

THERE IS NOTHING LIKE FACTS.

The More We Sell the Cheaper We Sell.
The Cheaper We Sell the More We Sell.
We Are Selling More Than We Did,
Because
WE ARE SELLING CHEAPER.

We are bound to make things stir this summer, and our way of doing this is to sell at lowest living prices, and when we have a good big bargain, give it to our customers. The fact that people are flocking to our store is proof of the value we give. No one can undersell us.

BEER BROS.

FIGURES DO NOT LIE.

Summer Jackets \$1.90
Silk and Lace Capes, very rich 3.90
New Dolmans 5.00
..... .40
..... .08

Ladies' Lisle Gloves 8c
Taffeta Gloves 19c
Pure Silk Gloves 30c
and
Special Bargains in Hats, Bonnets and Trimmings.

REMNANT COUNTER.
Our Wonderful Bargain Counter of Remnants is still under full way. Gingham, Satin, Dress Goods, Prints, Shirting, Cambrics, etc., at much under value. No one can undersell us.

BEER BROS.

THE COMMISSION

Prohibition Pressed Home

MR. GARDINER SPEAKS CLEAR AND STRONG.

Even Liquor Dealers Think Prohibition Desirable.

REV. MR. BREWER

Shows how a Drunkard's Money Goes

Father McAulay Thinks Prohibition Irrational.

To Dr. McLeod.—The licensees under the old license law never gave any assistance in enforcing the law. I once fined a city councillor who held a license for selling on the Sabbath day.

I think the non-enforcement of the Scott Act can be accounted for.

The city marshal's statement regarding the police having an eye to the opinions of the majority of the Council is one reason. The police should be free from outside influences.

Mr. Fitzgerald here submitted an additional table of statistics.

With reference to the number of persons convicted he said 144 different persons were actually convicted in the nine years. The statement reported that there were 364 illicit places under the Scott Act was incorrect. He estimated that there would be about 150 illicit places in existence at one time. There were twelve in this city when it was almost impossible to get a glass of grog. A man had to lose his self-respect to descend to the tricks of getting liquor. He thought the fines imposed wholly inadequate to enforce the law and read a list of persistent violators to show how they had fared under the nine years of Scott Act. One man was convicted seven times, paid \$350 in fines and went to jail twice. Another convicted 15 times, paid \$780 and was jailed twice. Another convicted 11 times, paid \$350 and went to jail twice. Another convicted 7 times, paid \$500 and was jailed once. Another was convicted 20 times, paid \$750 and went to jail 9 times. Some of these men made nearly \$1000 under the Scott Act. They took all risks, defied the law, and made big profits. Another hindrance was the fact that prisoners under the Scott Act were better treated than others. They always succeeded in getting a doctor's certificate, without which prisoners are permitted to have jail fare only. Then of the \$12,000 collected in fines, about \$2000 were spent in the enforcement of the act, when the whole sum should have been applied.

At the conclusion of his evidence Judge McDonald complimented Mr. Fitzgerald very highly on the clear, explicit and valuable evidence he had given.

Hon. A. B. McKENZIE—To Judge McDonald—I am a merchant. Have been doing business in Charlottetown for 25 years. Have been a member of the legislative council for 16 years, and was previously a member of the house of assembly. I have seen the Scott Act work. It was not well enforced. I prefer the Scott Act, even as it was a license law. The present law prevents a good deal of drinking on the Sabbath day and late at night, which the Scott Act did not.

I would rather have 70 saloons as they are now than 5 or 6 licensed. I oppose license on principle. I favor Prohibition and see no insuperable difficulties in its enforcement.

Mr. McKENZIE here explained the peculiar position in which Ch'town was placed until recently as regards representation in the council, by which the minority ruled the council and refused to carry out the wishes of the people regarding the enforcement of the Scott Act.

To Judge McDonald—I doubt if the legislative would pass a license law. I hear no complaints against the Scott Act in the district which I represent. I don't think there is an illicit tavern there. I believe if the citizens had an opportunity they would to-day repeal the Scott Act by a large majority. Its defeat at least election was due to a number of names of temperance people being left off the voters list by a mere quibble. The rum-sellers took advantage of this to bring on the repeal election.

To Dr. McLeod—I think Prohibition would be advantageous to the business of the country,—money spent for liquor is just as if it were thrown into the sea.

I think the Scott Act was an admirable act because it put the rum seller in his proper place and made drinking respectable. I think twenty attractive saloons would do as much harm as seventy or even two hundred illicit places.

