# The Colonist.

FRIDAY, JUNE 26, 1891.

## A TERROR.

The Liberal newspapers and, no doubt, the Liberal politicians, were dreadfully afraid that Sir Charles Tupper would have been chosen Premier. Their extraordinary dread of him appears in every line they write about the Premiership. They objected to every statesman named, and gave reasons more than enough why he should not be selected, but when they came to speak of Sir Charles Tupper they got hysterical. They cannot contemplate his elevation to the Premiership with anything like equanimity. They lose their heads at once and abuse him like so many fish-wives. They have, no doubt, good reason for their agitation and disquietude.

They regard Sir Charles Tupper in pretty much the same light as a crowd of bad boys, bent upon mischief, look upon a policeman. They know that as long as he is near they cannot do mischief with impunity. Sir Charles, they feel, is vigilant; has a heavy hand, and is ready to use it with effect when occasion requires. They have unpleasant recollections of the way that he has dealt with them in days not very long gone by—how he punished them for calling respectable people names, and how small he made them feel when he unsparingly exposed their short-comings and transgressions. They still feel the smart of his lash. This is why they make such an outcry when there is talk of putting him on the beat again.

The uneasiness exhibited by the Liberals, and their bitter and vehement abuse of Sir Charles Tupper, should be taken as evidence of his fitness to be the leader of the Conservative party. They see in him a man who is not to be trifled with, a man who is ready to give blow for blow, and a man whose blows always tell. They have good reason to believe that there will be some vigorous fighting to do in the near future, and they do not like the idea of seeing Sir Charles Tupper in the fore-front of the battle. And they are wise in their generation. If they can by incessant detraction and unlimited vilification create distrust of the High Commissioner among the members of the Conservative party and add to the number of those who dislike and envy him, they will make their own task easier and increase their chances of attaining power within a measurable period of time.

But the Liberals must not congratulate themselves too soon. If, as it appears, they are intent upon doing, they declare war to the knife against the Government and resort to the most unscrupulous and unfair means to weaken it and to bring it into disrepute, Sir Charles Tupper is within call, and he will be greatly changed if when he is needed by his country and his party he does not spring to the front and prove to them that he has not forgotten how to win battles.

## AN INCREDIBLE RUMOR.

We cannot but think that the Ottawa press telegram, which appeared in our Sunday's issue, was concocted by some newsmonger who was more desirous of creating a sensation than of giving the public reliable information. The public were told in the telegram that:—

"The failure of the Minister of Finance to move the House into Committee of Supply, yesterday, prevented Hon. Mr. Laurier bringing up his proposed motion of want of confidence. He proposes to ask the House to condemn the new Government because, as he will allege, Sir John Thompson and Sir Hector Langevin were passed over in the choice of Premier; the first because he was a Roman Catholic, and the second because he was a French Canadian and Catholic. Another section of the proposed amendment is said to have reference to the fact that the new Premier is a member of the Upper House."

We cannot think that the Leader of the Opposition would wantonly raise the religious issue in the House of Commons. He cannot but see that if he gives countenance to the idea that religion is a qualification for office and a plea for precedence he will create for himself and his party a difficulty which no leader, let him be ever so prudent and ever so adroit, will be able to overcome. He must know that his resolution, if carried, would be a boomerang of the most destructive kind. Mr. Wilfred Laurier is a far less sagacious politician than we take him to be if he, for the sake of annoying and embarrassing the Abbott Administration, moves a resolution based upon a principle, which, if attempted to be carried into effect, would make the formation of a Ministry by any party a matter of impossibility. To make denominational religion a qualification for office would be to place hypocrisy and fanaticism at a premium. Candidates for legislative honors would thereafter lay greater stress on their being zealous Catholics, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, etc., than on their being supporters of this or that political principle, or this or that line of party policy. Phariseeism would then get a tremendous impetus, and electors would be divided, not according to their political tendencies, but according to their religious professions. We have placed an altogether mistaken estimate on the Liberal Leader's principles and inclinations, if he would consent to do anything at all calculated to bring about such a state of things as we have described.

