

BORN.
Hedges-In-Austin, on Tuesday, 10th May, to Mr. and Mrs. Wm. Hedges, a daughter.

MARRIED.
Bain-Quinn In Oakville, on Wednesday, May 8, by Rev. G. W. Calvert, Henry Bain to Miss Louise Quinn, all of Oakville.

DIED.
KENNEDY At Guelph, on Thursday, May 9th, Anna McKeever, wife of the late John Kennedy, deceased, aged 70 years.

The Acton Free Press.

THURSDAY, MAY 11, 1896.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

The Shah of Persia, replying to the various provinces by the governor of his enthronement, says that his son will be born in the footsteps of his glorious father, especially as regards the maintenance of friendly relations with Great Britain.

Negotiations are in progress between Japan and Russia looking to joint action in Korea. Chief points under discussion are the return of the King to the palace from the Russian embassy, Japan to have the disposal of the troops about the palace, and the placing of the Korean telegraph system in the hands of the Japanese.

The commissioners appointed to divide the counties of the province of Ontario, in accordance with the Act passed last session, for the election of County Councils, held their first meeting in Toronto last Friday. Judge Jones, of Brantford, was elected chairman. It is expected the work will be completed before the midsummer vacation.

An exchange points out that there is something remarkable in the fact that of the seven or eight sensational murder trials that have occurred in Canada recently in connection with insurance money the names of the accused in all cases commanded with the letter "H." Look at the following list: Hollister, Hartley, Hyams, Hendon, Haywood, Hammond, Holmes.

A despatch from Shanghai states that the Russian consul threatens to forcibly seize a stretch of the fore shore at Chefoo to which Great Britain has a long-standing claim. The British Minister has protested the Russian seizure, and it is understood that China also objects. Four Russian warships are now off the Chefoo pending apparently to support the consul.

The Brampton Conservator publishes a detailed falsehood when it states that the Liberals of Halton had something to do with bringing those McCarthy speakers to Halton last week. What earthly good would Mr. Walder have two men to fight instead of one? The Conservative should have some regard for the truth, even if it does cost an effort. Milton Reforms.

There is much encouragement for instant probation, and I hope the Provincial Government would be willing to have the power to enact prohibitory legislation in the judgment of the Privy Council just handed down. The judgment in effect means—(1) that the provinces cannot prohibit retail selling; (2) that they can authorize local municipalities to prohibit; (3) that they can prohibit the manufacturing of liquor for sale in the province; (4) that they cannot prohibit the importation of liquor from other provinces, or from abroad.

Gradually, as the fiscal year draws to a close, the revenue and expenditure statement shows improvement. For the month of April there is a gratifying increase of half a million, while the expenditure is less than that of the same month last year. On the 20th of April there was nearly a surplus of five million in the treasury, which remains so when the books are finally closed for the year. There will be a substantial sum over and above expenditure.

The expenditure on capital account is half a million less than in the same period last year. The net debt was decreased last month by \$790,196.

The returning officer has posted up the proclamations for the Dominion election throughout the country. There has been a change made in the method of numbering polling sub-divisions. Now each small municipality from one to the number of 1000 will contain, now the municipalities are arranged alphabetically in the order of the names.

The returning officer has posted up the proclamations, and numbered from 1 to 32, the total number of polling subdivisions in the county. Acton is numbered 12, Burlington 34, Esquinton 510, Georgetown 16, Nelson 19-22, Oakville 24-30, Trafalgar 27-30, etc. With three or four exceptions the polling districts are the same as at the last Dominion election, the difference now being in the numbering of the polling sub-divisions.

MISSIONARY CONVENTION
The Women's Missionary Society
of Guelph District at Rockwood.

The second annual convention of the Guelph District of the Women's Misionary Society of the Methodist Church was held at Rockwood on Thursday, and was well attended by delegates and visitors.

Miss Barker, Guelph, District Organist, sang a solo, and a solo was sung by Mrs. D. A. Muir, of Georgetown. The report from auxiliaries, mission circles and bands, and from the district organizer, showed steady and satisfactory progress.

At the afternoon session Miss Husband's address of welcome was replied to by Mrs. E. R. Holler, Guelph, and addressed were given by Mrs. G. Smith, Guelph, and Mrs. Wm. W. Moore, of Mississauga, and Mrs. Geo. Bratt, Guelph, "Love in the Key." Mrs. W. G. Smith replied to the motion of the resolution, and the session was closed with a conversation service, led by Mrs. G. H. Ryan, Guelph.