Hon T. W. DODD, M. L. C. (sworn)—Have represented the city and county 18 or 20 years. I think in the country there was a decrease in the drinking habits of the people but not in the city. I don't think a prohibitory law could be carried out in this country. I think a great many officers would be required to prevent smuggling. I don't know what there would be a stronger sentiment for supporting a revenue law than a prohibitory law.

The wards of the city were changed by the voice of the people.

To Dr. McLeod—Fifty years ago there was more smuggling than now. The feeling of the people I think is more in favor of enforcing the revenue law now.

I think the drink trade affects injuriously other businesses, such as manufacturing, agriculture, etc. I think the Scott Act was better for the farmers. They were deterred from drinking when they came to Ch'town from fear of being summoned as witnesses and also because they would not degrade themselves by sneaking in back doors, etc. I think the law

was to a certain extent an advantage in this way.

To Mr. Clarke—I don't know whether or not a prohibitory law would work. I am in favor of a good sound license act. I object to permitting a man to import liquor, accepting the duty from him and then refusing him permission to sell it.

To Dr. Macleod—I don't know whether license would lessen drinking. I don't know whether or not I would prefer a prohibitory law well enforced.

C. C. Gardner, Esq. (sworn)—Am a man of leisure. I have been in the city and county 20 years. Under license the condition of the city was very different. I was not a temperance man, never belonged to a society. We used to come in and stand treat and nobody thought anything about it. It was necessary for people driving in from the country market days to return home before sun down because the roads were generally crowded with drunken drivers who were just as likely to run you down as not. Several times I was run down. The Scott Act entirely changed that. The farmers went home sober. I think ten men went home drunk under license for one under the Scott Act.

In spite of the poor enforcement of the act it did great good for country people and many in the city also. The rough element probably got more liquor under the Scott Act than they do now. They could buy it sometimes and demand it at other times to be kept quiet. Repeal was brought about from various causes. It not being properly enforced and second the people got tired waiting for the overthrow of the business. The continued struggle against the rum-sellers was discouraging. Those men were unceasing in their opposition. They were fighting for their living and they hoped that the people would in time grow disheartened and give up the fight and they would get back to license.

The effects of the drink traffic are most disastrous in the business interests.

To Mr. Clarke.—The lowest class of rum-sellers never voted to sustain the act in my opinion. I think that under the license law there was a worse state of affairs than under the Scott Act. I don't believe in license in any shape or form. The public become partners in the business and share the responsibility of any evil.

John Kelly (sworn)—Am in the commission business. Have been a Councillor for Ward 2. I think the present regulation act very good. I prefer a good license law and a limited number of saloons. With proper restrictions to make license effective, you must deal with the persons who drink, as well as those who sell. The Magistrate could make a monthly report of persons who were becoming drunkards and the sellers should not be allowed to sell to them. I would permit a man to drink until he became a drunkard and then I would stop him. I would close at 7 o'clock and on Saturdays earlier, so that when laboring men get their pay there would be no temptation for them. The old license law I don't think was very strictly enforced. The licensees fairly well observed the law. The licensees never kept an eye on the illicit sellers, as I never knew of any such. As soon as the Scott Act came in force I went out of the liquor business.

I prefer license to the Scott Act as we had it. I think the law was responsible for perjury. I think men who at first would swear straight later on grew less careful. As a business it was not considered as reputable as when it had the authority of law. A prohibitory law, if it could be enforced, I would prefer. It would have a better effect on the community.

To Mr. Giguault—I think there was a considerable temperance sentiment where the Scott Act came into force. It was not a matured sentiment. Men who voted for the act would be seen afterwards drinking. I think the clergy and the temperance societies are doing good. I think there was not much improvement under the Scott Act. I think it was pretty well enforced at times.

There is considerable difference of opinion as to how the Scott Act fines should be expended. The city was guaranteed all fines and penalties for its general fund. When, in the council, I always opposed placing this fund to the credit of the Scott Act. If that money had been expended in enforcing the law it would not have made much difference as public sentiment was lax.

To Dr. McLeod—I don't know any who sold under the Scott Act who are not selling now. I think there may be a few selling now whom the marshal hasn't counted.

HERBERT BEER—(sworn)—The Scott Act was fairly well enforced at times. Its non-enforcement caused its repeal to a certain extent. Then some of our newspapers were continually writing against the act,—a man could not get drunk but some papers used it to bring the act into dispute. The act was hampered by the Council also.

To Mr. Clarke—I have been elected a Councillor twice. The liquor party was not always in the majority. A proponent was appointed at one time and the act was fairly well enforced. The liquor party dismissed this official. If the Scott Act came in force now the Council would use every dollar of the fines to enforce the act. Under the old license law there was much drunkenness. It was looked upon as a very ordinary thing. The Scott Act has changed all that. I know several

respectable farmers who gave up excessive drinking when the act came into force. It was difficult for a certain class to get liquor under the Scott Act. The active avowed opponents of the act were the liquor sellers. The large majority of the best citizens wished to have it enforced. I believe enforced total Prohibition would be a grand thing. I don't think it would be nearly as difficult to enforce as many people make out. Many who always voted against the Scott Act have said they would support prohibition.

Commission adjourned to meet Monday morning at 10 o'clock.

The Commission assembled at 10 15 o'clock.

Hon. A. B. McKENZIE called attention to the statement in the published evidence that "he had been a member of the House of Assembly." He said that if he made such a statement it was not correct and called attention to it in case the official reporter had the same mistake.

Judge McDonald ordered such a statement erased from the official report.

JAMES CURRIE—To Judge McDonald—I have been collector of customs at Charlottetown for 13 years. There are 12 outlets besides Charlottetown.

Mr. Currie submitted the following memorandum to his lordship—spirits, etc. imported and entered for consumption at the port of Ch'town (Kings and Queens Counties) for one and a half years ending 31st December, 1890:

IMPORTED.		
Goods	Gals.	Value.
Ale	7,570	\$ 4,340
Spirits	24,358	26,919
Wines	1,407	2,395
Totals	33,335	\$33,654

ENTERED FOR CONSUMPTION.		
Goods	Gals.	Value.
Ale	7,978	\$ 4,487
Spirits	34,292	31,185
Wines	1,742	2,541
Totals	43,012	\$38,213

Spirits, etc. imported and entered for consumption at the port of Ch'town (Queen's and King's Counties) for one and a half years ending 30th June, 1892:

IMPORTED.		
Goods	Gals.	Value.
Ale	5,551	\$ 3,532
Spirits	32,692	35,999
Wines	2,389	2,691
Totals	40,632	\$42,222

ENTERED FOR CONSUMPTION.		
Goods	Gals.	Value.
Ale	5,656	\$ 3,613
Spirits	35,572	34,822
Wines	2,143	2,587
Totals	43,371	\$40,972

A statement of the spirits, including wines and ales, entered for home consumption at this port for the fiscal years from 1887 to 1890, as follows:—

Year.	Gals.	Duty.
1887-88	33,623	\$26,701 \$48,999.38
1888-89	30,357	24,234 \$4,705.81
1889-90	30,124	25,750 \$8,389.71

Owing to the burning of the customs house, I can give no statement previous to the enforcement of the Scott Act.

To Mr. Giguault.—The Scott Act was at times poorly enforced. It would have been a good deal better enforced had it not been for the insincerity of its friends.

From common report I should say the Scott Act was not as well enforced as it should be. All the imports were not consumed in Charlottetown.

To Mr. Clarke.—The common practice of most liquor dealers is to purchase liquor and then reduce it with water. From the time the Scott Act was repealed there was no restriction on liquor selling. There are from 20 to 30 roughs who are continually drinking. During the Scott Act liquor was sold illegally. We have in the community men who were hard workers in the cause of temperance and attentive to their business; and we have men who professing to be temperance men who are not. You cannot get 4 out 10, who voted for the Scott Act who had not been drinking during the enforcement of the act. These men were, perhaps, ill, but a great many of them were ill very often. I believe there was a very large quantity of liquor brought from Halifax, St. John and Montreal, which had been duty paid at those ports. I think we have a very good law now. If the present law was a little stricter and enforced with all strictness, it would be better than Scott Act, as it was. Those who thirsted for drink under the Scott Act would have to act the sneak. Under the present law those who want a drink can get it. The law for closing up at 10 o'clock and at 6 o'clock Saturday, is an excellent one. I know a den in this city—the worst in the Dominion of Canada. This place is owned by a Rev. gentleman who is absent from the Island. There is a clergyman in the court who has taken this matter in hand both in the press and from the pulpit. The working man does not go home till six o'clock on Saturday, and as the rum shops are closed at six, he cannot get any liquor till Monday morning. Prohibition is the law we want and the law we must have. If the ministers and temperance people keep at it, our people will be better educated for prohibition ten years from to-day. Owing to our coast being so easy of approach, a great deal of smuggling would be practised, and prohibition would be difficult to enforce. Some of the country districts have been getting liquor and selling it during the Scott Act. The habit under the Scott Act was to get into a place openly, purchase liquor and carry it home

I think there has been a decrease in drunkenness during the last 8 or 9 years. The fine here for drunkenness is very low, and should be increased 100 per cent. Any decrease in drunkenness is to be attributed to the pulpit and temperance lecturers. They have done more than legislation.