Besides, the very first clause of this alleged resolution states what Mr. Laurier knows to be untrue. Sir John Thompson was not passed over in the choice of a Premier. He, if we are rightly informed, was the first person called upon by the Governor-General to form a new Government; and it was not until he had declined the task that Mr. Abbott was asked to be the Head of a new Government.

It does seem ridiculous that a vote of want of confidence in a Government should be grounded on the fact that gentlemen who are members of that Government were passed over in the choice of a Premier. The consent of those gentlemen to placing Mr. Abbott in the position of Premier must have been obtained before a government could have been formed, so the resolution, if passed, would censure Sir Hector Langevin and Sir John Thompson for passing themselves over when the Premier was to be chosen. The whole matter is so absurd and so stupid that we cannot believe that the resolution ever had any existence except in the imagination of the telegram manufacturer.

There are no religious disabilities in this country. Any man, whatever his views and convictions on religion may be, is eligible for the premiership, or any other office in the gift of either the people or the Crown, and it would be in the highest degree wrong and impolitic for Mr. Laurier, or any other public man, to create disabilities and invidious distinctions, based on religious profession, that are unknown to the constitution. We think that we see a disposition, on the part of a faction, in this Dominion, to make quiet and harmonious government impossible. To effect their object these unprincipled intriguers are doing their utmost to kindle the flames of religious strife among the people. We hope, and believe, that they will be unsuccessful in this bad work. The people of Canada have too much good sense, and are too tolerant to allow a set of intriguing scoundrels, and their dupes, to set them quarrelling about religion.

Since the above was written, our Ottawa special telegram of yesterday has been received. We see by it that Mr. Laurier did not raise the religious issue, and that his motion could not resemble in any particular that circulated by the Ottawa newspaper for the purpose, no doubt, of fomenting religious jealousies, and unsettling the minds of the people.

## AN HONORABLE COURSE.

Sir John Gorst's resignation need not have taken anyone by surprise. He could not consistently have retained office under the Salisbury Government after that Government had rejected Mr. Buxton's amendment to the Factories' and Workshops' Bill.

Cardinal Manning in his article in the June number of the Contemporary Review makes the whole matter quite clear. Sir John Gorst was the representative of Great Britain at the Berlin International Labor Congress. One of the subjects brought before that Congress was child labor. A resolution was passed limiting the age at which children would be allowed to work in factories to twelve years. The representatives of Germany, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Netherlands, Sweden and Switzerland voted for the resolution, while those of England, Spain and Italy refrained from voting.

Sir John Gorst wrote to Lord Salisbury for instructions how to act in this matter, stating the facts. Lord Salisbury telegraphed his approval of the resolution, but to make sure Sir John Gorst wrote again as follows:—

We understand that we have your Lordship's authority to assent to the following proposals, which are in advance of our present law—

(a) Raising the minimum age of child labor to twelve years.

(b) Raising the minimum age of underground labor in mines to fourteen years.

(c) Providing four weeks cessation from labor for a woman that has been confined."

Two days afterwards Lord Salisbury replied:—

"Your attitude approved. You may assent to three proposals mentioned at the close of your despatch."

It can easily be understood that Sir John Gorst considered that the British Government was committed to making the lowest age at which children would be allowed to enter factories twelve years, as soon as it had a fair opportunity.

In the Government Factories' and Workshops' Bill there was no provision as to the child laborer's age, so when it was in committee Mr. Buxton moved the following amendment:—

"On and after the first day of January, 1893, no child under the age of 11 years, and on and after the first day of January, 1894, no child under the age of 12 years shall be employed in a factory or workshop; and, except as therein provided, any parent causing or permitting his or her child to be employed, in contravention of this section, for hire, and any person employing such child for hire shall be guilty of a misdemeanor."

