DO NOT FORGET THE DATE OF THE CONFEDERATION

THE CHARLOTTETOWN GUARDIAN

MORNING DAILY

CONFEDERATION CELEBRATION CHARLOTTETOWN

MORNING DAILY FOUNDED 1891 WEEKLY (NOWEVENING DAILY) 1887 } "THE LATEST NEWS CHARLOTTETOWN, CANADA, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1914 FIRST OF ALL." { $3.50 PER YEAR (DELIVERED) IN ADVANC $2.50 PER YEAR BY MAIL IN ADVANCE E

PROHIBITION CASE HEARD YESTERDAY

At the City Police Court yesterday morning considerable interest was manifested in the case in which George MacDonald was charged by the Public Prosecutor with having, on January 1st., 1914, sold intoxicating liquor, thereby contravening the Prohibition Act, this constituting his first offence.

Mr. Bentley appeared to conduct the prosecution, and Mr. Johnston, on behalf of the defendant, who was absent, entered a plea of not guilty. At his request the witnesses for the prosecution were separated, Mr. Valade being ordered by the Magistrate to wait outside the Court-room while his colleague gave evidence; and His Honor observing that he could not deal in such manner with one set of witnesses and not the other, those of the defence, the Rev. Mr. Marshall and Messrs Goff and Ross, were also asked to leave the Court until they were called. This done, Samuel J. Elrod was called by Mr. Bentley. He said he was a detective in the employ of the Thiel Agency and that he had come to Charlottetown to give evidence in this case. He had travelled nine hundred miles to come here, having left Montreal on the morning of the 15th and arrived on Friday at 3.30 p. m. He knew the defendant and his place of business on Great George Street. He remembered the 1st of January (Thursday). On that day he was in company with Valade, who went into the defendant's drug store at about 10.28 a. m. Witness remained outside. When Valade went into the store he had nothing on his person, but when he came out he was carrying two bottles. Witness and he took them to the hotel, The Lennox, where the bottles were opened. They contained rum. Witness and his friend drank some and then marked the bottles and labelled them. (One of the bottles was at this stage produced in evidence.) It was half full. In reply to Mr. Bentley, witness said that the writing on the bottom of the bottle was his.

By Mr. Johnson: They took the bottles down to the Lennox. Witness took a drink out of the one produced. That was all he took at the time. He did not know if that drink came up in size to those which he had when he took the famous forty drinks. The bottle was taken to Mr. Schurman after they had drank from it. Between the time he had that drink and the time when the bottle was returned from Mr. Schurman's witness had nothing to do with it.

MR. BENTLEY OBJECTS.

Mr. Bentley objected that if his friend's claims to unlimited cross-examination were allowed he might be permitted to ask the witness any question under the sun, and that was contrary to law. His friend would have to submit some authorities. He (Mr. Bentley) found the limits of cross-examination rather prescribed and marked. He submitted that Mr. Johnston's questions were unfair and improper.

Mr. Johnson urged his right to ask the question and in support of his argument cited a passage from Thompson's Criminal Code, page 846; but His Honour overruled the question.

Proceeding, witness said that Valade came down with him; he bought Valade's ticket. Valade went into the drug store while he remained outside. They were instructed to go to the Two Macs; in fact they had general instructions to go to any store where they thought they were likely to get liquor. They were not told any particular place; and no specific name was given them besides the Two Macs.

Mr. Bentley: Do I understand that you were given instructions to go to places where liquor might be sold including the drug stores?—Yes.

And you were told where the drug stores were?—Yes.

The Two Macs was simply included among them.—Yes.

Mr. Johnston: All right, Mr. Elrod; then if these were your instructions you went to every drug store.—No.

How many did you go to?—I don't know.

Did you go to more than two?—I don't think we did.

Dectective Valade was next called. He gave evidence similar to that given by Elrod, adding that he paid $2 for the rum which he bought at Macdonald's, $1 for each bottle. He got the bottles, made into a parcel, from the clerk in the store. MacDonald was standing in the passage at the time and asked him about the fox business. The bottles were taken to the Lennox, where witness and Elrod had drinks out of them.