The evening session was an open one and was attended by a large audience. After an address from the chairman, Rev. Jas. Keele, the pastor of the church, Mrs. Christie, Acton, spoke on "Prayer and Mission" in a very effective manner. A resolution was carried to Mr. J. R. Smith, Rockwood, Miss Moore, a returned missionary from Japan, then delivered an interesting and instructive address on the work in that field. During the evening the choir rendered several selections.

The delegates were most hospitably entertained by the ladies of Rockwood. Some seventy members of the Acton auxiliary were in attendance.

An elevator at Glebeorpe belonging to the Northern Elevator Company slipped from its foundation and spilled six thousand bushels of wheat.

JUDGMENT AT LAST.

The Dominion Allows Cap Prohibit the Importation of Liquor into the Provinces.

ONLY POWER FOR LOCAL OPTION.

On Saturday the Privy Council of England handed down judgment upon the bill introduced by Mr. G. W. Hedges, member of the Dominion of Canada, raising the question of the power of provincial legislatures to make prohibitory liquor laws. The appeal was argued Aug. 7, 1895, Lord Watson, lord of appeal, read the judgment.

The others present were Lord Herschell, Lord Halsbury, lord high commissioner; Lord Davy, lord of Appeal; and Sir R. C. Griffin, Treasury of the Superintendence Board, who is travelling in the West.

The customary inquiry as to whether the case was entered into, and as there were no cause of regularity before the hearing was speedily and completely decided.

The court of the district president, The entire inter-colonial staff of the district was present with the exception of Rev. Dr. Griffin, Treasurer of the Superintendence Board, who is travelling in the West.

Samuel Smiley, of Guelph, Ont., fell ill a bushel of barley presumably in a bushel basket and was so badly burned that he cannot live.

Dr. Bar, of Guelph, fifteen weeks ago appointed registrar of Ontario, to succeed J. Horn Perry, deceased, died suddenly Friday morning.

Rev. N. Clarke Watson, speaking at Woodstock Friday night, defied the Conservative machine to bring out a candidate in opposition to him.

In response to the question "Who have died?" the name of the late venerable Rev. S. Peacock was recorded, and Rev. J. Stevens, a former member of the Legislature, was present to give his opinion as to the worthiness of the man.

On the afternoon of the same day, the question was raised whether the manufacture of liquor was carried on under such conditions as to make its prohibition merely a local matter. Their Lordships' answer was:

"The answer to the seventh question was the most relevant. It was that this Ontario Legislature had jurisdiction to enact section 18, which, however, was important in any district adopting the second part of the Canada Temperance Act of 1886. As regards question three, the answer was that, in the absence of conflict of legislation by the Parliament of Canada, the provinces had jurisdiction.

An evening meeting was held at which Rev. T. W. Jackson of Paris, and H. P. Munro, Esq. of Acton, delivered excellent addresses on the class meeting and its advantage to Methodists. Mr. Jackson dwelt on the merit of fellowship in a church, and offered sound helpful criticisms on the class. Among other things Mr. Munro pointed out that the mass is a representative of caste distinctions in the church; that it furnishes a link of continuity in our church life rendered the more difficult by the fact that it is a safe guard against spiritual bankruptcy, affording an opportunity for weekly meeting of one's religious life.

The meeting closed with a general discussion.

At the opening of the morning session of the second day the representatives were present from nearly every circuit of the district.

Rev. W. J. Brandon was appointed Dis-

trict Clerk, with Revs. E. M. Mattingly, S. L. Lamb, J. T. Irwin, B. D. Assistant, Rev. D. A. Moor, Treasurer pro tem., and Rev. T. W. Jackson and Mr. H. P. Munro, Auditors.

The circuit's income was £1,127 and showed a gratifying increase in the membership of the district. Thirteen of the 17 circuits of the district participated in this increase. While the various financial interests of the church have been well safeguarded during the year, the stringency of the times has caused a decrease in the amount of money raised for charitable purposes as well as for the conventional funds. The present membership Guelph District is 1,227, a net increase of 151 during the year. The amount raised for circuit purposes was £14,071.52, a decrease of £16,39. The conventional funds agree-

able to the amount of money given by the Supreme Court."

The Montreal Star's London cable says—

"The strong points standing out in the judgment are that the Privy Council delivered its day ago. That the Dominion Government alone has jurisdiction regarding the importation of intoxicating liquor into a province, that the Local Option Law is ineffective where it clashes with Provincial power to prohibit manufacture.