The amendment was rejected on a division of 26 votes to 23. But Mr. Buxton was bound that the House of Commons should have the opportunity of accepting or rejecting his amendment, so at the proper time he moved its acceptance, and it was accepted by a small majority against the will, of course, of the Home Secretary, who had the bill in charge. Sir John Gorst could not, after what he had done in Berlin, do otherwise than vote for Mr. Buxton's amendment and against the Government, for the Factories' and Workshops' Bill was a Government measure. Here we have the secret of Sir John Gorst's resignation. He, if Lord Salisbury did not, considered himself bound in honor to vote in the British Parliament in accordance with the principle he assented to at Berlin. He had his choice either to vote against Mr. Buxton's amendment and retain his office or vote for that amendment and resign his office. It is principle against interest, and principle, to Sir John Gorst's credit, be it said, won.

There are two articles in the Contemporary on Child Labor. One to which we are indebted for the documents we have quoted, by Cardinal Manning, and the other on what is called the Halftimers, by Mr. Henry Dunckley. They are, we need not say, both able articles. They were timely also, and appearing as they did between the time when Mr. Buxton's resolution was rejected by the Grand Committee, and when it was considered by the House of Commons they, no doubt, had a considerable influence on the final vote.

## NOT POSTED.

The Times in its comments on our article on the Pope's Encyclical says, "But why did not the Pope put the seal of his disapprobation on the monopoly of land?" We cannot tell, but we presume it is because that no such thing as a monopoly of land exists anywhere on the face of the earth. Nowhere does the land belong to one person or to one corporation, and nowhere that we know of are men forbidden to buy and sell land. Our contemporary is altogether too careless in its use of words. If it went to the trouble to find out what the word "monopoly" really means, it would not use it so loosely. The only land monopolists that we know of are the disciples of Henry George. They would have the State to be the sole owner of the land. They would make land a Government monopoly. They would take it out of the market altogether, and make it unlawful to either buy or to sell it. This would be a true monopoly. The Pope's Encyclical does "put the seal of his disapprobation" on this monopoly.

Our contemporary says, "we do not understand that the Georgeites dispute the right of the individual to dispose of his earnings as he will, even to the purchase of land." This shows very plainly that the writer of the article either has not studied, or having studied, does not understand, George's system. That land must not be private property is the maxim on which the whole of George's theory is built. He would not allow any one to own as much of the earth's surface as would make him a grave. And, more than that, he would, if he had his way, take from every owner of land, no matter how large or how small, his holding, the land he claims to possess. According to George, buying and selling land is nothing more and nothing better than buying and selling stolen goods. He denounces it as an unlawful traffic, and the Georgeite who deals in real estate is even more inconsistent than the prohibitionist who makes money by dealing in whisky. According to George, land is a contraband commodity which men should not be allowed to deal in. Although the Times takes up the cudgels for the Georgeites, it is quite evident it has but a very indistinct notion of what Georgeism really is. We advise its editor before he again writes on the subject of Georgeism, and comments upon the criticism of the Pope or any one else on George's system, to take a look into the works of Henry George. They are very pleasant reading, and instructive too, in a way, for George can hide a fallacy as cleverly as any writer we know, and he can clothe nonsense with such a garb that many people, who are not by any means stupid, mistake it for sense.

## LAURIER'S ATTACK.

Mr. Laurier's attack on the Government was simply a move in party warfare. He believed that he had the new Ministry at a disadvantage, and he was bound to make the most of his position. Mr. Abbott's connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway he regarded as the Government's weak spot, and it was against that he directed his artillery. It must be admitted that his tactics were not unfair. It is right that the Government of Canada should keep itself clear of entangling and embarrassing connections with great railway and other corporations. No member of the Government should be in such a position as to give the people fair ground for concluding that he could be swayed by the influence of a corporation like the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that he could be tempted to prefer its interest to those of the country. It is right that Parliament and the people should be watchful in this matter, and should be jealous of any influence which would be likely to interfere with the fearless and the impartial performance of the Premier's duty. If Mr. Laurier could show that Mr. Abbott had, as a member of the Cabinet, and of the Senate, been in the habit of preferring the interests of the Canadian Pacific to those of the people of the Dominion, he would have been able to make out a good case against his acceptance of the Premiership. Here the Leader of the Opposition had a very great advantage. Mr. Abbott has been for many years a public man. He has been a member of the House of Commons, a member of the Senate and a member of the Government. He has acted in these capacities in full view of the Opposition. If he had been in the habit of unduly favoring the Canadian Pacific the fact could not have escaped the watchful eyes of his opponents in the Legislature and in the Press. His being connected with the C.P.R. would cause him to be watched all the more closely. If he had even made a slip or anything that could be construed into a slip in the direction of showing undue favor to the great railway corporation with which he was connected, the fact would have been noticed and commented upon by both friends and opponents. Mr. Laurier had the whole of Mr. Abbott's past to criticise and review. Mr. Abbott and Mr. Abbott's friends and supporters could not complain if his public life had been narrowly watched and severely judged and commented upon. Did Mr. Laurier accuse the Premier of having in the past been unfaithful to the country, of having sacrificed the interests of the people of Canada to those of the Canadian Pacific Railway? We do not see in the reports of his speech that have reached us that he did. We do not find that he gave even one instance of unfaithfulness, and certainly did not accuse the Premier of having habitually shown undue preference to the Canadian Pacific. Neither have we seen in the comments of the Opposition Press, on Mr. Abbott's elevation to the Premiership, even an insinuation that he had not in the performance of his public duties been faithful to the interests of Canada.