Witness was cross-examined at some length by Mr. Johnston. In reply to the question as to what size his drinks were, he said that sometimes his drinks were "heavy" and sometimes they were "small." He did not know how many drinks he took altogether. He was given the money with which to buy the rum by Elrod. At the time he (witness) was posing as a fox man. In the shop a man came up to him and spoke about foxes; he did not know him. He did not know Mr. George E. Auld. Mr. MacDonald was engaged in the shop. He had some papers in his hand. Witness did not know what the papers were; he did not know whether they were fox stock or not because he was not so far advanced in foxes himself as to know what was stock or not. He heard Mr. MacDonald say something to his clerk, but he could not say what the conversation was. He would not be prepared to say that Mr. MacDonald was telling his clerk not to sell liquor to him (witness). He left Montreal on the 15th.

Mr. Johnston: How many detectives came down with you?

Mr. Bentley: I object to that question, Your Honour, we have already settled the point.

Mr. Johnston (address ng the witness still): Do you know if there are any detectives, male or female, operating in this province for the Thiel Agency for the purpose of obtaining prosecutions under the Prohibition Act?

Mr. Bentley still objected and His Honour advised the witness that he could answer the question or refuse to as he pleased. The question was not pressed.

In further reply to Counsel witness said that he was told to go to the Two Macs. He was told by Elrod and Mr. Wilson and Mr. Schurman. He was also instructed to go to Johnson & Johnson but he did not go. At Foster's Drug Store he got cigars but did not ask for liquor.

Mr. Johnston: What about the hotels?

Mr. Bentley objected to this question and his objection was upheld.

Witness, continuing, said that he left by order of Mr. Wilson; he did not know why.

This closed the case for the prosecution. Mr. Johnston asked His Honour for an adjournment, as a most important witness, Mr. G.E. Auld, was ill and could not attend. It had been decided in this Court already that where a master forbids a servant to sell intoxicating liquor the master is not liable. In this particular case the master had given a specific command to his clerk not to sell the liquor to a particular person. In the circumstances he did not think any Court in the world would convict him. His witnesses would be able to prove that the defendant had forbidden his clerk to sell the liquor to the witness. Mr. Auld was an absolutely disinterested witness.

Mr. Bentley strongly opposed an adjournment. He urged that Counsel for the defence had had every reasonable opportunity of getting ready for and he ought to have been prepared to go on with the case. The information in the case was laid about the 5th. January and the defendant saw fit to leave the province out of which he remained until both the detectives had left. Mr. Johnston had also on two occasions objected to an adjournment of the matter to suit the convenience of the prosecution, and he (Mr. Bentley) did not see why the case should now be put off. It was unreasonable. Mr Johnston had called other witnesses and he should examine them.

Mr.Johnston in reply made a strong appeal for an adjournment, submitting that it would in no way prejudice the prosecution.

His Honour said that he would have been prepared to grant the request had it been satisfactorily proved to him that the evidence of Mr. Auld would in any way help the defence, since the liquor was sold in the presence of the defendant. Moreover, both the defendant and his clerk could have given the same evidence and they had not been summoned. He regretted he could not allow an adjournment.

Mr. Johnston consequently led evidence for the defence, The first witness called was the Rev. Mr. T.Marshall.

MR. MARSHALL GIVES EVIDENCE

In reply to Mr. Johnston he said: I live in Charlottetown and am President of the Temperance Alliance for the province.

Mr. Johnston: I want to ask you, Mr. Marshall, have you, by yourself or through any other person, directly or indirectly, purchased any intoxicating liquor from the store known as Two Macs (You know where it is? —Yes) without a prescription?

Mr. Marshall: I never bought any liquor under any circumstances whatever. I never ordered any. I never got any. But I have paid for liquor got from that store. I could not say if it was intoxicating or not. I simply know the bill said it was medicine.

Counsel: Could you swear it was not brandy? I don't know. I paid Mr. MacDonald personally for the medicine. I just asked him "Is this bill correct? and he said Yes" and I pa d it. I don't know whether there was a certificate for it; I had nothing to do with the getting of it.

Mr. Bentley: Will you please explain, Mr. Marshall what you know about this transaction. What the liquor, whether intoxicating or not, was for? In other words explain the situation.

Mr. Marshall said that it was pretty nearly a year ago he had a daughter who was seriously ill. She was sent to the hospital as a last resort. Dr. Yeo went to him and said that he had done his best and had been forced to the conclusion that a stimulant was absolutely essential for the patient. Witness protested strongly against the use of any intoxicating liquor, informing the Doctor that he was utterly opposed to it and that if he had been the patient he would have refused to have any liquor notwithstanding the con-

(Continued on page 3)

THE DISCUSSION ON REPRESENTATION QUESTION

Premier Borden Pleads Eloquently and Forcibly for Prince Edward Island

Showing the Fallacy of Sir Wilfrid's Carping Criticism and the Insincerity of Mr. Hughes who Argued Against Increased Representation in 1903.