Dr. J. J. MacLaren, who was the counsel for the Province, offers this explanation of the judgment:

"That Provincial legislatures had jurisdiction, but that the judgment of the Supreme Court, negatived the question of the power of a provincial legislature to prohibit the sale of intoxicants, confirmed, while the power to pass local option laws is upheld by this judgment, contrary to that given by the Supreme Court."

The Montreal Star's London cable says—

"The strong points standing out in the judgment are that the Privy Council delivered its day ago. That the Dominion Government alone has jurisdiction regarding the importation of intoxicating liquor into a province, that the Local Option Law is ineffective where it clashes with Provincial power to prohibit manufacture.

Dr. J. J. MacLaren, who was the counsel for the Province, offers this explanation of the judgment:

"That Provincial legislatures had jurisdiction, but that the judgment of the Supreme Court, negatived the question of the power of a provincial legislature to prohibit the sale of intoxicants, confirmed, while the power to pass local option laws is upheld by this judgment, contrary to that given by the Supreme Court."

The Montreal Star's London cable says—

"The strong points standing out in the judgment are that the Privy Council delivered its day ago. That the Dominion Government alone has jurisdiction regarding the importation of intoxicating liquor into a province, that the Local Option Law is ineffective where it clashes with Provincial power to prohibit manufacture.

Dr. J. J. MacLaren, who was the counsel for the Province, offers this explanation of the judgment:

"That Provincial legislatures had jurisdiction, but that the judgment of the Supreme Court, negatived the question of the power of a provincial legislature to prohibit the sale of intoxicants, confirmed, while the power to pass local option laws is upheld by this judgment, contrary to that given by the Supreme Court."

The Montreal Star's London cable says—

"The strong points standing out in the judgment are that the Privy Council delivered its day ago. That the Dominion Government alone has jurisdiction regarding the importation of intoxicating liquor into a province, that the Local Option Law is ineffective where it clashes with Provincial power to prohibit manufacture.

Dr. J. J. MacLaren, who was the counsel for the Province, offers this explanation of the judgment:

"That Provincial legislatures had jurisdiction, but that the judgment of the Supreme Court, negatived the question of the power of a provincial legislature to prohibit the sale of intoxicants, confirmed, while the power to pass local option laws is upheld by this judgment, contrary to that given by the Supreme Court."

The Montreal Star's London cable says—

"The strong points standing out in the judgment are that the Privy Council delivered its day ago. That the Dominion Government alone has jurisdiction regarding the importation of intoxicating liquor into a province, that the Local Option Law is ineffective where it clashes with Provincial power to prohibit manufacture.

Dr. J. J. MacLaren, who was the counsel for the Province, offers this explanation of the judgment:

"That Provincial legislatures had jurisdiction, but that the judgment of the Supreme Court, negatived the question of the power of a provincial legislature to prohibit the sale of intoxicants, confirmed, while the power to pass local option laws is upheld by this judgment, contrary to that given by the Supreme Court."

The Montreal Star's London cable says—

"The strong points standing out in the judgment are that the Privy Council delivered its day ago. That the Dominion Government alone has jurisdiction regarding the importation of intoxicating liquor into a province, that the Local Option Law is ineffective where it clashes with Provincial power to prohibit manufacture.

Dr. J. J. MacLaren, who was the counsel for the Province, offers this explanation of the judgment:

"That Provincial legislatures had jurisdiction, but that the judgment of the Supreme Court, negatived the question of the power of a provincial legislature to prohibit the sale of intoxicants, confirmed, while the power to pass local option laws is upheld by this judgment, contrary to that given by the Supreme Court."

The Montreal Star's London cable says—

"The strong points standing out in the judgment are that the Privy Council delivered its day ago. That the Dominion Government alone has jurisdiction regarding the importation of intoxicating liquor into a province, that the Local Option Law is ineffective where it clashes with Provincial power to prohibit manufacture.

Dr. J. J. MacLaren, who was the counsel for the Province, offers this explanation of the judgment:

"That Provincial legislatures had jurisdiction, but that the judgment of the Supreme Court, negatived the question of the power of a provincial legislature to prohibit the sale of intoxicants, confirmed, while the power to pass local option laws is upheld by this judgment, contrary to that given by the Supreme Court."

The Montreal Star's London cable says—

"The strong points standing out in the judgment are that the Privy Council delivered its day ago. That the Dominion Government alone has jurisdiction regarding the importation of intoxicating liquor into a province, that the Local Option Law is ineffective where it clashes with Provincial power to prohibit manufacture.

