

King's County Exhibition  
A GOOD ATTENDANCE.  
GRAND WEATHER.  
SPLENDID EXHIBITS.

[SPECIAL BY TELEPHONE.]  
GEORGETOWN, Oct. 1.  
The attendance at the King's County Exhibition at Georgetown, to-day, is good and the weather all that can be desired. At half-past twelve, Hon. D. Gordon, President of the Association, made a brief speech, at the conclusion of which he presented Premier Peters with the following address.

To the Honorable Frederick Peters, Premier of P. E. Island:  
DEAR SIR,—On behalf of the King's County Exhibition Association, we have much pleasure in tendering you an hearty welcome upon this your first visit to our grounds. We desire to express our appreciation of the interest you manifest in the affairs of this Province, particularly relating to agriculture.

We hope you will, upon viewing the various departments of the Exhibition, be pleased with the progress shown, and, also, that the exertions made by our Association towards the improvement of the ground and buildings will commend themselves to you and have your encouragement. You will notice that the Exhibition is mainly agricultural, and we have for consideration the appointment of a Minister of Public Works. Special attention should be given to this subject, most important to all our people. We also draw your attention to the importance to King's County farmers of a river steamboat service around the eastern section of the Island.

We sincerely trust that you may experience satisfaction with the exhibition of stock, etc., and the few manufacturers, and that you will enjoy the races which are a new feature under our management. We again welcome you to our County exhibition.

For self and Association members,  
D. GORDON,  
President.

Mr. Peters made a neat speech in reply, at the conclusion of which he declared the exhibition open.

The show in the drill shed is very good. The display of apples, plums, damsons and other fruit is larger than that of last year, and the samples shown are of a superior quality. The show of butter and cheese is not so large as it was last year, but the quality is excellent. Of roots and vegetables, many splendid samples are shown.

Mr. Jordan, of Murray Harbor, shows samples of cod liver oil and the emulsion of cod liver oil, prepared by himself. His exhibit attracts considerable attention. It took a diploma at the Jamaica exhibition.

Two miniature ships built and exhibited by Henry Gordon, son of Hon. Daniel Gordon, were much admired.

The display of fancy goods, mats, etc., is highly creditable to the exhibitors, and the showing of flannels, druggets, etc., is excellent.

Mr. R. W. Stewart, of Brudenell, exhibits a splendid collection of stuffed birds.

The show outside the shed is also very good. There is a splendid exhibit of horses. The animals are being judged inside of two large rings which are surrounded by interested spectators.

The sheep and pigs are of good quality, but the number is not large.

The cattle exhibit is larger than it was last year, and include some splendid specimens.

The Georgetown band is on the ground furnishing good music.

Telegraphic News.

MONTREAL, Sept. 29.—The Star says: News reaches me indirectly and on high authority that Canada is in imminent danger of an influx of Russo-Jewish refugees. I am told that agents of some great steamship lines running to Montreal are busy booking large numbers in Europe, and in order to avoid a renewal of the recent troubles with the government inspectors at Montreal, the emigrants are being booked through to various points in Canada. The agents naturally care chiefly for their commissions on the tickets, but those concerned in Canada's best interests think the Government should intervene and inform the steamship companies that landing will be refused to those without visible means of support, or who are otherwise undesirable.

Sir Charles Tupper is still here, and has not received instructions to proceed to Washington. Though the engagement was to renew the negotiations with Messrs. Elaine and Harrison on October 12th, it is expected that, seeing the lateness of the Ottawa session, the ministers may ask for a postponement of the meeting.

QUEBEC, Sept. 29.—The three judges to compose the royal commission have accepted and will arrive here Thursday, when steps will be taken immediately to organize the court, appoint officers and get ready generally to lay the details of Count Mercier's political inquiry before the country.

Up in a Balloon.

"A friend of mine was watching a balloon from the Naval Exhibition passing over a London suburb the other day, and seeing a number of handbills floating down, he carefully picked one up, being struck with the heading, 'Telegram from the Planet Mars.' 'Only an advertising dodge,' he said to himself, as he found it referred to somebody's special whiskey. Turning it over, however, he found a coupon on the back, stating that on presentation of the same to the nearest agent he would be rewarded with a bottle of prime six-year-old Scotch whiskey. This actually proved correct, and probably, while the Exhibition lasts, there will be many on the look-out for balloon missives, although I don't know how many coupons may be found among the thousands of handbills. Anyhow, it is one of 'the smartest advertising dodges of 'up-to-date' tradesmen.'—Extract from the Kensington Express.