The following are extracts from the discussion on the second reading of the Redistribution Bill in the House of Commons on the 17th inst. a telegraphic summary of which appeared in The Guardian of the 18th. Owing to the length of the speeches, only those parts relating to Prince Edward Island are here given. After Premier Borden had moved the second reading and given a short address, dealing with the historical and legal aspects of the question, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, arose. He also took up the historical and legal side of the question. Then he proceeded:

Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier * * * * My right hon. friend in this Bill, has refrained from making one provision, the absence of which seems to me a weakness in the Bill, and, I cannot but think, also a weakness on his part. He refused to determine whether or not the Island of Prince Edward is to lose a member. He left that blank and referred it to the committee for determination. I have to represent to my right hon. friend that that is a matter upon which the committee cannot have any jurisdiction; it is a matter on which this House has no jurisdiction. Parliament in this matter is not a free agent; THE WHOLE QUESTION IS SIMPLY A QUESTION OF ARITHMETIC. The very argument which my right hon. friend makes today in answer to the suggestion offered by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) is an answer for the action—or rather want of action—with regard to Prince Edward Island. The right hon. gentleman stated categorically that he would like to give more representation to Nova Scotia than is given under this Bill, and I have no doubt that he did spend many an hour trying to escape the necessary result of the census, the loss on the part of Nova Scotia of two members. That is quite natural. I have had in my day the same problem to deal with; but we had to come to the conclusion that we had no discretion in this matter —that Parliament must simply carry out the constitution as it stands. But when my right hon. friend leaves it to the committee to determine whether or not Prince Edward Island shall lose one member, what will he say to my hon. friend from Pictou or any other member from Nova Scotia should he suggest that it be left to the committee to determine whether or not Nova Scotia shall lose two members? What will he say to a member from New Brunswick should he ask that the same privilege be accorded to that province? What would he say even to the great province of Ontario, which under this Bill must lose four members, should a representative of that province ask why Ontario should be treated differently from other provinces? I say in this matter jurisdiction is not with the Prime Minister, nor myself, nor the Committee, nor even Parliament; it is a matter of the law and the constitution; the provision of that constitution must be maintained whatever the consequence. * * * * *

Having said this much, I have nothing to add at present. Of course, I am glad my right hon. friend has taken the course of referring this matter to a committee. The work, then, is no longer in his hands, or in mine, or even in those of the House. The committee will have to seek our ratification of their work.

Mr. E. M. McDonald. * * * * One does not need to refer to this subclause of the Bill. You have the number for Quebec fixed at 65, and thereby determine the electoral unit for the whole Dominion. You ascertain what the representation of each province in the Dominion is by dividing that electoral unit into the population of the respective provinces. When you come to subsection 4 of the Bill, you come, to the saving clause which is intended to prevent the loss or representation by the application of the electoral unit to the population of each province, and unless you can work out under the provisions of subsection 4 of section 51 of this Bill some right by which the provinces of Ontario, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island on this occasion will be saved the loss of their representation, it is impossible for a committee of this House or this Parliament, as a matter of law, to give to any one of those provinces any more representation than what you can by working out this plan. If the right does not exist under subsection 5 it is not of much use for the right hon. gentleman to submit a Bill in blank and send it to a committee and ask it to be filled in, because the action of the committee would be wholly illegal and improper. So would the action of this Parliament if we undertook to give to Prince Edward Island or to any other province a greater number of any members than the number ascertained by the application of that section.

* * * * * * *

Mr. J. J. Hughes followed with an explanation, which did not explain, of his attitude on the question in 1903, an extract from which, and Mr. A. A. McLean's reply thereto, was given in yesterday's Guardian.

A number of other members spoke at this stage, occupying the time of the House till recess. After the House resumed at 8 o'clock, Mr. Turgeon, Gloucester, N. B., spoke. He was followed by Premier Borden who spoke as follows:

RT. HON. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister) I have only a few words to say in speaking in reply on this Bill. Mt right hon. friend, in the course of his observations, did not take any pronounced exception to the principles which I had submitted for consideration in introducing the Bill. He went somewhat at length into the question of the extent to which county boundaries had been departed from in the readjustment of 1903. It is neither necessary nor desirable that I should go into that question at length tonight, because it will be a proper matter for the consideration of the committee. The right hon. gentleman dealt only with the province of Quebec. If he had taken the province of Ontario and some other provinces, he might have found a good many illustrations in addition to those with which he has favoured the House. In the province of Ontario I recall that the municipal boundaries were departed from in the case of the County of Carleton, the city of Ottawa, the county of Russell, the county of Frontenac, the city of Kingston, and I think also in the case of the county of Leeds, and in addition to that in relation to the territorial district of Nipissing. In the province of Nova Scotia the county of Cape Breton was divided and a part of it added to the adjoining county of Victoria. In saying this, I do not at all intend to suggest that great consideration should not be given to the question of county boundaries. I only desire to repeat that, in connection therewith, another principle must be taken into account—the equalizing, to as reasonable an extent as possible, of the inhabitants within the various electoral districts which are to be established in Canada.

The right hon. gentleman was more or less exercised because I had left a blank in the Bill with respect to the representation of Prince Edward Island. But, in discussing that question, he did not even allude to the matters which I thought worthy of consideration by the House and by the committee, namely, the fact that the province of Prince Edward Island has alleged, and still alleges, whether rightly or wrongly, that there was an unfortunate mistake made in drawing up the terms of Confederation in that regard. Nor did he allude to what I thought was proper for the consideration of the House and the committee—the question as to whether or not it is a desirable thing that any province in Canada should have a smaller representation in the Lower House than in the Senate. Nor did he pay any attention whatever to the suggestion which I made, that the population of Prince Edward Island, being entirely a rural population, it would be entitled, if situated in any other province in Canada, to have a representation of at least four members. Both he and the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) seemed to be more or less disturbed about some proposed attempt to depart from the compact by which the various provinces were given representation upon a certain basis. My hon. friend from Pictou, as well as the right hon. gentleman himself, sought to enlighten me as to the capacity of this Parliament to deal with the question under consideration. I am not disposed at the present moment to debate the legal question, but it might be worth while, in passing, to allude to the fact that upon a strict application of that 51st section of the British North America Act in 1882, the province of Prince Edward Island would then have had its representation reduced to five members.

I did allude to the consideration put forward by my hon. friend from King's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Hughes), but I alluded to it as a consideration present to the minds of those who framed and introduced that Bill, and not as a legal ground which would have justified them in concluding that upon strictly legal considerations the province could have retained its membership. Given in the first place the unit fixed by the population of the province of Quebec and applying that unit to Prince Edward Island, you would thus find that the representation of that province must be reduced. Then when you came to seek relief from that by reason of the provision of the 4th subsection of the 51st section of the British North America Act, the reason suggested by the hon. member for King's would not justify a departure from the result arising from the first part of the section. If the conditions demanded by the provisions of that sub-section were not capable of being invoked, the subsection could have no operation. However, that is by the way, I did suggest, in regard to Prince Edward Island, that at least that province ought to have the right to be heard, and I venture to propose that the province shall have the right to be heard before that committee, notwithstanding the apprehensions which have been expressed with very great eloquence and earnestness by the hon. member for Gloucester, New Brunswick (Mr. Turgeon). I am afraid that my hon. friend is of too timorous a frame of mind altogether, because no one is disposed to rush into an attempt to depart from the compact which was entered into at the time Prince Edward Island was brought into Confederation. The questions which have been presented for our consideration speak for themselves. If my right hon. friend who leads the Opposition is somewhat exercised about my own attitude in this regard, I would like to tell him if he were present, that if there has been any departure from the compact made between the original provinces in 1867, when a certain basis of representation in this Parliament was fixed, it seems to me that my right hon. friend is the only one who is to be credited with such a departure. When we, two years ago, in pursuance of a resolution passed by this House some years before, added a very large territory to the province of Quebec, we made two provisions which were fair, on the one hand, to the province of Quebec and, on the other hand, to the Maritime Provinces and all the other provinces of Canada. We provided, by the terms of the Bill which at that time was passed by Parliament, that if there should be in the additional territory a population entitled to representation in this House of Commons it should receive that representation. That was fair to the province of Quebec. We also provided that, for the purpose of fixing the unit which should determine the representation of the Maritime provinces and the other provinces of Canada, the population within that added territory should not be taken into consideration. That was fair, as I say, on the one hand, for the province of Quebec, and it was absolutely fair, on the other hand, to the people of the Maritime provinces and the other provinces of Canada.