This being the case, it is fair to presume that Mr. Abbott's conduct in this respect, before he became Premier, was above suspicion or reproach, and it is not to be supposed that now that he is Premier he will change for the worse. If he was perfectly impartial as regards the C.P.R., while he was the Leader of the Government in the Senate and while he was Cabinet Minister, it is altogether unfair to presume that when his responsibilities are greater and the checks upon him much more numerous and very much stronger, he will be less impartial and less conscientious.

We know that with a great many, when the conduct of a public man comes to be considered, suspicion is regarded as proof. We saw that as soon as the Toronto Globe heard Mr. Abbott's name connected with the Premiership, it exclaimed at once, government by Abbott meant government by Van Horne. It did not reason about the matter, it entered into no enquiry. It suspected and gave utterance to its suspicion. That suspicion, in its opinion, was enough to condemn Mr. Abbott. And it is to be feared that in the judgment of many others it was considered amply sufficient. Proof, in their estimation, was superfluous. And it appears that Mr. Laurier's speech was nothing more than an amplification of the text supplied him by the Toronto Globe. He could not prove that Mr. Abbott was unfaithful in the past, but he took it for granted that he would be unfaithful in the future. Was this fair? Was it reasonable? Was it honest? Cannot Mr. Abbott's supporters and admirers, pointing to his past record, say—"He has been faithful in that which is least, he will be faithful also in much"?

## THE SIMPLE TRUTH.

The Nanaimo Free Press a few days ago published, without note or comment, an extract from the Coast Seamen's Journal, in which "Dunsmuir" is represented as a "foreign tyrant" who "tries his utmost to bring down his employes to the level of the pauper labor of Europe." This the Nanaimo Free Press knows well is utterly untrue. It, therefore, by publishing this glaringly false statement, knowing it to be false, without contradicting it or qualifying it in some way, is really more culpable than the editor of the San Francisco paper. He might not know anything more about the dispute between Dunsmuir & Sons and the Union men than he has heard from parties who were interested in leading him astray; but the editor of the Nanaimo Free Press cannot plead ignorance. He knows all about the Wellington dispute, from first to last, and he knows that there is not a word of truth in the statement which we have quoted and which he published as if it were true. The editor of the Free Press knows that there was no question of wages between Dunsmuir & Sons and their employes. They were satisfied with the pay that they were receiving. The miners were well paid and well treated in every respect. The Free Press has acknowledged more than once that the only question at issue between the Dunsmuirs and their employes was the recognition of the Union in the management of their mines. It was to assert this principle that the men struck, and no other. There was no dispute as to wages or hours of labor or anything else. The Union made the recognition of the pit committee the test question, and, when the mine owners refused to recognise that committee, men who had good wages, plenty of work, and were well treated, went out on strike. This is the simple truth, and why should the Nanaimo Free Press lie about the matter or countenance lying in others? The men were free to strike on this ground or any other, and their Union, if they saw fit, were free to contribute towards the support of the men on strike, but it should not be forgotten by either workingmen or employers, that what the Wellington miners went out on strike for was for the recognition of the Union in the management of the mines. This should not be lost sight of for a minute, either by the miners or the general public. That the Coast Seamen's Journal and other journals find it necessary to lie about this matter and to represent the Dunsmuirs as tyrants, who desire to grind their men down, shows that they look upon the true cause of the strike as an insufficient one, and that in order to get sympathy and support from outsiders they must represent it to be something else and something worse. But it is true that the Dunsmuirs paid their men well, treated their men well and did not overwork them or try to overwork them. They refused, however, to allow the management of their mines to be interfered with by pit committees, in connection with the Union. This was the head and front of their offending and the sole cause of the strike.

## A CANDID CRITIC.

The Baccarat scandal is a sweet morsel for very many of the American newspapers. They moralise about the wickedness of princes in the most edifying manner, and expatiate on the demoralization of the British aristocracy with a sanctimoniousness that Chadband himself might envy. But all American journalists are not Pharisees. They are not blind to what is going on in their own country, and they are not afraid to rebuke their fellow journalists for their hypocricy and self-righteousness. The Chicago Times speaks to its censorious contemporaries in this fashion:

"Let Americans," it says, "before they wag their tongues at Englishmen, recall the history of the last twenty-five years, and refresh their memory of those events which have stained the record of their great captain, which have all but spotted the ermine of their highest court, which have pulled Senators down from their high places and retired a vice-president to obscurity, and which, from paining and angering a people essentially moral and just, have come to be considered almost matters of course, and in some sort susceptible of justification, or at least of palliation. Let us consider the methods by which a legally elected President was defrauded of his seat, and the methods by which the present occupant of the White House gained entrance into it. Let us contemplate a portfolio bestowed upon the raiser of a corruption fund, who is now involved in a scandal the proportions of which dwarf a gentleman's game of baccarat. Let us look upon a statesman whose political life is made up of a series of scandals born of greed for gold, and who is yet the leader of a party professing morality thought to be the one most worthy of the presidency. Let us consider our senatorships exposed at public auction, our public policy shaped by a coterie of senatorial poker players, and our Senate chamber disgraced by drunkenness when measures of moment and pith are up for determination."

Not until they have done this, the Times thinks, will it be appropriate in its contemporaries to belabor too unmercifully any occasional weakness that may appear in the English political or social system.

"The Prince of Wales," continues that journal, "has not overthrown constitutional rights, has not plundered the treasury, nor crept into power by bribery. The people of England have not raised convicted corruptionists to places of high trust or defied rascality in the name of virtue."

Making American public men black does not, we know, wash the Prince of Wales white. But we are glad to see the men who wink at American corruption and rascality and, perhaps, profit by it, rebuked when they pretend to be horrified by the follies and the mistakes of the British Heir Apparent.

## SEAMEN IN TROUBLE.

### Rioters at San Diego to be Prosecuted for Inducing Sailors on the Hounslow to Desert.

San Diego, June 20.—Warrants were today issued for all the members of the seamen's union who induced the sailors on the coal steamer Hounslow to leave the vessel on Thursday, and who assaulted the Captain in attempting to prevent him from shipping a non-union crew yesterday morning. Two shots were fired by the seamen in pursuit of a boat containing the captain, the bullets striking near Pilot Drill and an officer of the vessel. Constable Murray, who was on board the yawl which took the captain, pilot and two non-union men to the ship, was hit in the face with the butt-end of an oar and badly injured. The rioters also assaulted Ellington Maybee, who rowed the yawl, and pounded him unmercifully with brass knuckles. His face was laid open, his eyes closed and one of his teeth knocked out. Captain Dill's life was threatened, and upon his return from the pilot grounds this morning he swore out the warrants. There is universal indignation in the city over the affair, and the prosecution will be pushed.