Messrs. Lawrence, A. Wilson & Co., of Montreal, the Canadian agents for Messrs. Greenleaf Brothers' celebrated "Claymore" Scotch Whiskey, state that this same balloon will make several ascensions during the Exhibition here and distribute thousands of telegrams during its flight over the city.

NOTES FROM OTTAWA.

END OF TARTE-McGREGGEEVY.

Lister's Vain Attempt to Ruin Haggart.

[SPECIAL CORRESPONDENCE OF THE EXAMINER.]

On Monday last, the great debate on the report of the committee of privileges and elections in the Tarte-McGreggEEVY case commenced with a speech from Mr. Girouard, the chairman of the committee, in an able and impartial defence of the findings of the report. One important admission made by Mr. Girouard was, that cases like the one under discussion should be tried by a court and not by a parliamentary committee. Such a change would give a greater guarantee of justice, and avoid deciding such cases by party votes.

Mr. Tarte followed Mr. Girouard in a speech lasting for over four hours. I am not going to attempt an epitome of what each speaker said. The case is decided now, and for Heaven's sake let it not be resurrected. But I think it to the point that at least one or two sentences of Mr. Tarte's speech should be published. Here they are:

"I must immediately say this much to the credit of the Minister of Justice: From the very moment he perceived I had a case (and I have his permission to say so) he sent me to you by the Public Works Department, Messrs. Osler and Henry, on the very day that Mr. Perley was proved to have received a bribe. They came to me and to my lawyer and said, 'It is better not to say publicly that we will work together as much as we can, but we have been authorized to come to you by Sir John Thompson.' I asked them, 'Are you going to take your orders from the Minister of Justice or from Sir Hector Langevin?' They replied, 'We are taking our orders from the Minister of Justice, and we are prepared to work with you to find out the truth as much as we can.' I say they helped us, and my lawyer will say the same thing. They helped as much as their delicate position, and the delicate position of the Minister of Justice allowed them to do. I think it is well the world should know that when a great and momentous question like this is thrown upon parliament, the representative of Justice is prepared to stand by his duty, however delicate and difficult may be the position in which he is placed."

Ananias Cameron wound up Monday's debate. On Tuesday it was resumed by Mr. Coatsworth, one of the Toronto members, who was followed by Mr. Davies, who made the speech of and for the opposition, reviewing the whole case in all its bearings, and concluding by moving an amendment to substitute the minority report prepared by himself and Mills for that prepared by Sir John Thompson, Girouard and Adams. Mr. Dickey, of Amherst, who is one of the thoughtful men of the House, replied to Mr. Davies, and that finished Tuesday's debate.

On Wednesday it was resumed at a late hour by Col. Amyot, who was so discursive in his range and so wild in his assertions that the House, which contained only a handful of members, and nobody in the galleries, was for a time a perfect bazaar. Bullock Ives of Sherbrook, spoke of Langevin as a boulder, and Langevin gave Ives the lie direct. Laurier, white with rage, demanded the adjournment of the House, and when 64 members had been secured together, some of them routed out of their beds, Laurier's motion to adjourn was defeated by 35 to 28. Then when Amyot had concluded, at 2 o'clock in the morning the House adjourned.

On Thursday, Sir Adolphe Caron delivered an eloquent and powerful defence of Sir Hector Langevin. The Minister of Militia takes so little part in debate that his silence is attributed to laziness, and a disinclination to be bored by work of any kind. However this may be, it is a fact that Sir Adolphe can speak ably and well, as he demonstrated on this occasion.

Mr. Laurier followed Sir Adolphe in a bitterly denunciatory speech of Sir Hector Langevin and of the Government, and, for the moment forgetting his character as a gentleman, descended to slander the memory of Sir John Macdonald, whom he charged with having taught the Conservative party the use of corrupt methods. Adverting to a speech made some years ago at a banquet in Quebec, he charged Sir John Macdonald with having said: "Our opponents say that we bribed the constituencies, but we bribed them with their own money." Mr. Laurier then proceeded: "Did Sir John Macdonald deny the charge? Did he attempt to explain it; did he exonerate it? Nothing of the kind; he rather gloried in it and that was his answer. Such were the ethics taught to his party by the late leader of the Conservatives. If his party was to be kept in power, and if to attain that end the constituencies had to be bribed, bribed they would be. Before history, Sir John Macdonald stands answerable, not only for the fact, but for all the consequences which have to follow, and have followed, and of which we are to-day the humiliated witnesses. That was his doctrine and what was his practice? We remember that, on the eve of a general election Sir John called together the manufacturers of Toronto in secret meeting. What was discussed there? Affairs of state? No. If affairs of state had to be discussed, Parliament was the place to discuss them; and why of all men should he call the manufacturers together, but in order to have the funds necessary to bribe the constituencies with their own money."

At this point Mr. Laurier was called to order, and evidently recollecting himself, continued his speech with more decency than he had commenced it.

After recess Mr. McCarthy took the floor, and the crowded galleries prepared themselves for a great speech; nor were they disappointed. Referring to Mr. Laurier's attack on Sir John Macdonald, Mr. McCarthy said: "But the hon. gentleman was able to satisfy his conscience and to arrive at a conclusion that he ought to arrive—no doubt unwillingly, but on political grounds—his opponent from public life by appeals to passion, by invoking statements which were not always accurate, by charging, for instance in one example, that the leader who is no longer in this House had openly boasted that he carried and bribed constituencies with their own money, and the hon. gentleman said, 'What should we expect from the second of that honorable gentleman, from the second in command, than that he should have carried out the practice what the late Sir John Macdonald publicly stated was his rule of conduct and practice. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the dead might have been spared in this enquiry. I think the hon. gentleman must have been hard pressed in making his attack upon the late Minister of Public Works, when he found it necessary to quote statements which he said had fallen from the lips of him who has recently left us and of whom, in my hearing, the hon. gentleman himself spoke in the very highest terms on an occasion which will be memorable to us all. But, if the hon. gentleman had not the magnanimity to abstain from attacking the memory of him who has gone, we might have expected at least that he would not have garbled his statements in the speech to which he referred. I had some recollection of that speech, not very accurate I admit, but the hon. gentleman's statement did not bring to my mind the utterances of the late Sir John Macdonald on that occasion, and by great good fortune I have obtained the words of the Hon. gentleman, and I ask, and I feel certain that I will not be denied, an apology from the leader of the Opposition for the garbled statement he made. As the leader of the Opposition stated the words of Sir John Macdonald, they were:

"The Opposition charges us with having bribed the constituencies. Well we have bribed them with their own money."

There the Hon. gentleman stopped. Will it be believed that he stopped not merely in the middle of a paragraph, but in the middle of a sentence? Will it be believed that the Hon. gentleman, in uttering these words, which, if they were as he gave them, could only have been made in joke, did so without giving the context? Here are the words which the late leader used:

"The Opposition charge us with having bribed the constituencies. Well, we have bribed them with their own money, and the charge amounts to this, that we have so wisely and equitably distributed the revenues in the different parts of the Dominion as to gain the approbation of the country as a whole."

Surely the Hon. gentleman can see the difference.

Mr. Mulock—We are just complaining of the distribution.

Mr. McCarthy—Well, I do not know what the difference is between the conduct which the Hon. gentleman support and the conduct which the Hon. gentlemen denounce. They denounce the late Sir John Macdonald because he distributed the revenues of the country in a way the people approved of.

Mr. McCarthy concluded his splendid effort by moving an amendment which recited that gross frauds had been perpetrated on the Government in their dealings with Larkin, Connolly & Co., and that these frauds were accomplished by a conspiracy between members of the firm and Thomas McGreggEEVY and one or more officers of the Public Works Department. That owing to Mr. Perley's illness, which precluded the completion of his examination, the House could not pronounce upon his complicity in the frauds or determine who among the other officials participated therein, and for the same reason the House feels unable to decide whether the conduct of Sir Hector Langevin was to be ascribed to a blind confidence in the integrity and efficiency of his chief engineer, or to a guilty connivance. That in addition to the foregoing reasons the House has no hesitation in recording its opinion that, judged by the well-known constitutional rule which makes the Minister responsible to Parliament for the administration of the department over which he presides, the late Minister of Public Works cannot be absolved from his ministerial responsibility, and in that regard merits the censure of this House.

And the House recommends that in addition to such action as may seem to be called for under the findings hereinbefore expressed, such legal proceedings as may be available be taken against those who were concerned in the conspiracy, and for that purpose the books and papers which were before the Committee be retained or so many of them as may be necessary for such prosecution.

Finally that the House desires to record its conviction that the enquiry directed by the House has been rendered unsatisfactory, incomplete and in some respects abortive by the fact that the House cannot help characterizing as the wilful perjury of some of the witnesses examined before it, and the House recommends that Nicholas K. Connolly and Michael Connolly and such other witnesses as the law officers may advise that there is evidence on which indictments for perjury should be preferred, be prosecuted therefor.

The debate was continued by Messrs. Curran, Davin, Edgar, O'Brien, McNeill and Mulock; after which a division was taken on Mr. McCarthy's amendment, which was defeated by 184 to 2; only Messrs. McCarthy and O'Brien voting therefor.

Before Mr. Davies' amendment was put, Mr. Tarte arose and expressed his intention of not recording his vote. Mr. Davies' amendment was defeated by 104 to 83, a majority of 21; and Mr. Girouard's motion adopted by 101 to 86, a majority of 15. Messrs. McCarthy, O'Brien and Davin voting against both Davies' and Girouard's motion. Mr. Faurel was paired with Mr. Earle, and had no right to vote; Sir Hector Langevin, of course, did not vote, and Mr. Jones was absent without a pair, and Mr. Tarte, during the debate, having announced that his temporary connection with the Liberals had ceased, and that he could not approve of their fiscal policy, he should be reckoned as Conservative. This would make the Government majority 24, without the Speaker, in a House of 213 members, counting Kingston and Quebec West vacant, and allowing for the two seats held by Sir Hector Langevin.

Some weeks ago it was whispered around that the Postmaster General was to be impeached before the House, but as no charges were presented, the rumor had almost been forgotten. Baffled in his devilish attempt to ruin Haggart's moral character and to stamp him as a libertine, dared over and over again by Chap'au to arraign him before the House, Mr. Lister on Tuesday last revived some old charges which had been made against Mr. Haggart twelve years ago, and demanded investigation. On Wednesday the charges came regularly before the House and, in short, amounted to this, that in 1879, while a member of the House, he had under the name of (Senator) Peter McLaren, had become beneficially interested in the contract for the construction of Section S. of the C. P. R., and that the

contractors had subscribed largely to election funds. It will be observed that the indictment did not charge Mr. Haggart with any corruption or dishonesty, but simply with having violated the Independence of Parliament Act.

Mr. Haggart immediately rose and gave the charges a specific and emphatic denial. Not only so, but he pointed out that twice already, once before the C. P. R. commission and again in the suit before Leacock v. McLaren, he had denied the charges on oath. Mr. McLaren had also denied them on oath, and he undertook to obtain from Senator McLaren, when he returned to Ottawa, a statutory declaration which would reiterate his denial. Mr. Haggart proceeded to explain that at McLaren's solicitation he had arranged the partnership between him and the other parties and had overlooked the carrying on of the contract and the final settlement. For this, during five or six years, all that he had received was his travelling expenses and bare hotel allowance. But he (Haggart) had no interest in the contract and had received no share in the profits arising from it. Neither had the contractors, to his knowledge, contributed any money for political purposes, nor had he acted as the intermediary between them and the Government in any way.

Sir John Thompson took exception to the form in which the charges were formulated. Even if Mr. Haggart had violated the Independence of Parliament Act in 1879, he had been three times since elected by his constituents to Parliament, and was thereby absolved. Supporting Mr. Haggart was guilty, what could the present Parliament do about it? But Mr. Lister had taken no responsibility upon himself in making the charges—he had not charged that Mr. Haggart had violated the Independence of Parliament Act, and had left himself ample loop-hole for escape in the event of the charges being disproved. The time of the House could not be taken up in investigating such indefinite charges. Twelve years had expired since the affair had occurred, and now within a week of prorogation the House was asked to investigate it. Surely it could keep for four months longer till next session. Besides it had been twice denied on oath, and Mr. Haggart had in his place again declared it unfounded. The present charges only injured, and did not state, a breach of the Independence of Parliament Act, and as to the charge that the Government had received contributions from the contractors, it was not stated that even this were so. The contractors had been given no undue advantage, and further the charge was against an administration of twelve years ago, of which only one member now remained on the treasury benches. Sir John then moved that the House, having heard Mr. Lister's statement and Mr. Haggart's denial, proceed with the ordinary business.

Mr. McCarthy supported Sir John Thompson's argument. After a number of other members had spoken, Sir John Thompson's motion was carried on a division of 102 to 78—a majority of 24.

It is very amusing to witness the great anxiety of the grits for the purity of Parliament, when we recall their own practices when in power. To-day, they would condemn a member for an offence alleged to have been committed twelve years ago; while, during the MacKenzie administration, when it was proved that Speaker Anglin had received some \$20,000 for Government printing, and had thus forfeited his seat, when he was re-elected he was again placed in the speaker's chair. Their Minister of Militia, Mr. Vail, had also forfeited his seat for being interested in Government contracts as did also Mr. A. G. Jones, of Halifax, for a like offence. Vail was defeated when he offered for re-election, but what did the Government do? They immediately appointed Jones to the vacant portfolio and he was returned as Minister of Militia. Grit professions and practices are wide as the poles asunder. W. C. D.

own money, and the hon. gentleman said, 'What should we expect from the followers of that honorable gentleman, from the second in command, than that he should have carried out the practice what the late Sir John Macdonald publicly stated was his rule of conduct and practice. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the dead might have been spared in this enquiry. I think the hon. gentleman must have been hard pressed in making his attack upon the late Minister of Public Works, when he found it necessary to quote statements which he said had fallen from the lips of him who has recently left us and of whom, in my hearing, the hon. gentleman himself spoke in the very highest terms on an occasion which will be memorable to us all. But, if the hon. gentleman had not the magnanimity to abstain from attacking the memory of him who has gone, we might have expected at least that he would not have garbled his statements in the speech to which he referred. I had some recollection of that speech, not very accurate I admit, but the hon. gentleman's statement did not bring to my mind the utterances of the late Sir John Macdonald on that occasion, and by great good fortune I have obtained the words of the Hon. gentleman, and I ask, and I feel certain that I will not be denied, an apology from the leader of the Opposition for the garbled statement he made. As the leader of the Opposition stated the words of Sir John Macdonald, they were:

"The Opposition charges us with having bribed the constituencies. Well we have bribed them with their own money."

There the Hon. gentleman stopped. Will it be believed that he stopped not merely in the middle of a paragraph, but in the middle of a sentence? Will it be believed that the Hon. gentleman, in uttering these words, which, if they were as he gave them, could only have been made in joke, did so without giving the context? Here are the words which the late leader used:

"The Opposition charge us with having bribed the constituencies. Well, we have bribed them with their own money, and the charge amounts to this, that we have so wisely and equitably distributed the revenues in the different parts of the Dominion as to gain the approbation of the country as a whole."

Surely the Hon. gentleman can see the difference.

Mr. Mulock—We are just complaining of the distribution.

Mr. McCarthy—Well, I do not know what the difference is between the conduct which the Hon. gentleman support and the conduct which the Hon. gentlemen denounce. They denounce the late Sir John Macdonald because he distributed the revenues of the country in a way the people approved of.

Mr. McCarthy concluded his splendid effort by moving an amendment which recited that gross frauds had been perpetrated on the Government in their dealings with Larkin, Connolly & Co., and that these frauds were accomplished by a conspiracy between members of the firm and Thomas McGreggEEVY and one or more officers of the Public Works Department. That owing to Mr. Perley's illness, which precluded the completion of his examination, the House could not pronounce upon his complicity in the frauds or determine who among the other officials participated therein, and for the same reason the House feels unable to decide whether the conduct of Sir Hector Langevin was to be ascribed to a blind confidence in the integrity and efficiency of his chief engineer, or to a guilty connivance. That in addition to the foregoing reasons the House has no hesitation in recording its opinion that, judged by the well-known constitutional rule which makes the Minister responsible to Parliament for the administration of the department over which he presides, the late Minister of Public Works cannot be absolved from his ministerial responsibility, and in that regard merits the censure of this House.

And the House recommends that in addition to such action as may seem to be called for under the findings hereinbefore expressed, such legal proceedings as may be available be taken against those who were concerned in the conspiracy, and for that purpose the books and papers which were before the Committee be retained or so many of them as may be necessary for such prosecution.

Finally that the House desires to record its conviction that the enquiry directed by the House has been rendered unsatisfactory, incomplete and in some respects abortive by the fact that the House cannot help characterizing as the wilful perjury of some of the witnesses examined before it, and the House recommends that Nicholas K. Connolly and Michael Connolly and such other witnesses as the law officers may advise that there is evidence on which indictments for perjury should be preferred, be prosecuted therefor.

The debate was continued by Messrs. Curran, Davin, Edgar, O'Brien, McNeill and Mulock; after which a division was taken on Mr. McCarthy's amendment, which was defeated by 184 to 2; only Messrs. McCarthy and O'Brien voting therefor.

Before Mr. Davies' amendment was put, Mr. Tarte arose and expressed his intention of not recording his vote. Mr. Davies' amendment was defeated by 104 to 83, a majority of 21; and Mr. Girouard's motion adopted by 101 to 86, a majority of 15. Messrs. McCarthy, O'Brien and Davin voting against both Davies' and Girouard's motion. Mr. Faurel was paired with Mr. Earle, and had no right to vote; Sir Hector Langevin, of course, did not vote, and Mr. Jones was absent without a pair, and Mr. Tarte, during the debate, having announced that his temporary connection with the Liberals had ceased, and that he could not approve of their fiscal policy, he should be reckoned as Conservative. This would make the Government majority 24, without the Speaker, in a House of 213 members, counting Kingston and Quebec West vacant, and allowing for the two seats held by Sir Hector Langevin.

Some weeks ago it was whispered around that the Postmaster General was to be impeached before the House, but as no charges were presented, the rumor had almost been forgotten. Baffled in his devilish attempt to ruin Haggart's moral character and to stamp him as a libertine, dared over and over again by Chap'au to arraign him before the House, Mr. Lister on Tuesday last revived some old charges which had been made against Mr. Haggart twelve years ago, and demanded investigation. On Wednesday the charges came regularly before the House and, in short, amounted to this, that in 1879, while a member of the House, he had under the name of (Senator) Peter McLaren, had become beneficially interested in the contract for the construction of Section S. of the C. P. R., and that the

MANTLE DEPARTMENT.

FOR LADIES! What is Fashionable?

"Everything" would be a short answer, and not far from the correct one. We will, however, make our reply to this important question more explicit. Jackets are undoubtedly as popular as ever, and a great variety of styles in different lengths are shown. As to material, Serges and Vicloines are the most fashionable, but Beaver and Nip Cloths are also largely used. For Trimming, Fur of all kinds is decidedly the correct thing, and forms at once the most handsome and serviceable trimming obtainable. Braid and Curly Cloth are also used as trimmings, whilst the heavy Nip Cloth Jackets are worn almost if not altogether plain.

Long Quilted Cloaks have taken a very prominent place and are very fashionable. Plain and Figured Cloths are both used, whilst Fur is the universal trimming. The Russian shape is the most popular. Many of these garments are extremely handsome and becoming, and no lady can well afford to be without one.

Nothing has taken the place of Dolmans, which still retains their popularity, especially in the latter qualities. The addition of sleeves is a novelty, and is considered by many a decided advantage.

Usters are a still worn, but not so largely as formerly—the Quilted Cloaks having, in a great measure, taken their place.

The new Capes are quite long, and some of them are undeniably elegant and becoming.

Shot Silks in beautiful combinations are largely used for linings, and add very materially to a garment by their rich appearance.

In conclusion, we believe long Quilted Cloaks and Jackets will prove the most fashionable and popular garments, and we have spared no trouble to procure the latest novelties for our customers.

For Children, Usters are the favorite, while Reofer Jackets are both fashionable and popular.

Every week brings additional novelties to our Mantle Department from London and Berlin.

The great success attending this Department the past season leads us to hope that every lady of taste may find something to suit her in our present stock, which is the largest and finest we have ever imported.

FOR MISSES!

ULSTERS and REEFER JACKETS.

N. B.  
All Goods are marked in plain figures, and are guaranteed to be exactly as represented.

BEER BROS.

NOTICE.

Word has just come that Waltham and Elgin Watch Factories have decided to reduce the price of all 18 size (Gents' size) Watch movements. This being the case, anyone needing a good Watch would do well to note that G. H. TAYLOR will give his customers the benefit of the rebate. Buy now and so save money, as prices may be raised at any time.

NORTH SIDE QUEEN SQUARE.  
Charlottetown, Oct. 1, 1891—dy 2aw wky

For West Indies.

THE BRIGT. "VARUNA," to load next week for the West Indies, has room for  
A Few Horses on Freight.  
Space should be applied for at once.  
FENTON T. NEWBERY.  
oct1—dy 2i pat

PUBLIC NOTICE.

THE following Pure-bred Stock from the Stock Farm will be sold at PUBLIC AUCTION, at the Provincial Exhibition Grounds, on WEDNESDAY, 7th October, at Two o'clock, p. m., viz.,—  
One Ayshire and one Shorthorn Bull, rising 5 years (superior animals).  
3 Cows (1 Ayshire and 2 Shorthorns), one extra beef.  
6 Calves, 3 Sheep and 6 Lambs.  
A Mare and Foal, and a number of Pigs.  
PETER SINCLAIR,  
Chairman Stock Farm.  
Ch'town, Oct. 1, 1891—tl dte

AUCTION.

Apples! Apples!  
AT Sal'room, TO-MORROW MORNING at 11 o'clock:—  
75 Barrels APPLES—choice brands.  
R. BEARSTO,  
Auctioneer.

PURE-BRED STOCK.

WE will sell by Auction, on the Exhibition Grounds, immediately after sale of Stock Farm Stock, the following Stock, the property of B. F. Longworth:—  
2 pure-bred Shorthorn Bull Calves,  
1 " " Heifer, 3 years.  
This Heifer has taken two first and one second prize at Provincial Exhibitions.  
—ALSO—  
Pure-bred Shorthorn Bull (registered pedigree), 3 years old, owned by H. W. Frazier  
—ALSO—  
Pure-bred Jersey Heifer in calf, 3 years old, No. 293, N. S. Register, owned by Joseph Taylor.  
And several other well-bred Cattle.  
Terms at sale.  
E. H. NORTON & CO.,  
sept29—eod wy li Auctioneers.

Big Bargains all Exhibition Week.

Our Friends are talking about big REDUCTIONS, but they cannot begin to undersell us.  
Envelopes, 2c. per package of 25; Foolscap, 5c. per quire; see our new 1c. Exercise Book; Rosebad Scribbler, best in the Dominion, 5c. each.

HASZARD & MOORE, 162 QUEEN SQUARE.  
Charlottetown, Oct. 1, 1891.

A NEW LOT OF WALKING STICKS

For Young Men and Old,  
In many Styles and Woods, including some variously mounted in Gold, Silver and Oxidized Silver, all prices, just received at  
WATSON'S DRUG STORE.  
Charlottetown, Sept. 29, 1891—dy

The Dominion Building and Loan Association.

HEAD OFFICE, 54 ADELAIDE STREET, E., TORONTO.  
CAPITAL, - - - - \$10,000,000.  
OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS CHARLOTTETOWN LOCAL BOARD:  
Lemuel E. Prowse, President; Rob Angus, Vice-President; McLeod, Morse & McQuarrie, Solicitors; Lemuel Phillips, Appraisers; M. P. Hogan, Lorne Bros., H. W. Anderson, D. McLean, W. F. Carter, Directors; Urquhart and Brow, Secretary-Treasurers.  
THIS Association will be prepared at once to make Loans on Real Estate in this city, and also to take investments in large or small sums in the form of stock in the Association, which is one of the best paying investments offered. Applications for Loans or Stock may be made to the Secretary-Treasurers, where full information may be obtained.  
URQUHART & BROW,  
Special Agents for P. E. Island.  
OFFICE—Brown's Block, Charlottetown, P. E. Island.  
sep124