Before Judge Wells, under the Speedy Trials Act, at two o'clock today, Chas. Seith, John Hurley, Edmund Gallant and Edward Howe pleaded guilty to charges against them, and were sentenced to terms in the maritime penitentiary and common jail.

Seith and Howe were charged with breaking into the house of Rev. Mr. Hinson of Moncton and stealing $140 in cash, besides other valuables, and also with breaking into the store of P. S. Enman and destroying and taking away the fixings of a soda fountain.

Hurley and Gallant were charged with receiving stolen goods, knowing them to be stolen. Hurley, on account of his previous good record, was sentenced to two months' imprisonment in the common jail: Gallant received five years in the maritime penitentiary, and Howe and Seith ten years each, five for each offence.

These four criminals constituted the gang of thieves who within the past three months had been the terror of the citizens of Moncton, having within that time entered and stolen from many residences and places of business. With the exception of Hurley, they have records in the police court, although the oldest is but eighteen years of age.

NOVA SCOTIANS WANT TO EMIGRATE.

(Vancouver News-Advertiser, May 16.)

Rev. C. S. Stearns of North Jeddore, N. S., had a short preliminary interview on Saturday with Premier Semlin at Victoria, in connection with the emigration project that brings him to this coast. William Marchant and P. C. MacGregor accompanied and introduced the visitor, who explained that he represents some 200 families in North Jeddore alone, who are looking to British Columbia and will probably come here to take up homes if suitable locations can be secured for the prosecution of the agriculture and fishing industries in conjunction The populations of several other Nova Scotia communities are also watching with interest for the result of Mr. Stearns' visit to British Columbia, and likely to follow the example set by North Jeddore. Rev. Mr. Stearns will pay a visit to the West Coast, and afterwards have another talk with the leader of the government.

Children Cry for
CASTORIA.

DEWEY'S RETURN.

NEW YORK, May 22.—The municipal assembly committee on the celebration to be given in honor of Admiral Dewey in New York city, decided today not to ask the legislature for any pecuniary aid in connection with the affair. It is said that whatever expenses were necessary in addition to the $150,000 appropriated by the city would be supplemented by private subscription. Mayor Van Wyck was opposed to asking the legislature for additional money.

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

GRIM HUMOR.

Some genius has been gathering witticisms from the graveyards, and he seems to have pretty well succeeded in resurrecting a lot of epitaphs found on tombstones in England and the United States that would also cause the late lamented themselves to smile could they but read them. Some of his quotations, which were read before a New Haven, Connecticut, scientific society, were as follows:

In the churchyard at Bury St. Edmunds this was found:

Here lies the body of Deborah Dent;
She kicked up her heels and away she went.

In Burlington, Massachusetts:

Sacred to the memory of Anthony Drake,
Who died for peace and quietness' sake.
His wife was constantly scolding and scoffing,
So he sought repose in a twelve dollar coffin.

In a cemetery in East Tennessee:

Here lies ——— ———, born May 10, 1830; died June 4, 1851.
She lived a life of virtue and died of cholera morbus caused by eating green fruits in the full hope of a blessed immortality, at the early age of twenty-one years, one month. Reader, go thou and do likewise.

In Baton Rouge, Louisiana:

Here lies the body of David Jones. His last words were "I die a Christian and a democrat."

In Palo Pinto, Texas:

He remained to the last a decided friend and supporter of democratic principles and measures. Blessed are the dead who died in the Lord.

In England:

At rest beneath this churchyard stone
Lies stingy Jimmy Wyatt,
He died one morning just at ten,
And saved a dinner by it.

In a Maine graveyard:

Here lies interred Priscilla Bird
Who sang on earth 'till 62,
Now up on high, above the sky,
No doubt she sings like sixty, too.

In a Kentucky churchyard:

Here the body of Mary Ann rests,
With her head on Abraham's breast,
It's a very good thing for Mary Ann,
But very hard lines for Abraham.

The humorous epitaph collector of the future will doubtless be able to discover other equally remarkable specimens of graveyard wit with very little research. If the characteristic virtues of some of those now living are truthfully engraved on the marble that will mark their last political resting places. It would not be surprising that if in our own Canada, he would secure a particularly rare collection of cemetery gems. What more likely than to see over the political grave of the present alleged premier this cheerful couplet:

"Here lies the body of poor Sir Wilfrid
Who boldly the Tories' policy pilfered,
With sunny smile and Cobden medal,
Promises and principles he began to peddle.
He was a titled Democrat up to the hilt,
But too much Tarte caused him to wilt."

And over the obscurity in which the minister of the interior will shortly rest one might find:

"Clifford Sifton is 'lying' here;
He was to his country very 'dear.'
He danced his way into the Cabinet,
For he could 'sasshay' and pirouette,
He was born in Ontario, up near Lucan,
And died shortly after 'going through' the Yukon."

What better could be said of the member for Wellington, when he has passed away into well-merited retirement, than:

"When the Tories were in
Mister James McMullen
Would "rare" and tear round and cavort,
But now he keeps still,
Though he finds bigger bills
In the Auditor General's report."

Then over the pillar of fame that will ornament the lot in which the minister of railway's reputation is laid will probably be found something like this:

"Stranger, stranger have a care,
For here is 'lying' A. G. Blair;
He ran New Brunswick and the I. C. R.,
And travelled around in a private car;
He stayed by the man that paid two prices,
And was an adept in all 'human devices,'
But at the end, where—oh, where—
Were the political remains of A. G. Blair?"

Then the minister of agriculture, he would be wreathed in beautiful poetic flowers like this:

"In memory of Sydney Fisher.
Erected by a well-wisher—
A Grit.

"With his farming erudition
And love for Prohibition
He made the world richer—
Nit."

The minister of Whatever-it-may-be, Mr. Dobell, could have his merits perpetuated this way:

"Here you'll find Richard Dobell,
Who in his life-time was an ocean swell,
Across the Atlantic he made innumerable trips,
But never in one of his unsinkable ships."

It would be ungrateful indeed were not some kind hand to perpetuate the virtues of the minister of public works in his private boneyard, say, something like this:

"When Israel Tarte got into Parliament
He made things hum and squandered every cent,
Let contracts without tender, gave jobs to friends galore,
And when brought to task about it gave them more and more;
From a Tory to a Liberal he made a lightning change
And in politics did many things that looked almighty strange;
Israel was poor, but now he's fixed all right,
And there'll be a hot time in the old town tonight."

INCREASE OF CONSUMPTION.

(Toronto Mail.)

During the month of April, the vital statistics of the province, as furnished by the board of health, showed a total of 2,066 deaths, of which 256 resulted from consumption, 21 more than the highest previous record, which was last month.