## GAMBLING BY OFFICERS

### Forms the Subject of Discussion in the House of Commons—The Prince of Wales' Popularity.

In the House of Commons, on Monday evening, Hon. Edward Stanhope, secretary of state for war, replying to the question by Henry Peyton Cobb, Liberal, said the government would consider whether three years' return of non-commissioned officers and others of the British army who had been punished by reduction to the ranks for conniving at card playing or other forms of gambling, or for partaking therein with official inferiors, could be granted. Replying to another question, the Secretary said he could see no necessity for the issuance of an order calling the attention of officers of the army to the gambling regulations of the service, as he did not believe these regulations had been broken.

Mr. Gladstone is said to have forwarded a personal request to Mr. Cobb, asking him to give up his proposition to renew the subject of baccarat in the House, but without avail, as Mr. Cobb, who usually works well in the Liberal traces, refuses to be influenced. He is not a vulgar agitator, but a man of university education, a successful solicitor and banker. He is also deeply conscientious in religious work, and has a horror of aristocratic dissipation.

That the popularity of the Prince of Wales has not abated was shown by his reception at Eastbourne Saturday. The Prince and Princess opened the addition to All Saints' Convalescent Home, at the foot of Beachy Head, and they were received with the greatest enthusiasm. Later in the day they drove to Upperton and opened the children's ward of the hospital established in memory of the hapless Princess Alice, who was the mother of the still living, but unhappy, Grand Duchess Elizabeth of Russia, at Compton.

After the ceremonies the Prince was the guest of Lord Hartington, where a distinguished company was assembled to greet his royal highness.

On Monday the Prince and Princess of Wales, Queen Victoria and the Duke and Duchess of Connaught were present at the marriage, in the Wellington barracks church, of Col. William E. Montgomery of the Scots Guards, to Miss Alberta Ponsonby, daughter of Gen. Sir Henry Frederick Ponsonby, keeper of the privy purse and private secretary to Her Majesty.

### Will Probably Go.

The Mayor and members of the aldermanic board are in receipt of invitations to spend the Fourth of July as the guests of Seattle. They know what this means, and will no doubt accept. But here the question arises, how can one Mayor and nine aldermen be in Whatcom, Fairhaven and Seattle at one and the same time? The invitations of the two former places have been accepted, and it will not do to slight their hospitality for the sake of enjoying that of Seattle.

### The World Enriched.

The facilities of the present day for the production of everything that will conduce to the material welfare and comfort of mankind are almost unlimited and when Syrup of Figs was first produced the world was enriched with the only perfect laxative known, as it is the only remedy which is truly pleasing and refreshing to the taste and prompt and effectual to cleanse the system gently in the Spring time or, in fact, at any time and the better it is known the more popular it becomes.

*ja20-tts-d&w

## THE HEIR APPARENT.

### The Outcry Against the Prince of Wales Discussed by Rt. Rev. Bishop Cridge.

On Sunday morning, the Rt. Rev. Bishop Cridge delivered a sermon apropos to the severe criticisms to which the Prince of Wales is being subjected in connection with the developments in what is known as the Baccarat scandal case. Taking as his text, Galations vi., verse 1: "Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual restore such a one in the spirit of meekness, considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted." He said:

I do not propose, this morning, to pursue a line of either apology or censure in reference to the outcry against the heir to the Throne. The case, as it is, is before the world and before the Church, and both the world and the Church have spoken in reference to it in a very decided manner. But it may be a question whether that manner has been altogether the best; the best, I mean, not on the part of the world, but on the part of the Church; whether there have been sufficiently kept in view that charity, moderation, and considerateness, which are so necessary to reproof, and without which rebukes often aggravate rather than heal the sore.

Let it be granted that the character of princes is the property of nations, and that persons in eminent places may not safely contemn popular rebuke. Let it be admitted also that the voice of the nation in this matter is to a certain extent a cause of congratulation, England has not possessed an open Bible in vain. The righteousness which exalteth a nation has not altogether passed behind the freedom which truth hath conferred. Old things have passed away. Reverence for royalty is not that blind and indiscriminating sentiment which once it was. The heir to the throne is but the first subject of the realm. Law is supreme over all. Reverence is counted due only to uprightness, and no station is held secure if tainted with corrupt doings. Honor departs from the dissolute, and office is refused to the immoral. The same word which exalts righteousness, leaves us not without instruction as to how to deal with human faults and frailties. There must be grave and exceptional grounds for holding up a man, whether in high station or low, to public scorn and reprobation. Behind all is a voice which speaks, or ought to speak, with an authority which does not appertain to mere secular utterances. That power is the church—a wide term—but let us take it in its best and highest sense. There is a law of reproof which the church, as leader and teacher of men, is bound to observe. It is expressed in the text, and confirmed by the Lord himself: "Go and tell him of his fault between thee and him alone."

