

# The Daily Examiner.

TERMS:—FIVE DOLLARS A YEAR.

"This is true Liberty, when Free-born Men having to advise the Public, may speak free."—EPICURUS.

SINGLE COPIES TWO CENTS.

NEW SERIES.

CHARLOTTETOWN, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 12, 1882.

VOL. 10.—NO. 119.

## BRITISH WAREHOUSE, QUEEN SQUARE.

### W. & A. BROWN & CO.

Keep in Every Department of their Establishment a full assortment of  
**STAPLE AND FANCY DRY GOODS,**  
of superior quality and texture, which cannot be surpassed either for price or quality,  
as they import direct from the best British and Foreign markets.  
INSPECT THEIR STOCK IF YOU WANT GOOD VALUE FOR YOUR MONEY.

## AT COST!

### Readymade Clothing, Tweeds and Heavy Cloths,

AS I WANT TO CLOSE OUT MY STOCK IN THIS LINE.

### Some Expensive Ladies' Cloth Mantles and Dolmans, and Fur Lined Cloaks, Scalettes and Colored Dress Goods.

AT A LARGE REDUCTION.

JUST OPENED AND MARKED LOW.

A Select Assortment of Flowers, Feathers, Velveteens, Ladies' Sacques, &c., &c.

### R. W. TREMAINE,

83 QUEEN STREET

Nov. 1, 1881.

## SELLING OFF

—AT—

### W. A. HUTCHESON'S.

### I shall Sell off my Stock of Groceries at COST.

Parties wishing to get their **GROCERIES** Cheap should call at once and leave their orders.

GOOD TEA, 25, 30 and 33 cents; CRACKERS, 4 to 14 cents; MOLASSES, 47 cents; SUGAR, 8 cents.  
RAISINS, 10 cents; CURRANTS, 8 cents.

A large lot of **CONFECTIONERY** from 15 to 20 cents; lot **CHRISTMAS GOODS**, very cheap; and sundry other articles too numerous to mention—all at cost for Cash only.

### W. A. HUTCHESON,

109 UPPER QUEEN STREET

Dec. 16, 1881—3m eod, wkl

## BOSTON BRANCH

THE BOSTON SILVER PLATING CO are now prepared to do all kinds of Gold and Silver Plating, such as Knives, Forks, Spoons, Cake Baskets, Ice Pitchers, Crust Stands, Tea Sets, Watches and Jewelry of every description, Carriage Work, Handles, Dashers, etc., etc.

Also, Sewing Machines and Guns repaired, and all kinds of fine Machinery.  
Every job warranted to give entire satisfaction or no charge made.

WILLIAM BROWN,  
Manager.

Shop on the corner of Prince and Grafton Streets,  
Charlottetown, Feb. 4, '82.

## CHARLOTTETOWN BUSINESS COLLEGE,

(ESTABLISHED 1873.)

Welsh & Owen's Brick Building, Corner of King and Queen Streets, Charlottetown, P. E. I.

REAGH & MILLER, - - Proprietors.

Designed to Educate Young Men for Business.

OUR SYSTEM is conducted on Actual Business and Scientific Principles, and embraces all subjects necessary for a thorough Commercial Education. Our facilities for teaching these are the most complete that have ever been devised. Theory and practice are combined, and the whole course rendered so interesting and practical that the dull student cannot fail to be largely benefited. The course of Study is short, practical, useful and reasonable; it is just what every Man needs and will use, no matter what his calling or profession is to be.

The youth commencing a business life with only industry and integrity as his capital, the clerk engaged during business hours, but desirous by evening study to repair the defects in his education, each have the advantage offered by our course occupying DAY AND EVENING. Morning Session, 9.30 to 12, and 2 to 4 p. m. Evening Session, 7.30 to 9.30.

Diplomas granted to such as pass satisfactory examinations. Students may enter at any time. No entrance examination required. Business men and others are cordially invited to call and examine our system.

Teach your sons what they will practice when they become men.

Full particulars concerning Terms, Tuition, Scholarships, &c., &c., on application to  
L. B. MILLER,  
Principal.

Jan. 7, '81—s o d.