Dr. J. J. MacLaren, who was the counsel for the Province, offers this explanation of the judgment:

"That Provincial legislatures had jurisdiction, but that the judgment of the Supreme Court, negatived the question of the power of a provincial legislature to prohibit the sale of intoxicants, confirmed, while the power to pass local option laws is upheld by this judgment, contrary to that given by the Supreme Court."

The Montreal Star's London cable says—

"The strong points standing out in the judgment are that the Privy Council delivered its day ago. That the Dominion Government alone has jurisdiction regarding the importation of intoxicating liquor into a province, that the Local Option Law is ineffective where it clashes with Provincial power to prohibit manufacture.

Dr. J. J. MacLaren, who was the counsel for the Province, offers this explanation of the judgment:

"That Provincial legislatures had jurisdiction, but that the judgment of the Supreme Court, negatived the question of the power of a provincial legislature to prohibit the sale of intoxicants, confirmed, while the power to pass local option laws is upheld by this judgment, contrary to that given by the Supreme Court."

The Montreal Star's London cable says—

"The strong points standing out in the judgment are that the Privy Council delivered its day ago. That the Dominion Government alone has jurisdiction regarding the importation of intoxicating liquor into a province, that the Local Option Law is ineffective where it clashes with Provincial power to prohibit manufacture.

Dr. J. J. MacLaren, who was the counsel for the Province, offers this explanation of the judgment:

"That Provincial legislatures had jurisdiction, but that the judgment of the Supreme Court, negatived the question of the power of a provincial legislature to prohibit the sale of intoxicants, confirmed, while the power to pass local option laws is upheld by this judgment, contrary to that given by the Supreme Court."

The Montreal Star's London cable says—

"The strong points standing out in the judgment are that the Privy Council delivered its day ago. That the Dominion Government alone has jurisdiction regarding the importation of intoxicating liquor into a province, that the Local Option Law is ineffective where it clashes with Provincial power to prohibit manufacture.

Dr. J. J. MacLaren, who was the counsel for the Province, offers this explanation of the judgment:

"That Provincial legislatures had jurisdiction, but that the judgment of the Supreme Court, negatived the question of the power of a provincial legislature to prohibit the sale of intoxicants, confirmed, while the power to pass local option laws is upheld by this judgment, contrary to that given by the Supreme Court."

The Montreal Star's London cable says—

"The strong points standing out in the judgment are that the Privy Council delivered its day ago. That the Dominion Government alone has jurisdiction regarding the importation of intoxicating liquor into a province, that the Local Option Law is ineffective where it clashes with Provincial power to prohibit manufacture.

Dr. J. J. MacLaren, who was the counsel for the Province, offers this explanation of the judgment:

"That Provincial legislatures had jurisdiction, but that the judgment of the Supreme Court, negatived the question of the power of a provincial legislature to prohibit the sale of intoxicants, confirmed, while the power to pass local option laws is upheld by this judgment, contrary to that given by the Supreme Court."

The Montreal Star's London cable says—

"The strong points standing out in the judgment are that the Privy Council delivered its day ago. That the Dominion Government alone has jurisdiction regarding the importation of intoxicating liquor into a province, that the Local Option Law is ineffective where it clashes with Provincial power to prohibit manufacture.

Dr. J. J. MacLaren, who was the counsel for the Province, offers this explanation of the judgment:

"That Provincial legislatures had jurisdiction, but that the judgment of the Supreme Court, negatived the question of the power of a provincial legislature to prohibit the sale of intoxicants, confirmed, while the power to pass local option laws is upheld by this judgment, contrary to that given by the Supreme Court."

The Montreal Star's London cable says—

"The strong points standing out in the judgment are that the Privy Council delivered its day ago. That the Dominion Government alone has jurisdiction regarding the importation of intoxicating liquor into a province, that the Local Option Law is ineffective where it clashes with Provincial power to prohibit manufacture.

Dr. J. J. MacLaren, who was the counsel for the Province, offers this explanation of the judgment:

"That Provincial legislatures had jurisdiction, but that the judgment of the Supreme Court, negatived the question of the power of a provincial legislature to prohibit the sale of intoxicants, confirmed, while the power to pass local option laws is upheld by this judgment, contrary to that given by the Supreme Court."

The Montreal Star's London cable says—

"The strong points standing out in the judgment are that the Privy Council delivered its day ago. That the Dominion Government alone has jurisdiction regarding the importation of intoxicating liquor into a province, that the Local Option Law is ineffective where it clashes with Provincial power to prohibit manufacture.

Dr. J. J. MacLaren, who was the counsel for the Province, offers this explanation of the judgment: