

# The Daily Examiner.

TERMS:—FIVE DOLLARS A YEAR.

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

SINGLE COPIES TWO CENTS.

NEW SERIES.

CHARLOTTETOWN, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND, MONDAY, APRIL 14, 1884.

VOL. 14.—NO. 122.

THE DAILY EXAMINER

is issued every evening by

The Examiner Publishing Co.

From their office, corner of Water and Great George Streets, Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island.

RATES OF SUBSCRIPTION:

Six Months, \$2 50  
Three Months, 1 25  
One Month, 0 50

Advertising at most moderate rates. Contracts may be made for monthly, quarterly, half-yearly or yearly advertisements, on application.

ALMANAC FOR APRIL, 1884.

MOON'S CHANGES.

First Quarter, 2nd day, 5h. 45m., p. m.  
Full Moon, 10th day, 7h. 31m., a. m.  
Last quarter 18th day, 11h. 42m., a. m.  
New Moon 25th day, 10h. 45m., a. m.

DAY OF WEEK	Sun rises	Sun sets	Moon rises	High water	Days len'th.
1 Tuesday	5 45	6 22	9 36	2 4	12 39
2 Wednesday	42	24 10	37	3	2 43
3 Thursday	40	26 11	41	4	15 45
4 Friday	38	27	44	5	39 49
5 Saturday	37	29	1 11	6	57 52
6 Sunday	35	30	2 56	7	59 55
7 Monday	32	31	3 59	8	46 59
8 Tuesday	34	33	5 0	9	27 13
9 Wednesday	29	34	6 21	2	5 5
10 Thursday	27	35	7 31	3	36 8
11 Friday	24	36	8 11	4	12 12
12 Saturday	23	38	9 0	11	41 15
13 Sunday	22	39	9 56	15	18 18
14 Monday	20	40	10 50	0	16 21
15 Tuesday	18	42	11 38	1	27 24
16 Wednesday	16	43	12 10	2	10 27
17 Thursday	14	44	0 22	2	57 30
18 Friday	12	45	1 4	4	0 33
19 Saturday	11	47	1 40	5	10 36
20 Sunday	9	48	2 13	6	28 39
21 Monday	8	50	2 46	7	36 42
22 Tuesday	5	51	3 17	8	31 45
23 Wednesday	3	53	3 48	9	19 49
24 Thursday	2	54	4 22	10	5 52
25 Friday	0	55	4 59	10	47 55
26 Saturday	4 59	57	5 47	11	33 58
27 Sunday	54	58	6 19	12	14 1
28 Monday	51	59	7 23	0	16 4
29 Tuesday	47	0	8 25	1	1 6
30 Wednesday	53	7	9 32	1	52 9

N. J. CAMPBELL,

(Successor to Campbell & Rayden)

Auctioneer and Commission Merchant,

SHIP BROKER,

AND INSURANCE AGENT,

COR. OF QUEEN AND WATER STS.,

Charlottetown, P. E. Island.

Importer and Jobber of Choice Groceries and Spices

General Agent for P. E. Island of the British Empire Mutual Life Assurance Company, of London, England. Special attention given to Auction Sales of Lumber, Coal, Fish, Apples and other Fruit, Real Estate, Household Furniture, Bankrupt and other Stocks, and all kinds of Merchandise. Correspondence and Consignments solicited. Returns promptly made. March 28, 1884.

DRESS MAKING.

MISS TAYLOR and MISS FARROW are now prepared to attend to DRESS MAKING, in every department, at Lord's Hotel, Souris East. Ladies giving orders will meet with prompt attention. Souris, April 4, 1884.—1m

JAS. E. GRANT,

Sole Agent for P. E. Island for

THOS. CONNOR & SONS,

Rope Manufacturers,

ST. JOHN, N. B.

Orders from the trade respectfully solicited.

Ch'town, Feb. 29, 1884.—1m

McLeod, Morson & McQuarrie,

BARRISTERS

—AND—

ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW.

Office in Old Bank,

(UP STAIRS).

Ch'town, Feb. 21, 1884.

SULLIVAN & MACNEILL,

ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW

Solicitors in Chancery,

NOTARIES PUBLIC, &c.

OFFICES—O'Halloran's Building, Great George Street, Charlottetown.

Money to Loan.

W. W. SULLIVAN, Q. C. | CHRISTOPHER B. MACNEILL

Jan. 16, '83.

## FIRE INSURANCE.

HORACE HASZARD,

GENERAL INSURANCE AGENT,

—REPRESENTING—

Western Fire Assurance Company, Toronto, Ontario,

CAPITAL, \$800,000.00.

Commercial Union Assurance Company, London, Eng.,

CAPITAL, \$1,166,666.00.

British American Marine Insurance Company, Toronto,

CAPITAL, \$500,000.00.

Risks taken on all descriptions of insurable property.

OFFICES—Corner of Queen and Lower Water Streets.

Ch'town, March 17, 1884.—1m eod

## THE LIVERPOOL AND LONDON AND GLOBE

FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY, OF ENGLAND.

ESTABLISHED A. D. 1836.

Invested Funds, \$30,632,000; of which ONE MILLION DOLLARS is invested in Canada.

General Reserve and Fire Re-insurance Fund, SEVEN MILLION TWO HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS.

This Company will now do a general business in the City and Province. Risks taken daily by

R. R. FITZGERALD,

AGENT.

Ch'town, March 10, 1884.—eod

## FURNITURE. FURNITURE.

We have on hand a full line of PARLOR AND BEDROOM SUITS, latest styles and well made, that we will sell cheap to make room for new patterns.

We are prepared to do all kinds of Upholstering, Cabinet Work, Polishing, etc., for house-cleaning time, in a thorough manner.

HAIR MATTRESSES Re-made, Re-picked and Cleaned, which make them as good as new. CHAIRS Reseated with Birch, Veneer, Perforated Seats, and Cane.

First-class work guaranteed in every branch. All orders entrusted to us in this month will be promptly executed, and cheaper than after the spring rush commences.

Better value in every department than ever before offered in Charlottetown.

MARK WRIGHT & CO.,

Kent Street, and 83 Queen Street.

Charlottetown, March 17, 1884.—2aw wklly

## GRAND SALE OF DRY GOODS AND CLOTHING.

JOHN MACPHEE & CO. will, during the HOLIDAY SEASON, give special bargains in

Dress Goods, Knit Wool Goods, Mantles, Shawls, Flannels, Hosiery, Gloves, &c

CLOTHING. CLOTHING.

Men's Overcoats, \$3.90, \$5.00, \$6.50, \$7.50, up.  
Men's Ulsters, \$4.95, \$6.25, \$7.00, up.  
Men's Reefers, \$2.95, \$3, \$3.50, \$5, \$4.50, \$5.50, up.

Fur Caps, Kid Mitts and Gloves, Cardigan Jackets, Worsted Tweeds, Under-clothing, Buffalo Robes, Horse Rugs, Small Wares, etc.

PARKS' WARP, CHEAP.

Cash Buyers can depend on getting REAL BARGAINS in every Department.

WHOLESALE AND RETAIL.

JOHN MACPHEE & CO,

ROBERT ORR'S OLD STAND.

Ch'town, Dec. 12, 1883.—2aw wklly pres pat

## THE FISHERY AWARD.

MR. BRECKEN'S SPEECH.

OUR Ottawa despatch of the 2nd of April stated that Mr. Brecken spoke against Mr. Davies' Fishery Award motion. The contrary is the case. Here is Mr. Brecken's speech on the motion:—