## THE EXAMINER JOB PRINTING OFFICE

HAS LATELY BEEN REPLENISHED WITH

### A Large Supply of Printing Types and Material,

OF THE LATEST INVENTION AND BEST DESCRIPTION,

AND WE ARE NOW PREPARED,

Under the Careful and Skillful Supervision of Mr. J. W. Mitchell,

TO PRINT

**BILL HEADS, LETTER HEADS,  
BLANK CHEQUES, RECEIPTS,  
NOTES OF HAND, POSTERS,  
HAND BILLS, DODGERS, &c., &c.,**

On Short Notice, in Good Style, at Cheap Prices.

## WHOLESALE DRY GOODS SALE.

I am prepared to dispose of the whole of my Stock of

## DRY GOODS,

—CONSISTING OF—

### Readymade Clothing,

### HATS AND CAPS,

### Shirts, Collars, Scarfs, Ties,

—AND—

### Gents' Furnishings Generally, &c.

I will sell the Stock in lots to suit purchasers, or in one lot.

—ALSO—  
The Lease, for three years, of the PREMISES at present occupied by me.

CHARLES I. MORRISON.  
Charlottetown, Feb. 2, 1882.

## Herring. Herring.

100 bbls. Extra Fat No. 1, equal to Yarmouth Boaters.  
100 quintals Codfish,  
100 do. Hake,  
12 casks Cod OIL,  
300 Mackerel Barrels (good stock),  
1000 bushels Fishing Salt.  
On hand, a full supply of Cotton Duck Bolt Rope, Hemp and Manila Cordage, Lines and Twines, Paints and Oils.

DAVID SMALL,  
Queen's Wharf, Sept. 10, 1881.

## Coal! Coal!

A Quantity of Pictou and Albion Mine ROUND COAL for sale for Cash only. N. B.—Orders to be left at Koughlan's Scales.

## WANTED.

AT the JUNK STORE, Head Pownal A Wharf, old Copper, Brass, Iron, Lead, Zinc, Rope and Canvas, Horse Hair, Rags, &c., for which the highest price will be paid. Charlottetown, Jan. 13, '82—3m

## Mr. Hackett's Speech

### ON MR. LAURIER'S MOTION.

MR. HACKETT—In my opinion the hon. gentleman who has introduced this motion has done so for the purpose of making

SOME CAPITAL

in the Maritime Provinces. As we have to depend to a large extent on the people of Ontario for our breadstuffs, the hon. gentleman imagines that he will make a strong point with the people of the Maritime Provinces. If I am credibly informed, I believe that hon. gentleman made a tour of the Maritime Provinces last year. I am told that he went down to Nova Scotia and said there that he intended to convince the people of that section of the country that they were unjustly taxed. I am also informed that on one occasion the hon. gentleman was addressing an audience at New Glasgow in the county of Pictou, and his platform being a very unsubstantial and rickety one, he was precipitated below and came down at the feet of the people of Nova Scotia. I think that the hon. gentleman will find that his present motion is just as unsubstantial and as poorly constructed as that platform was, and when he and his party go to the people of this country in 1883, or sooner, they will meet with a similar misfortune, and will find themselves, as they did then, scrambling in the dirt. The hon. gentleman has endeavored to make it appear that the people of this country are paying a certain tax on breadstuffs. The fact is that we in this country

PRODUCE MORE FLOUR

than we can consume, and have to go abroad to find a market for our surplus flour, and while this is the case no one can make it appear that we are paying an exorbitant price for our flour. The price of breadstuffs is regulated by the markets of the world, and when we have to go to Europe to sell our products, it is quite evident that we are not paying more for our breadstuffs than we would pay were there no duty upon them. But to prove my position I have only to quote the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). He stated in his speech on the Budget that spring wheat was sold in Buffalo at \$1.45 per bushel, and in Toronto at \$1.26 per bushel, or 18 1/2 cents lower in Canada than in the United States. Now, Sir, we know very well that if wheat can be bought in Canada 18 1/2 cents cheaper than in the United States, flour must necessarily be bought cheaper also. We have the same facilities for manufacturing flour in Canada that they have in the United States. We have as good water power or steam power, as good skilled workmen, and as good mills, and what is the reason that, if we can produce wheat in Canada 18 1/2 cents cheaper than the United States, we cannot also have flour at a cheaper rate? Now, following out the line of argument laid down by that hon. gentleman, what would be the result, taking as a basis four and a half bushels of wheat for a barrel of flour? We find that flour manufactured from Canadian wheat could be sold in the markets of the world for 85 cents less than the flour of the United States of a corresponding grade. It is ridiculous for the hon. gentleman to endeavor to make it appear that, with a duty of 50 cents per barrel on United States flour, it is going to raise the price of Canadian flour. I came from a Province that possesses few manufacturing industries. Whether that being to a want of enterprise, or to an isolated position, I cannot say. But it is impossible to prove that, because we are shut out for a great portion of the year from the rest of the Dominion, and have to buy a large portion of the commodities we consume, that we are unduly taxed. Now, with regard to the article of breadstuffs, I will just state what has been done in that line last year. I find, in looking at the Trade and Navigation Returns, that Prince Edward Island, last year, imported 2,200 barrels of flour, upon which duty amounting to \$1,100 has been paid. Is that any reason why we should take alarm at this flour duty. The amount collected from the importation of foreign flour amounts only to 1 cent per head of the population of the Island. Is that an exorbitant tax? Hon. gentlemen will agree with me that a tax of that amount, even if the people had to pay the duty, which I deny, would not be alarming. Those 2,200 barrels of flour were imported from the United States, and so they are reported to be the simplest fact that we have some citizens of the United States doing business on the Island. They can buy in the markets of the United States a certain brand of flour very much cheaper than they can do in Canada. We have no brand of flour in Canada so low as the brand which they can buy in the United States. Flour that has been cast aside as not capable of bearing inspection is brought to the Island and sold to fishermen. Those 2,200 barrels are altogether of this description; they were of a low grade, so low and poor that they could not be sold to the people of the United States, and they had to be mixed with good Canadian flour before they were saleable. I am of the opinion that a duty of \$1 or \$1.50 on American flour would be better than the present duty of 50 cents per barrel, so as to shut out the American flour altogether. We have in this country

A LARGE EXTENT OF FERTILE LAND, as intelligent farmers as in the United States, and, with a good climate, we should be able to raise sufficient breadstuffs for ourselves and not be dependent on the United States. For myself, speaking from the standpoint of a Prince Edward Islander, I know the low grades of flour that are imported, and I shall be very glad to see such grades altogether excluded from our market. But apart altogether from the question of flour and wheat, there are other products of Canada that require protection. We raise large quantities of coarse grains, such as barley and oats, and our farmers require to be protected in that particular industry. They require protection against American oats and barley brought into our markets. Our opponents say a duty of ten cents per bushel on coarse grains is no protection whatever. But what was the condition of things in 1878? We had a very large quantity of these grains imported. We do not say hon. gentlemen opposite did so for political purposes, but an hon. gentleman who is looking at me at this moment introduced a resolution setting forth that it was necessary, in the interest of our farmers, that a duty should be imposed on American oats and flour. Has the honorable gentleman come back on his position? If so, he is the most inconsistent of individuals. In 1878, 340,491 bushels of American barley were imported to this country. Was it not neces-

sary that Canadian farmers should be protected in some measure against such an influx. Hon. gentlemen will agree with me in saying that it was. What has been the result of the present tariff on barley? While we imported nearly 500,000 bushels in 1878, last year, 1881, we imported only eleven bushels; and that is a conclusive proof that the protective duty had the effect of shutting out those 500,000 bushels. Coming to oats, in which I am more immediately interested, I would remark that, in 1878, 1,638,778 bushels were brought into the Dominion from the United States. Hon. gentlemen may say that the price is low in the United States, and for that reason oats were brought into Canada. That is the very reason why the farmers should have Protection. As opposed to almost 2,000,000 bushels imported in 1878, there were only 2,573 bushels imported last year. Here we clearly see the result of the National Policy, under which our own farmers have the market to the extent of the former importation. What was the result of the policy in force in 1878, on the people of Prince Edward Island. Owing to the fact that oats were imported from the United States, and sold in Ontario and Quebec, the oats of those Provinces were