There was less drinking when the Scott Act was enforced. There was a change in the duties, an increase, in the last session of parliament. It was small and would not effect the importation very largely. I never saw a temperance man pretend to be a drinking man; but I know drinking men pretending to be temperance men. The pretence is on the part of the drinking man.

Dr. McLeod.—Then the insincerity is due to the drinking habit.

I don't know how many such men there are, just as many as there are hypocrites.

Some men and women in Charlottetown, some of the best sun shines on, and there are also some sneaking hypocrites. I think the former are friends of the Scott Act. I remember the old license law; there was a good deal of drinking; there is less now. A man who drinks now is supposed to put a blot upon his reputation. The custom of the country has changed. Temperance lecturing and preaching has done more than law. Law has restricted it because one could not get it as freely under the law of restriction. I think the law only taught men to break it. A man will drink as his appetite prompts him, there was less drunkenness visible on the streets under the Scott Act than under license. The effect of unadulterated liquor, will make a man drunk. All men are not the same under the influence, some are jolly, some combative, and some inclined to swindle. I suppose it takes a man longer to recover from the effects of bad liquor than good. I think surrounding the trade with great restriction, till the time the people are prepared for prohibition, is the best thing to do; I would increase the fines of those who sell and those who drink. I would not go in for a license law, but for restriction. If restriction were enforced it would do good. I think it impossible to legislate men into sobriety, but you can legislate to make it very difficult to get liquor. The man with an appetite however, would be more intent under restriction to get liquor. I think boys who have an impudent taste for liquor would get it also. Some of the licensees broke the old license law, just as they do now. There will be an illicit sale until you touch the moral sentiment. The weak dissolute drinkers require restriction. The ranks of these I suppose are continually being recruited. Of course these men at one time were not excessive drinkers.

I was in the grocery and liquor business before I became collector of customs. Since 1880 trade hasn't been so good or so fluctuating. It appears to me that when the liquor trade was prosperous more money was in circulation, and there was more to spend. I don't know that this was due to the prosperity of the liquor trade. If I was a farmer I would rather have no saloon in the settlement. It would be convenient for travellers but for the settlement it would not be as good as a church or a school-house. I believe if alcohol were not in the world at all the world would be better, but Prohibition now would be utter folly. I think there is a growing sentiment for temperance. I believe if the sentiment was such as to convince a large majority that to drink is injurious and wrong that would be the time to prohibit.

To Mr. Clarke.—There are not quite as many sailing vessels coming here now as there were at the time of the license law. We have more steamers now.

MR. CLARKE asked Rev. Mr. Fisher to identify the journal of the proceedings in 1891 of the Grand Lodge S. of T. Grand Scribe Burns, on page 17, utters a word of warning to the effect that hundreds, yes, thousands of our boys are going to destruction.

MR. FISHER—I regard the statement as overdrawn. It is the personal opinion of the Scribe. I do not think that part of the report was adopted.

Mr. Clarke then read a paragraph from the committee's report agreeing with the Scribe that the time was critical and the repeal of the Scott Act in Ch'town had the result of distributing liquor from Ch'town throughout the county.

MR. FISHER—That was adopted by the majority of the Grand Lodge. After the repeal of the Scott Act there was an increase of drunkenness here, and I think the Scribe's note of warning was based on that fact.

M. P. HOGAN, lumber dealer, (sworn)—Have resided here 17 years, excepting 2 years in Ohio during the Scott Act period. I think the Scott Act was enforced as far as it was possible. But it was not well enforced, because, let one half the community did not back it up. I believe people were given liquor to vote for the Scott Act. I know of this being done. I would not favor the re-enactment of the Scott Act, because it caused perjury. That would be my chief reason. Some people cannot enjoy themselves at social gatherings without liquor. I have no doubt the police officers were blocked and hindered from enforcing the law. I would not prefer a prohibitory law because I believe it never could be enforced. I don't know anything about

Maine. I think a stringent license law best. I don't like the present law with the bar rooms open everywhere. I think it would be better if they were all closed up. I supported the Scott Act at first, but not altogether on my own convictions. It made social enemies of neighbors and caused perjury. Seventeen years ago trade and shipping were good, money plentiful and liquor cheap. At present the people haven't the means to drink. I remember one particular occasion when a temperance man gave a man liquor to vote for the Scott Act. The liquor trade never affected my men because I don't employ drinking men. I believe drink makes men less valuable laborers.

Rev. Mr. Brewer (sworn)—Have lived 3 years here and four years in the vicinity from 1870 to 1874. As far as my knowledge goes the effect of the Scott Act was good. I don't know of more than one suspected place in the upper part of the city when I labored there. I am very positive about good resulting from the Scott Act and the law was a help to me as a moral teacher. Mr. Brewer also described the Harbor Light work; 75 per cent of the men went to no church; 50 per cent were Roman Catholics; the work was done on non-denominational lines; 75 per cent of those who took the pledge kept it. The drink habit was altogether the cause of such dissoluteness as had existed among them. This work was done during free run days. He attributed the moral improvement of a certain locality alluded to by a previous witness as due to police activity and moral influence. An instance of destitution due to liquor was given. The wife of a mechanic had given him a bill of liquor sent to her by a liquor seller for one month's grog to her husband for \$16.92, (copy of bill certified by magistrate was handed in as evidence). The man would not have been able to get this liquor or the seller to collect the bill under the Scott Act. I think legalization of the trade in any form would not help the public conscience. I prefer the present system to license. The Methodist church has pronounced against license in any form. (Mr. Clarke here attempted to put words in the Rev. gentleman's mouth and received his rebuke therefore.)

To Mr. Clarke.—There are 3 or 4 places now where liquor is sold openly in the upper part of the city where formerly I only knew of one suspected place. I have found the police quick to answer when information is given.

To Mr. Giguault—I favor Prohibition except for medicinal, scientific and sacramental purposes.

Mr. Giguault read a passage from the Bible, recommending a little wine for the stomach's sake and often infirmities, etc.

Mr. Brewer said his church discouraged the use of fermented wines. He was not there to enter into controversies, but he believed the church's ruling was in accord with the divine law. He considered it against the divine law to drink fermented wine as a beverage. The Bible will not allow men to use what is destructive of physical health and morals.

Rev. Mr. McAulay (sworn)—Am Roman Catholic priest of Charlottetown. Have been a priest 27 years. I don't think the Scott Act had the effect of stopping liquor selling. In the opinion of the majority it restricted natural rights and was not supported by public sentiment. I don't think the officers enforced the law. It did not stop drunkenness. It created perjury and deceit. Low people without moral responsibility took hold of the business, and other sins besides drunkenness were committed. I think the habitual violation of one law leads people to violate others as well. My idea is that good legislation and temperance and religious work together are needed to suppress drunkenness. Neither can be effective alone. I do not think the divine law forbids the moderate use of wine or of any of God's works, or of any combination of them. I look upon drunkenness as the sin of the drunkard and not of the drink. If alcohol were essentially evil it would be evil to license it. I don't think God has made anything essentially evil. Liquor must be sold, so let us have the most restrictive law possible.

To Dr. McLeod—I consider the liquor of commerce God's creature. I consider the effects of drinking are not good, but the effects of the drink trade have in the main been bad. The moderate use of intoxicants I don't consider tends to excess. I can not say I know of any moderate drinkers who have become excessive drinkers. I think by putting the trade in reputable hands the evil results are reduced. I do not believe prohibition well enforced would do good, because I do not think it could be enforced. It is an irrational law to deprive a man of the use of his natural rights. I do not consider a law which prevents a man from injuring himself or his family irrational. Then you restrict the abuse, not the use. I believe prohibition brought about in a certain community by moral persuasion was good.

Dr. McLeod.—If the sentiment of the people would support prohibition would it be good?

Ans.—The way I look at it, the people would not get up to this point. It could be brought about generally by the

free will of the people, it would be good. If four-fifths of the people were favorable to prohibition I don't think—being enacted—it would educate the other fifth. The Scott Act is probably better enforced in the country than in the city. There is a better sentiment.

Montague News.

MONTAGUE, Aug. 17, 1892.—On Tuesday, the 16th inst., the four Sabbath School of Montague Bridge together with S. S. scholars from adjoining settlements assembled on the beautiful grounds of Peter A. Dewar to hold their annual picnic.

About 200 S. S. children together with a large number of teachers, parents and visitors made quite a large gathering. Two large tables capable of accommodating from 50 to 60 persons were spread on the lawn, and from three until after five o'clock the kind ladies who presided were kept busy and were certainly satisfied that their labours were fully appreciated, judging from the pleasant faces that surrounded them and the manner in which the good things provided disappeared; when not occupied at the tables the young folks enjoyed themselves on swings or in athletic sports.

I notice that our celebrated Athlete, Mr. B. F. Stewart, was busy all the afternoon superintending and giving hints and exhibitions of the best method in racing, jumping, vaulting, etc.

About 6 o'clock, after many expressions of pleasure and thanks for the kindness of Mrs. and Mr. Dewar, each took up their several ways resolved to meet some "other day."

On the 18 inst., the Farmers' Association of Cardigan are to hold a tea at that place we hope that they will have a fine day, and that they will enjoy themselves. I do not think the dancing part of the programme will be much inducement to the staid farmers of this section of the county to leave their unfinished hay or white harvest fields.

Harvest has commenced in some sections. J. M. Aitken out a field of white oats yesterday. Oats and wheat are generally a light crop, but apparently well filled root crops are looking exceedingly well; the potato bug, although numerous does not appear to have injured the vine much.—Con.

Letter from Judge Hodgson.

Sir—In your report of my evidence before the Royal Commission yesterday, you credit me with having said:—

"I imagine a man would swear to a lie in his own interest, if he thought he would not be found out."

I never made such a preposterous statement.

What I did say, (in answer to a question from Dr. McLeod) was:—"That most men who would tell a lie, would probably swear to it, if they thought they would not be found out."

I did not say—"in Prince County liquor selling has greatly increased under the Canada Temperance Act."

What I did say was—"that liquor selling has decreased in Prince County, except perhaps in Summerside."

In answer to Judge McDonald, I did not use the expression—"fermented wine." I do not believe that there is such a thing as "fermented wine," it is a contradiction in terms. I spoke of "wine," and called it "wine" because I said:—"That is law, where God Himself is judge." I did not say this; I do not know what this means, nor can I make any suggestion as to what you thought I meant, or intended to make me say.

Yours &c., EDWARD J. HUDSON.

[We regret that our reporter of Friday's proceedings, should have made these mistakes; at the same time it must be said that the reporters are placed at a great disadvantage in the court room, being placed behind the witness boxes, and consequently they are often difficult to hear correctly what they say.—Ed. G.]

Gladstone at Osborne House.

LONDON, Aug. 22.—The stories that Gladstone was received coldly at Osborne House are absolutely untrue. The interview with the Queen was especially cordial.

Among the honors conferred by the Queen is a Baronetcy to Sir Julian Pauncefote, Minister to Washington.

A previous despatch says that Mr. Gladstone had a warm reception at Osborne. Although Queen Victoria does not like Mr. Gladstone's politics, she has the respect of a veteran for a veteran and is known to be grateful to Mr. Gladstone for the tact and success with which he has often intervened to protect the royal family from radical assaults in parliament. Her Majesty talked with Mr. Gladstone for half an hour in private. Lord Salisbury himself was never treated more cordially.

St. John Lawyer Missing.

ST. JOHN, Aug. 22.—Herbert Lee, a well known and highly connected barrister suddenly left the city going West by O.P.R. He is now known to be in Boston. He had been entrusted with the management of a great deal of property, including the Drury, Botsford, Tate and Simmonds estates. There are a great number of small creditors. Messrs Baird and Hazen, M.P.'s, have gone to Boston to look after Lee.

K. D. C. cures midnight Dyspepsia.

THE CANAL TOLLS

Haraisons Bid for the Popular Vote.

Press Comments on the reclamation.

TORONTO, Aug. 22.—President Harrison has issued a proclamation imposing retaliatory tolls on Canadian vessels going through American canals.

TORONTO, Aug. 22.—The Empire in an editorial says that the spirit of President Harrison's action in issuing the proclamation imposing tolls on Canadian vessels passing through the Sault Canal is an unfriendly one, and will not tend to increase the cordiality of feeling between the two nations. The Montreal Star and Witness also deal with the question of tolls. The former says the President issued the proclamation to make political capital, while the latter looks upon his action as a moderate one.

On the 18 inst., the Farmers' Association of Cardigan are to hold a tea at that place we hope that they will have a fine day, and that they will enjoy themselves. I do not think the dancing part of the programme will be much inducement to the staid farmers of this section of the county to leave their unfinished hay or white harvest fields.

Harvest has commenced in some sections.