MR. BRECKEN—As my hon. colleague remarked in his opening, this is not the first time that this important question has been brought under the consideration of the House. I think I am correct in saying this is about the third time. I have listened very carefully to the arguments advanced by my hon. colleague, and I think he has pretty well covered the question. I think he will agree with me in saying that we have not advanced anything new, that the arguments put forward this afternoon were pressed upon the consideration of the former House of Commons in 1880. I have myself always had a very strong view as to the justice of the claim of the Island to a share of that fishery award, and I do not know that I can advance very much in addition to what has fallen from my hon. friend. In 1871, as he has stated, we were pressed by Lord Kimberly, the then Colonial Minister—and the House must bear in mind that Prince Edward Island was not then in Confederation; we did not enter Confederation till the 1st July, 1873; we were then a separate Province—and Secretary Fish, through the English Ambassador at Washington, Sir Edward Thornton, pressed upon the English Government the necessity of the Province of Prince Edward Island, anticipating what would be carried out by the treaty, and allowing Americans to fish in our waters. I was a member of the Government which drew up the minute which has been read by my hon. colleague, and I believe my name is attached to it. I remember the circumstances very well. We then considered that, when this treaty took place, we ought to receive some consideration, and what he said is quite correct, that the Island looked for commercial advantages and commercial considerations very much more than they did for anything in the way of money consideration. The matter was brought under the consideration of the Island Government, and we acceded to the wish expressed in Lord Kimberly's despatch, and the Americans were allowed to fish in our waters. The treaty was made, and, as my colleague stated, in the articles of that treaty it was stipulated that the Imperial Government, the Dominion Government, the United States Government, and Prince Edward Island should, by legislation, confirm the terms of the treaty. In June, 1872, we did our part and confirmed the terms of the treaty, and what did we do? At that time we were out of Confederation. We agreed to the terms of the treaty, and we looked forward to a share of the money. I need not go over what was read by my hon. friend. We had an assurance from the Colonial Minister that our rights would be protected, and a request was made—and here is a point my hon. friend has not touched upon—that we should be represented at the Commission in Halifax. Lieutenant Governor Robinson, who was then the Governor of the Island, in a despatch to the Colonial Secretary, dated the 26th July, 1871, wrote as follows:—

"I may add that, in the event of the Acts necessary to give effect to the treaty being passed by the Legislature of P. E. I., my Government will apply to your Lordship for permission to send a representative to Halifax for the purpose of conferring with the agent of the Imperial Government whose appointment is provided for in the concluding paragraph of article twenty-three of the treaty, and of urging upon him the claims of this Island, to a just share proportionate to the value of our fisheries of whatever compensation may be awarded as an equivalent for the privileges which the colonies are asked to surrender."

"My Government are, of course, aware that Great Britain and the United States are to be represented before the Halifax Commission each by one agent only; but they believe that it would be competent to Her Majesty's Government, as aforesaid, to receive information on the subject of our fisheries from a representative to be appointed by the Government of P. E. Island."

Mr. Odo Russell, Secretary of State, reports as follows:—

"I am to add that as regards the desire expressed by the Government of Prince Edward Island, that some persons should be appointed to attend the Commission at Halifax, it appears to Lord Granville that it would not only be permissible but highly desirable that Prince Edward Island should furnish the fullest information before the Commission as to the value of the inshore fisheries on her coasts. The 24th article of the treaty provides that the Commission shall be bound to receive such oral or written testimony as either Government may present, and it will consequently be competent for the Government of Prince Edward Island to send to Halifax any person who may be selected as best capable of giving evidence on its behalf."

I think these two documents show that at that time Prince Edward Island was recognized as possessing separate and independent claims and rights, such as the Island of Newfoundland had when she received her million dollars. Now, as my hon. colleague has fairly conducted this argument, and has not imported any feeling into it, I wish to follow his example. However, I cannot abstain from making one remark, and it is this: In 1877, when the Commission were sitting at Halifax, my hon. friend was the leader of the Local Government, and he was employed by the Federal Government, then led by the hon. member for East York, to appear at Halifax as one of the advocates, I suppose, of the Dominion generally. Now, Sir, I cannot but express my regret that the hon. member, then Premier of Prince Edward Island, with all the information before him, having

these two despatches that I have just read to the House showing that this Island had been independent, and had a right to be recognized by the Commission, having also an assurance from the Imperial Government that she need not be at all doubtful as to her right of getting her share—I say, I think it is matter of great regret that my hon. friend did not then insist upon the rights of this Province to have a representative before the Commission in Halifax. I think it is a matter of great regret, because I expected that my hon. friend, upon becoming a member of this House, would have brought up this question before. At the last General Election in 1882, one of the most serious charges that my hon. friend brought against me was that during the years from 1879 to 1882, I did not advocate the interests of my Province in this House as I ought to have done, but contented myself with moving for papers; and that when an amendment was proposed by an hon. gentleman then representing Halifax, who is now Governor of Nova Scotia, I did not advocate the claims of the Province as distinctly as I ought to have done. The answer I made was that if I had erred how much more had my hon. colleague erred when Premier of Prince Edward Island in not insisting upon the rights of that Province. He was before the Halifax Commission as counsel, and I suppose that he discharged his duties well. Why did he not have a representative of Prince Edward Island there, and if, as he argues here to-day, those separate rights existed, why were they not urged before the Commission?