FORCED INTO THE MARKETS.

of the Lower Provinces. Before that time we had the markets of the Lower Provinces almost to ourselves. The farmers of Prince Edward Island could send oats to different points in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and sell them at remunerative prices, but in 1878, owing to the large quantity of oats entering the Upper Provinces these oats were forced down to the Maritime Provinces and reduced the prices to unremunerative rates. On account of the import duty of 10 cents a bushel on oats American oats are not sent into the Upper Provinces, the oats of their farmers are therefore sold in the home market and we command the Lower Provinces. Island farmers can now send their oats to Halifax and St. John and all along the north shore of New Brunswick, and sell them at remunerative prices, and I therefore contend that I have thoroughly and clearly established that the National Policy has greatly benefited not only Ontario and Quebec but also the Lower Provinces. Hon. gentlemen opposite will argue that while the Islanders are dealing with Ontario and Quebec they should deal with the people of the United States, and that the United States is their natural market. I cannot see that that has been clearly established. As regards certain commodities such as

POTATOES

our principal market is the United States, but they meet us with a duty which almost shuts us out. If that is our natural market it would appear as if we were not the natural suppliers of that market, because the Americans impose a heavy duty before they admit our products. Is it consistent with political economy that the Americans should shut out our products and we allow them to bring in their products free? It is an injustice, and hon. gentlemen who support such a policy are not a party who will receive the support of the people. The Province of Prince Edward Island in 1870 supported just such a policy as is at present in force in the Dominion. Looking at the Tariff of the Island for that year, which was three years before Confederation, and when the Island did not think it necessary to enter Confederation, and when every person was opposed to the proposal, the Government of the day imposed a duty on products coming from the United States. I have in my hands the journals of the Legislative Assembly for 1870, and I find that even at that day a tax of 11 per cent was imposed on bread coming into the Island—a higher tax than is now imposed by the Government of the Dominion. I find also that every article produced by the farmers of the Island was protected. I find that such articles as butter, cheese and many other articles produced by the farmer were largely protected.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH—But you imported these articles.  
MR. HACKETT—Well, the duty was put on in the interests of the Island, as it has been put on the Dominion of Canada, by a Government desirous of protecting the interests of farmers as well as other classes. I find that a duty of one shilling per barrel was imposed on corn-meal, so that it will be seen that the Island was in favor of protection long ago, notwithstanding the statements of those who try to make it appear that they speak for the people of that Province, that they are heaven-born statesmen who can speak for the whole Dominion. I represent as intelligent a constituency as any gentleman in this House. I care not from what part of the Dominion he comes, and when I speak for them I speak their sentiments and views, and in their interests. When I say that we are not opposed to

FAIR TAXATION,

that we are willing to bear our share in common with the rest of the Dominion, I speak the sentiments of my constituents, who believe that this system is in the interests of the Dominion at large. Hon. gentlemen opposite try to make it appear that the people of the Maritime Provinces are galling under the yoke of the present Tariff. These hon. gentlemen are trying to stir up sectional feelings to turn one Province against another. That is their desire, but the people are too intelligent and well schooled in the politics of the country for hon. gentlemen of small ideas, of contracted views, to lead them astray on this subject. Now, with regard to the duty on flour, I find that, even at that time, though the Island had not joined the Dominion, the people of that Province felt that they should trade with their brethren in Canada; they recognized that as an act of patriotism, and in consequence they taxed American flour 1s. 6d. per bushel, and allowed the colonial product to come in free. They said we are going to protect the interests of people living under

THE BRITISH FLAG

in all parts of this country; we will let their products in free and impose a tax on the people living south of the boundary line to the same amount as they impose upon us. And who are the hon. gentlemen who were at the head of the Government who imposed this tax. They are gentlemen who still live in Prince Edward Island; they still say that they belong to the great Liberal party of this country, and although they are represented in this House by a not very numerous party, in fact a most insignificant party, still occasionally meet them down in Prince Edward Island where they claim to belong to the great Free Trade Liberal party of this country. The leader of that Government has now a very snug place in the Senate of this Dominion. He is at present the only gentleman in the Senate from Prince Edward Island who supports hon. gentlemen opposite,

and yet he was the man who said that the products of Prince Edward Island should be protected against the products of other countries. I refer to the Hon. Mr. Haythorne. Another was the Hon. Alexander Laird, brother of the ex-Governor of the North-West Territories, who was formerly a member of this House, and a great Free Trader. Hon. Peter Sinclair was another who was also a member of the last Parliament. Then there was the Hon. Benjamin Davies, who has been ensconced in a fine office in Prince Edward Island, as a reward for his services; and I think it comes with very bad grace from hon. gentlemen here, who pretend to be on the same side of politics with them, to oppose Protection for the industries of Canada. I believe that Protection is

THE SETTLED POLICY

of the people of this Dominion, and that nothing hon. gentlemen can say or do will change in the slightest degree the minds of the people, for the feeling is too widely spread, too deeply seated. Hon. gentlemen may move want of confidence motions, as many as they please, but the people will regard it as on par with the clap-net which these hon. gentlemen indulged in in 1878. Another redeeming feature of the present policy is this: that we are relieved from the pressure of alarming deficits of hon. gentlemen opposite. We are placed beyond the possibility of their repetition. Last year we had the large surplus of \$4,500,000 and the present year I hope it will be \$3,000,000 at least—a fact that shows that we are now starting on an era of prosperity. The people of this country realize that we are starting on an era of prosperity, and why should they abandon it for a more gloomy state of things. Hon. gentlemen need not imagine that they are going to carry away the people, or change their policy by moving these resolutions, as the people are bound that they shall not depart from the prosperity, the peace and plenty which they are now enjoying under the present Tariff by adopting the one advocated by hon. gentlemen opposite.

## NOTICE.

HAVING rented the premises lately occupied by C. F. HARRIS, the subscriber begs to intimate to the public that he is carrying on the

TINSMITH BUSINESS

in all its branches. Orders punctually attended to. A call respectively solicited.  
L. W. HARRIS,  
Upper Queen St.  
Feb. 8, 1882.

## INSURANCE OFFICE.

### Queen Insurance Company, OF ENGLAND.

CAPITAL, TEN MILLION DOLLARS.

### City of London Fire Insurance Company,

CAPITAL, TEN MILLION DOLLARS.

Insurance effected on all kinds of property at current rates. Losses settled promptly and equitably.

F. KENNEDY,  
General Agent.

Office—South Side Queen Square,  
Charlottetown, Feb. 3, 1882.

## St. Lawrence Hotel.

THE above Hotel is now RE OPENED, having been thoroughly repaired and refurnished in the best style. Being centrally situated and within three minutes walk of the Railway Depot and Steamboats, it offers inducements to the travelling public. Permanent and transient boarders accommodation unsurpassed by any other Hotel in the city.

WM. E. HICKEY,  
Proprietor

Charlottetown, Dec. 21, '81.

## W. C. BISHOP, SHIPPING

## FORWARDING AGENT,

Marine Insurance Broker,

## General Commission Agent,

BEDFORD ROW.

P. O. BOX 1 . . . HALIFAX, N. S.

PARTICULAR ATTENTION given to the Shipment of Lobsters and other Canned Goods, and collection of Custom Drawbacks thereon.

Hulls, Cargoes, and Freights insured in first-class offices at most favorable rates. Consignments of Produce solicited, and prompt returns guaranteed.

Correspondence solicited and answered promptly.  
Nov. 14, 1881—1yr

## CARD.

## THE MISSES CURRIE

HAVE removed from the Rooms recently occupied by them above the Store of R. W. Tremaine, Esq., to the Store lately occupied by their late father, near cor. of Pownal and Grafton Streets, where they are still prepared to fill orders for Dress and Mantle-making. Mantles a speciality. [64 meed

MRS. BOSWALL

For Sale or to Let.

THAT Freshford Property, with a front of 180 feet on Pownal Street and eighty-four feet on Sydney Street, the House containing 16 large rooms and two Kitchens. Can be turned into one Dwelling by unblocking a door. Apply on the premises to

MARCH 12, 1881—1f