John the Baptist knew how to rebuke a king. He did not go about preaching against the monarch. He did not inflame the popular excitement, which, no doubt, was rife, by declaiming against the sovereign's delinquencies. He went to the king and consulted him privately. He told him that that which he was doing was not lawful. In doing this he endangered his head. Good counsel does not always meet with immediate success.

From the many examples and precepts which were written for our learning we perceive a rule that public rebukes should be visited on classes, individuals admonished face to face. Our Lord's most awful denunciations were directed against pharisees as a sect or class. He did not select an individual as the subject of his discourse, though such a one might perhaps have been found, whose castigation would satisfy the common feeling against one who was reported as a devourer of widows' houses and as guilty of odious hypocrisies. There is no reason to think that this law has been repealed, or that it is not still in force. A more difficult question may be, where does this power reside and how has it been exercised in the present case? It is remarkable in the examples referred to that the reformers were messengers of neither church nor state, but spoke freely in the name of God, a sign, perhaps, of overmuch corruption at the fountain head. England is supposed to be highly favored in the possession of a state church, and it might reasonably be considered the peculiar function of such a church to guard the interests of morality in high places. The Prince is a member of that church, and, surely, if his conduct were worthy of discipline or reproof, the church, if its mission be not futile, should find a better way of ministering it than by public denunciations on the part of prelates or preachers. Other bodies have what the Church of England has not, namely, power to speak in their co-operate capacity; and I must humbly think that they would have come nearer the law of God by sending a wise and faithful messenger with secret-loving counsel, instead of allowing their rebukes to be published all over the land, a course which they would not pursue towards the humblest member of their flocks. I cannot see that it is more fair to fall upon and rend a person because he is in eminent station, than one of humbler rank. And if this be so, it is not the man but Society that has to be denounced and reformed. The axe should be laid to the root rather than the branches. In our day law has reformed or done away with many evil things. Most vices have small beginnings; and are pernicious rather by their evil principle than by their accidents. Sin is sin in small things as well as great. If it is wrong to stake £100, it cannot be right to stake a sixpence. This is how the evil begins; who can tell how it will end? What has fair play got to do with this gaming, as tried by the law of God? You coveted your neighbor's money indeed. You compelled him to hate you; and his wife and children to curse you. You drove him to suicide; but because you played fair he shall go free. Will the law of God say this? Beware then of the beginning of this terrible vice, for your own sake; for your children's sake. It is astonishing how the discovery of a person's faults may be allowed to blemish the whole character in our esteem. All that once engaged our affection and sympathy, how soon is it clouded over and forgotten! Some of us can well remember the grief and anxiety which oppressed the nation when the Prince's life trembled in the balance through a sore sickness, and how fervently the prayers of a whole people ascended on his behalf. We remember, also, what hearty thanksgivings were returned to God all over Her Majesty's dominions when God was pleased, in answer to their prayers, to raise him up again. Thus did the nation adopt, as it were, anew the heir to the Throne. I think it was a better way than that which has been lately pursued. At least, we may all ask ourselves how can we rise from our knees, in making supplication to God, and straightway join in the outcry against him for whom our supplication has been made: "That it may please Thee to bless Albert Edward, Prince of Wales, the Princess of Wales, and all the Royal Family!" The Princess of Wales! welcomed to the heart of the nation on a memorable occasion with unequalled demonstrations of affection and joy, and at this day second only to our gracious Sovereign herself in the nation's esteem. How little do these royal ladies seem to have been remembered in the storm of reproach! Though there be just ground for anxiety,—as how should there not be, in view of the associations which surround a prince,—the good should not all be forgotten; the labor and assiduity with which for many years the Prince has devoted himself to measures for the public benefit; the well-ordered household and domestic life—Too little have such reflections softened the sternness of rebuke, or added hope to prayer. I speak simply as a citizen, not bringing the conduct of the future King to the severe test of the divine standard, by which, if any of us be tried, we should come miserably short. Not all have been deemed unworthy to reign who have failed to attain to that. The democratic spirit may find pleasure in fostering the flame of popular resentment in hope of change. But the Christian spirit will give itself to prayer, and leave to God to work out the nation's destiny in the way which seemeth Him best; nor be eager to accelerate a change knowing how uncertain are the benefits which a different order of things might bring. Never on the part of royalty was there more disposition to concede, unaffectedly and unreservedly the rights and privileges of true freedom; rights and privileges which the nation at present enjoys to a degree unsurpassed if equalled, by any other nation under the sun.