MR. MACKENZIE—Perhaps my hon. friend will allow me to interpose one word, as I was in office here at that time. The reason, and a very sufficient reason, why Prince Edward Island had no representative was that the treaty did not provide for her sending a representative.

MR. BRECKEN—I am quite well aware the treaty did not provide for it, but I am proceeding in the line of the argument of my hon. colleague, and I say that if our rights exist to-day, as I claim they do, they existed in 1877 when that Commission sat. Although my hon. friend was counsel for the whole Dominion I should have supposed that, coming from Prince Edward Island, and his special duties being to collect information affecting the fisheries of that Island, he would have taken advantage of the opportunity to advocate the claims of Prince Edward Island then as well as now. That would have been a more opportune time for him to have done so in his double capacity as Premier of the Province and as Dominion counsel before the Commission. He ought to have urged our separate claims as the present Premier of Newfoundland did.

MR. DAVIES. Does the hon. gentlemen contend that any counsel acting on behalf of the Commission could have asked the Commissioners to award a separate claim for any Province? The hon. gentleman knows that the arbitration was as between Great Britain and the United States.

MR. BRECKEN. My hon. friend held a brief as counsel for the whole Dominion at large, but he was also Premier of the Colony at the time; and if that right existed then, as I contend it did just as strongly as it does to-day, I say that it was the duty of the hon. gentlemen, in some shape or form, to have brought that matter before the Commission. His clients were the Dominion Government, but he was also the Premier of the Colony and he should have made some effort to have pressed the claim which he says exists now, and which must therefore have existed then. The hon. gentleman is quite right when he says that in 1871 we consented to agree to the views of the Imperial Government, though they were contrary to our own views in the matter, and that in 1872 we confirmed that arrangement by legislation. And if that was the position we occupied when we legislated in June, 1872, whatever award might be given by the Commissioners for the overflow of the Dominion fisheries within the three-mile limits, we would have our share of it in proportion. We had bonds in the Treasury, we had money in our coffers, we had claims due us, but when we went into Confederation they were not handed over, nor were they asked for; and when this share was awarded, and we had legislated as we did under the treaty, we were then in precisely the same position as Newfoundland. That Commission sat in 1877. Suppose it had sat in August, 1872, and the award had been given, and a month or two after we had, by our legislation, confirmed it, would we not have been entitled to our share just as much as Newfoundland, and can it be said that, because of circumstances over which he had no control, that Commission was delayed in 1877, that rights which existed in 1872, by this delay, were taken from us? I do not see how that is going to be the contention. I remember very well the debate which took place in this House in 1880, and the very able speech delivered by the First Minister at that time—and, of course, in regard to constitutional questions both the House and the country look upon the right hon. gentleman as a very high authority. The First Minister contended, and no doubt theoretically he was correct,—that the right to fish within the three mile limit was an Imperial right; that it belonged to Her Majesty's subjects in general; that fishermen might come from Ontario, Quebec, the Northwest or any other part of the Dominion, and fish within that limit; that it was not in the shape of a royalty, although Prince Edward Island particularly might enjoy greater advantages than other people from the fact that they are in the neighborhood. But if that was an Imperial right, why did not the money awarded go into the Imperial treasury? Why was it handed over to the Dominion of Canada? Then there comes another argument: If it is not a territorial right but an Imperial right, and if the waters around the shores of the various Provinces are the property of British subjects in all parts of the Dominion, why were 1,000,000 given to the Island of Newfoundland? If