When my right hon. friend added 250,000 square miles to the province of Quebec in 1897 he took no such course as that. He enlarged the geographical unit upon which depends the representation of all the other provinces of Canada by about 250,000 square miles, and if there should be one person for every four square miles of territory inhabiting that added territory, the result would be that the unit which determined the representation, and will determine the representation of the Maritime provinces and of the province of Ontario for all time to come, would be increased by no less than one thousand. Every hon. gentleman in this House will understand that that made a very material change and would, I believe, if it were acted upon at the present time, change the representation of more than one province in Canada in the measure which we now propose. Therefore, in view of the fact that my right hon. friend has expressed so keen an anxiety that we depart in no measure whatever from the compact which was entered into at the time of Confederation, it would have been well for him at the time he made that change in 1897, to have had regard to the same considerations which affect him so deeply today.

My hon. friend from the county of Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) has alluded to the methods by which the British North America Act has been changed in the past, or may be changed in the future, namely, by an address to His Majesty's Government asking that a certain change should be made in the Constitutional Act which is the charter of the people of this Dominion. That is one method; but perhaps my hon. friend from Pictou is not aware that other methods have also been established, and on more than one occasion since 1867, and that there have been occasions when legislation has been passed by this Parliament admittedly, or probably, beyond the jurisdiction of this Parliament, accompanied with a stipulation that it should not be put into force until after an Act had been passed by the Imperial Parliament confirming the provisions which were therein set forth.

My hon. friend from Pictou also made certain observations with regard to the principles which should govern the committee. I would like to say, in so far as these are concerned, that while some of the principles which he laid down would be entirely desirable if they were practicable, I do not for a moment think that they would be practicable in carrying on the operations of the committee; nor are they in force today in half of the constituencies in Canada. When the hon. gentleman expressed not only the importance but the necessity of having all the people within a constituency in direct relation with each other, in a business way and otherwise, he certainly must have known that no such desirable result is possible. In my own county it is not possible; in his county I do not think it is possible; and there are other constituencies in Canada in which such a result could not be obtained. At the same time, in so far as it can be obtained, I find no fault with the suggestion of my hon friend.

In regard to certain observations addressed to me by my hon. friend from King's, P. E. I. (Mr. J. J. Hughes)—and in connection with which I am the innocent cause of

(Continued on page 3)

YESTERDAY IN HOUSE OF COMMONS

(From Our Own Reporter.)

OTTAWA, Ont., Feb. 23—The Government has lost no time in carrying out the promise which was made in the House last week that a committee would be appointed to investigate the question of improvement of electoral methods in Canada.

Hon. C. J. Doherty gave notice today that he will move on Thursday that a select committee of seven be named for this purpose, consisting of Messrs. Doherty, W. B. Northrup, A. K. MacLean, Hon. Charles Murphy, J. A. McKay, Carvell and Robidoux. The Committee will have power to send for persons, papers and records and to examine witnesses under oath.

(From Our Own Reporter.)

OTTAWA, Feb. 23—Hon. T. W. Crothers, Minister of Labor, gave notice today that he will on Thursday move a resolution on which will be based a bill to prohibit the use of white phosphorus in the manufacture of matches in Canada.

The bill will provide for the inspection of any place where it is suspected that matches made with white phosphorus may be found and to authorize the governor in council to make any necessary regulations and to fix penalties for the infraction of the act.

(From Our Own Reporter.)

OTTAWA, Feb. 23—That Hon Sidney Fisher and Liberal members of Parliament are said to have profited out of the sale of Farnham Camp in the eastern Townships, a camp almost worthless to the Laurier Government, and that the militia department, under Sir Frederick Borden, disposed of St. Helens Island worth millions to the City of Montreal for $200,000, were the counter blasts today of Col. the Hon. Sam Hughes to an attack of Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux upon a purchase of a new site for a military instruction school near Montreal. In addition the minister said that he courted the fullest investigation into the purchase of the property which consists of 167 acres, about 13 miles from Montreal, costing $180,000. Sir Frederick Borden had selected a site for the proposed instruction school at Longueil. Col. Hughes said that the Montreal officers all protested against it on account of its general unsuitability, He visited the site and had to wade around in mud to his knees. Not only was the site low, but it was inaccessible. After a full investigation, the property about thirteen miles west of the city, was purchased. He showed that it had been secured at a price below that placed on it by a valuator and in addition that the surrounding property was held at a much higher figure. The site was reached by four railroads and there would soon also be a street car service.

CIVIC LAND ENQUIRY CLOSED

(Canadian Press.)

MONTREAL, Feb. 23.—After sitting six months holding seventy-five sessions and examining over 1,000 witnesses, the civic land enquiry closed this morning, It is the general opinion that Judge Fortin's judgement will be handed down within a month.

THE CANADIAN DEFENCE LEAGUE

There was a large audience in Prince of Wales College Hall last night to listen to what was probably one of the most eloquent addresses ever heard in Charlottetown. The speaker, as had been previously announced, was Mr. George M. Elliot, a member of the Canadian Defence League. His subject was "A Nation in the making, a plea for universal military Training."

Hon. W. S. Stewart, President of the Board of Trade, presided. Before the lecturer was introduced two excellent local solos were rendered by Messrs Parker Hooper and J. Webb Stanley. The Chairman then introced Mr. Elliott in a short appropriate address.

Mr. Elliott said in part:—"There is a law of nature, common to all mankind, which no time shall annul or destroy, that those who have more strength and excellency shall bear rule over those who have less."

So said Dionysius, in the days before St. Paul voiced a like sentiment when he said; "Be strong; quit you like men." And in all the ages men have recognized the truth and sought to act upon it. It lives still, and because it lives I come to you with a message of Defence. The Canadian Defence League, which I have the honor to represent, and which includes in its membership some of the most prominent men of this wide Dominion, believes that defence is one of the fundamental duties of citizenship.

But I draw your attention to the fact that if you would go to the defence of your coubtry, in the face of a threating and visible foe, you would not, I am sure, do so from a mere desire to wound or kill a fellow-man. I do not think there are many in any civilized community so wantonly blood-thirsty. You would rush to the front from a sense of duty, and, as an inteligent man, it would take you only about a day to find out of how little use you were in the effective discharge of that duty, and you would find out also how unwilling

(Continued on Page 3)

Minard's Liniment Cures Diptheria.

FIVE INJURED IN COLLISION

(Canadian Press.)

DECATURE Ills. Feb. 23—Five persons were injured when a Wabash Railroad's Continental Limited ran into three road engines here today. The engineer of the passenger train was blinded by the snow.

Minard's Liniment Cures Distemper.

CONDENSED ADS TOO LATE FOR CLASSIFICATION

WANTED.—AN UP-STAIRS GIRL at the Queen Hotel. 1357-2-23mtf.

GIRL WANTED.—AT THE UNION Hotel. One that understands cooking. Good wages. 1358-2-23m6i.

WHIST.—An enjoyable game of whist at the Rebekah Social tomorrow evening. 1354.

WANTED AT ONCE.—MAID FOR general housework. No washing,. Apply to Mrs. Henry Aitken, 35 Longworth Ave. 1356-2-24mtf.

CELERY, JUST RECEIVED SAUNders, Newsom & Co. Market building. 1355-2-24M3i.

TO LET.—MAY 1, A TENEMENT, corner Fitzroy and Weymouth. Modern conveniences. Apply at 193 Weymouth. 1352-2-24m6ipd

STRAYED.—BOSTON TERRIER pup with initials I. R. B. on collar. Finder please notify I. R. Brown, 140 Elm Ave. 1347-2-24m3ipd

FOUND.—SATURDAY EVENING 14th, two ties. Owner may have the same by calling at the Arlington House, proving property and paying for this ad.1351-2-24m1ipd

FOR SALE.—OPTIONS ON 6 PAIR Silver Black pups. Parents Dalton-Gordon foxes. Delivery, Sept, 1st. St. George's Bay Fur Co., 803 Journal Bldg, Boston, Mass. 1353-2-24mtf.

WE WILL SELL BY PUBLIC AUCtion on the premises of Geo. Chappell, 11 Douglas St., on Monday March 2nd, his cottage, out-buildings with lot containing splendid orchard. Benj. Carter & Co. Auctioneers. 1350-3-24M5ipd.

FARM FOR SALE AT NORTH River Corner, 4½ miles from Charlottetown, containing 98½ acres in a high state of cultivation, with a good house and a large barn and seven other buildings. Apply to Rodd's Harness Shop Charlottetown. 3826-1-12Mtf

COMING EVENTS, ANNOUNCEMENTS, MEETINGS ETC.

One cent per word each insertion in this column. Cash must accompany order. Minimum charges twenty-five cents.

**Mr. Frost's lecture on Thursday night in Zion school-room will be under the patronage of Lt-Governor Rogers. A quartette selection and a solo will be given during the evening. 1359-2-23m3i

**Regular meeting of Hamilton, L. O. L., No. 1366, Monday, March the 2nd. A full attendance is requested.

Minards liniment cures garget in cows.