## FIGHT WITH COAST SEAMEN.

### Captain of the Steamer Hounslow Gets a Crew at San Diego.

San Diego, June 19.—The British coal ship Hounslow, which has been engaged for several months in carrying coal from Nanaimo to this port, did not succeed in getting out of the harbor until this morning at 11 o'clock, although her cargo was discharged and she was ready to sail night before last. After the striking seamen left the vessel yesterday morning representatives of the Seamen's Union patrolled the wharves and constantly rowed back and forth in boats to prevent the shipment of non-union crews. At an early hour this morning Captain Norman had secured a boatload of men, and while passing from the wharf to the steamer three shots were fired at them by pursuing members of the Union, but no damage was done. While making another trip the captain was beset by a number of desperate longshoremen, and but for the presence of a squad of police with drawn revolvers, would undoubtedly have been seriously injured or killed. When he had reached the vessel he had the anchor weighed, and the steamer went down the harbor to Ballast Point, where several more non-union men were taken on board, they having been driven to that point in a wagon to escape the pickets of the union at the wharf. After drilling the men until noon to-day, the big steamer disappeared around Point Loma, leaving miners in this city minus about $2,000 in salary, which would have been due to-day, according to their contract, but which by the strike they have forfeited. The trouble is said to be caused by the action of the walking delegate of the Coast Seamen's Union, who prevailed upon the vessel's crew to demand Coast seamen's wages, while they were working under a two years' contract with the owners of the Hounslow at $25 per month.


SYRUP of FIGS

ONE ENJOYS

Both the method and results when Syrup of Figs is taken; it is pleasant and refreshing to the taste, and acts gently yet promptly on the Kidneys, Liver and Bowels, cleanses the system effectually, dispels colds, headaches and fevers and cures habitual constipation permanently.

For sale in 75c. Bottles by all Druggists.

CALIFORNIA FIG SYRUP CO.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.

LOUISVILLE, KY. NEW YORK, N.Y.

ja20-tts-d&w

Children always Enjoy It.

SCOTT'S EMULSION

of pure Cod Liver Oil with Hypophosphites of Lime and Soda is almost as palatable as milk.

A MARVELLOUS FLESH PRODUCER

It is indeed, and the little lads and lassies who take cold easily, may be fortified against a cough that might prove serious, by taking Scott's Emulsion after their meals during the winter season.

*Beware of substitutions and imitations.*

SCOTT & BOWNE, Belleville.

ap3-12mo-eod

Burdock BLOOD BITTERS

REGULATES THE Bowels, Bile and Blood. CURES Constipation, Biliousness, all Blood Humors, Dyspepsia, Liver Complaint, Scrofula, and all Broken Down Conditions of the System.

WATFORD, ONT.

My daughter, after a severe attack of Scarlet Fever, was completely broken down. I spent hundreds of dollars in doctors' bills with but little satisfaction. Before she had taken one bottle of Burdock Blood Bitters there was a remarkable change, and now she is entirely cured. MRS. HOPPERTON.

HOTEL TO LEASE.

THE HOTEL AT COLWOOD TO LEASE for a term of years, with good will and fixtures; doing good business; good opportunity for the right kind of man. Apply to Archer H. Pratt, Colwood. m27-1m-dw