the hon. gentleman will turn to the evidence taken before the Commission they will find from the statements of one of the American counsel, Mr. Forster, that as regards the matter of the fisheries, the most valuable fisheries were around Prince Edward Island. We know very well that the Newfoundland bank fisheries are beyond the three mile limit; and I assert, without fear of contradiction, that there is no part of the Dominion of Canada more seriously affected by the three-mile limit than Prince Edward Island. I happen to know something about the matter, for when I was Advocate General, an American schooner was seized, brought into harbor and condemned, and we had the whole evidence taken. If the Americans were excluded from the three-mile limit, taking one year with another, it would be disastrous to the mackerel fishing on that part of the coast. It is true that sometimes they may follow fishing outside of the three-mile limit; but, as a general rule, if they were prevented from fishing within that limit they could not prosecute fishing with success. Here is another point which gives Prince Edward Island a particular claim for the portion of the award. The Americans resort to a mode of fishing very different from that pursued around our coast by our fishermen. We have very few fishing schooners, and the general practice is to fish with boats. The Americans come there with seines and take fish of every description, probably not 25 per cent. of which are of any value to them, for they only take mackerel, and the other fish are thrown overboard, decompose in the water and damage our fisheries. Another consideration which goes to show that we should receive a portion of the award is, that the Americans will throw vast quantities of pogies on the surface of the water for the purpose of drawing fish around them, and in that way they will draw schools of mackerel from the waters in which our men are fishing. These are arguments to show that we really have sustained a loss. I do not think that I need press the case further than to say that we were outside the Dominion when the bargain was made, and when it was ratified; and if the Commission had sat promptly, as it should have done, we would have been in the same position as the Island of Newfoundland. I agree with one remark made by my colleague, that men of all shades of politics in Prince Edward Island consider that we have a just and equitable claim to a fair share of the \$5,500,000 awarded by the Halifax Commission, and paid by the United States Government to Great Britain for the privilege of fishing within the three-mile limit.

### Cetewayo in England.

An Englishman relates the following of Cetewayo's visit to Great Britain: "When he first arrived his daily ration of three and a half pounds of beef contented him. Before he left his regular allowance had risen to seven and a half pounds per diem. He greatly admired English beef. How much he would have eaten at last if he had stayed much longer no one knows. But this huge mass of fresh meat looks larger than it was in reality, because of the way in which it was frizzled in cooking. Cetewayo was particular about his cooking. The beef had to be cut in steaks two inches thick, and cooked until it was as dry as toast, then it was eaten by itself. Cetewayo always made a separate course of each article of food; he would have beef as one course, sweet potatoes as the next, then beans and melted butter, and so forth. In drink he was particularly fond of champagne, although he had no objection to whiskey. You know how eloquently he discoursed to a temperance deputation about the curse of intoxicants, and his earnest desire to keep them outside of Zululand. If his desire to keep rum outside Zululand was half as keen as his desire to put champagne inside the corporation of one particular Zulu whom I know well, Cetewayo must, indeed, have been one of the most zealous Maine Law men on record. When he left this country he had added two English words to his native vocabulary. One was 'Good-night,' and the other was 'Fizz;' and of the two he most loved 'Fizz.'"

From all the facts that investigations furnish, we are inclined to believe, says the New York World, that butter is passing out of existence very much as wax-tapers and stage coaches did. Experts give it as their opinion that the real article is exceedingly scarce. Vast quantities of another substance have taken its place in Washington Market. Milk, which it may not be generally known to our readers is a necessary ingredient in the manufacture of butter is no longer put to that purpose. It is mixed with water and sold for cream. Machinery and chemistry have come into the field, and it does not pay to make butter. However, let us be brave and readjust our simple beliefs to the teachings of science. Butter is a beautiful dream of youth. Let us relegate it to poetry, but in the stern, practical duties of life, let us boldly recognize the scientific factor of oleomargarine."

What is termed a great invention was shown at Essex Institute, Salem Mass, last week. It is a new bleaching process by paraffine soap, which is termed an event in scientific discovery. Unrotted field flax just as it is cut from the field and dried, was rendered snow white in forty minutes, by this process, while the old process of bleaching takes a week to ten days; the new one but a few hours; by the former method a loss in weight of 10 to 20 per cent., and by this method almost nothing. There is no loss of fibre by the new process, so it is claimed, the cloth never mildews. Dyed cloth retains its color. Even the root of the cotton plant can now be used for threads and cloth. All the fibrous growths, it is claimed, will show a bank of white flussy fibre ready for spinners' cards or papermakers' vats.