

The Colonist.

FRIDAY, AUGUST 25, 1893.

TAMPERING WITH THE SEWERS.

About a week ago we felt it our duty to call attention to an alleged proposition to permit the surface drains under construction to be used as sewers.

At the present moment the surface drain passing through the School Reserve, and which, under the contract, was to be connected with the surface drain on the west side of Cook street, has been directly connected with the Cook street sewer.

It would appear that this action can only have been taken with the object of obtaining either of the two following results:

1. To convert this drain into a sewer for the schools or other buildings.

2. To carry the surface water into the sewer instead of its proper channel.

With regard to both these points, if either of such courses is pursued the Council is guilty of a direct breach of faith with the ratepayers.

It is, as every one knows, certain that a large proportion of the silt held in suspension in the muddy water will, no matter what precautions in the way of strainers are taken, inevitably be deposited in the sewer. The effect of this will be to choke the sewer beyond the power of flushing to free.

Really the Council appear to be desirous of making the sewerage system a failure; the main tanks, which are a necessity, are ignored, and provision is made to deliberately introduce silt into the sewer.

We trust some member of the Council will at the next meeting ascertain by whose authority this action has been taken, as we are informed that it has been carried out without the knowledge and consent of the Sewerage Commissioners.

The whole case resolves itself into this: If the view street drain is a sewer, money has been appropriated which had been voted for another purpose, for its construction; if it is not a sewer, the Council have no right to connect it with the sewerage system.

HOW WILL IT WORK?

A good many who discuss the award of the Behring Sea arbitrators seem to forget that the Americans, as well as the British, are subject to its restrictions. Its first article will bear a good deal of study. Here it is:

Article 1.—The United States and Great Britain shall forbid their citizens and subjects, respectively, to kill, capture and pursue in any manner whatever, the animals commonly called fur seals within a zone of sixty miles around the Pribilof Islands, inclusive of the territorial water, the miles being geographical miles, sixty to a degree of latitude.

United States citizens include not only the sealers of San Francisco and other American seaports, but the members and servants of the Commercial Company. It is not, therefore, British Columbia sealers alone who are to be prevented from hunting seals within sixty miles of the Pribilof Islands, but American citizens of all classes and descriptions. Even the Indians are not excepted. According to clause 8, these are favored with certain exemptions, but it is expressly stated that the exemptions shall not extend to the waters of Behring Sea or the waters around the Aleutian Islands.

It will be observed, too, that the restrictions include the "territorial water," that is, the belt three miles wide around the islands, which is considered as much the territory of a country as the land itself. According to this article the servants of the Commercial Company and other United States citizens, whether they are white men or Indians, cannot "kill, capture and pursue," fur seals in the waters immediately surrounding the Pribilof Islands. The question arises, does this restriction extend to the land of those islands? Common sense says that it does. It would be folly to prevent American seal hunters coming nearer those islands than sixty miles to hunt seals, the hirelings of the Commercial Company are allowed to land on them for the purpose of driving them and clubbing them. Professor Elliott, when he was in Behring Sea, was horrified at the way in which the servants of that favored company treated the seals. They were driven over the land in the most barbarous manner, and so great was the injury done to the animals, that he attributed the decrease in their numbers which he had observed, to these horrible cruelties. Professor Elliott's Report, it is true, was excluded by the tactics of the American counsel as evidence, but the British lawyers were allowed to quote from it, a privilege of which they do not doubt availed themselves.

It is evident that it is the intention to make the Pribilof Islands and the sea surrounding them a preserve for the seals. They are not to be molested while there, by men of other nation. We are the more inclined to believe that the restriction extends to the land as well as the sea, as we observe in the abstract before us that "the arbitrators make certain suggestions to the two governments, the most important being that they should come to an understanding to prohibit the killing of seals on land or sea for a period of one to three years." This shows that in their opinion the preservation of the fur seal, which was evidently the sole object they had in view, required that they should be protected on land as well as on sea. But if the Commercial Company are permitted at any season of the year to make raids on the rookeries, and kill and mangle the seals all, the other precautions to save them from destruction are vain. To allow the Company this privilege would be to make the arbitration nothing more and nothing better than a means to secure to the Commercial Company increased profits. The arbitrators

will hardly be satisfied with themselves and their work if they find that, after all the thought they have given the subject and all the expense that both nations have been put to, they have been able to accomplish nothing more than this. This would be the old story of "a mountain in labor" with a vengeance.

It will be necessary for the legislatures of the two nations to enact the laws necessary to give effect to the provisions of the Award. When those laws or regulations are formed, it will be seen how the Award is interpreted by the two nations. We hardly think that Great Britain will acquiesce in a law or regulation which will make the work of the arbitration subservient to the interests of an American trading company.

THE REVERSE OF A FAULT.

The Vancouver News-Advertiser, in an article on the census and redistribution, evidently intended to be crushing, says that the Colonist has made no attempt "to palliate the Government's fault." This is quite true. And the reason is that the Government have not, in this matter, committed any fault. On the contrary, they have pursued the only course that was open to prudent men who were determined to deal with all parts of the Province fairly.

As soon as the Government examined the census returns, with a view to redistribute the representation of the Province, they were convinced that some mistake had been made, and that if the seats in the Legislature were apportioned in accordance with the census returns, great injustice would be done to some sections of the Province.

When they had good reason to believe that the officials in Ottawa had made a mistake, what ought they to have done? Should they proceed with the work of redistribution, taking for their basis the guesses of Mr. Brown or Mr. Cotton, or Mr. Somebody Else? Such a course would be so conspicuously unfair and in every way improper, that even those who might be benefited by it, would, in their hearts, condemn the Government for their recklessness and their injustice.

Those, again, who had reason to consider themselves injured by having a system of redistribution on conjecture, would have the best reason to condemn the Government for depriving them of privileges, on grounds that everyone could see were unreliable. A fault, and a very grievous fault, would have been committed if the Government had gone on with the work of redistribution, when they had good reason to believe that the figures of the census were incorrect, and the fault would have been much more grievous if they had accepted any one's conjectures as corrections of the authoritative returns.

The plain and honest course to take under such circumstances was to apply to the Ottawa authorities for more and better information. This the Government did. The reference has caused a little delay, but this is really no grievance at all, for the new redistribution bill will be ready before the term of the present House expires, and the next election will be held under its provisions. No one, except it may be a few political cranks, expected or wanted a general election before the present Assembly, through the efflux of time, died a natural death.

Our contemporary's bragging about the splendid position which the Independent camp, in view of their very poor performance as a party, appears very ridiculous. No set of men that were ambitious to be considered "a party" ever made so poor a showing as these same Independents. They had no acknowledged leader, they had no policy, and there was nothing like cohesion among them. The stand that some of them took in this matter of redistribution was neither politic nor reasonable. The conjectures they ventured about the population of the different sections of the Province were about as exact and as much a matter of rational calculation as the guesses which are made as to the number of beans in a glass jar.

MISCHIEVOUS PERVERSION.

The manner in which the City Council does its business is inexplicable. It does not compel those who live on streets provided with sewers to connect their houses with them, while, contrary to law, and in violation of its compact with the ratepayers, it converts surface drains into sewers. We are informed that some members of the Corporation, in an underhand way and without the knowledge of the City Council, have given residents on View street permission to connect their houses with the surface drain that runs along that street, and that they have also allowed that surface drain to be used as a sewer in connection with the Central School. Such a proceeding, besides being dishonest, is certain sooner or later to be productive of consequences most injurious to the citizens.

The City Council asked for leave to raise money to cut surface drains in different parts of the city. They obtained the leave they desired for the purpose specified, and for no other. The surface drains were to carry off the surface water. They were not to be sewers.

The City Council, at a very considerable expense, had a system of sewers laid out for the city on the separate principle. They were not intended to carry off the surface water. To use the sewers as surface drains would, in a short time, completely ruin them. They would be choked up by the silt contained in the water, and the choking of one sewer of the system would be certain to make many others worse than useless. There is nothing more dangerous to a neighborhood than a sewer choked by refuse. It is one of the worst disease breeders that can be imagined. The aldermen who have surreptitiously permitted the View street surface drain to be perverted into a sewer have done much to spoil both the drain and

the sewer. If the surface water from View street is allowed to run into the Cook street sewer, it must inevitably choke it sooner or later. The choking of View street sewer will cause sewer gas to accumulate in the pipes, and this escaping in the houses and elsewhere will spread disease in the localities connected with that sewer.

Then the View street surface drain, when it is used as a sewer, will also become a source of disease and unpleasantness.

When the Corporation allows householders living on streets in which there are sewers, to remain without connection with the sewers, it is lax and indulgent where it should be stringent and severe; and those who permit householders to connect their residences with the View street and other surface drains, prove that they possess neither principle nor intelligence. They, in effect, violate their own laws, they break faith with the rate-payers, and they act with a stupidity which is almost incomprehensible.

We do not wonder that men of intelligence and public spirit complain bitterly of the vagaries and blunders of the City Council. It is, they say, active in wrong directions, and where it should be prompt and energetic, it is dilatory and apathetic.

A FEW HINTS.

It would do Alderman Bragg no harm if the electors of the North Ward reminded him that they did not send him to the City Council to gratify his own whims or to vent his private spite on those whom he dislikes. It would be quite in order if they told him that they elected him to aid in doing the business of the city, and to look after the interests of the citizens. They might also try to show him that he is not doing their work or performing the duty of a city councillor when he prevents business being done because the other qualified members of the Council do not vote and speak in the way he approves. It may be hard to convince Alderman Bragg that the member of the Council who, merely because business cannot be done without him, leaves his place when he cannot have his own way, is neither doing his duty nor acting a manly part. He might be shown that if every other qualified member acted as he did at Monday night's meeting of Council, that body would become a nuisance, and would incur the contempt of every man of sense within the city's limits. It appears that Alderman Bragg is deaf to reason and argument, when the speaker is an ordinary citizen who votes in one of the wards which he does not represent. It might be different if the men who played him in the Council and who have the power to turn him out when voting day comes round, told him a little wholesome truth with respect to his position as a City Councillor and the duties he is expected to perform. He would, perhaps, accept suggestions from them which he would reject if offered by others.

We trust that the electors of the North Ward will give Alderman Bragg a little of the instruction he so badly needs. It would, in all probability, do him a world of good. He is their servant, and a little lecture from them might bring him to a sense of his duty, and might probably effect a reform that cannot be brought about by any other means.

A POINT SETTLED.

We trust that we have heard the last of the offensive nonsense about "poachers," as applied to British sealers in Behring Sea. The Award of the Arbitrators has settled once for all that Behring Sea is part of the ocean, which is free to all, and that after this the American caught sealing within the sixty-mile limit is quite as much a poacher as the venturesome "Britisher" who attempts to act in defiance of the Award to which his own Government is a party. It is now seen that the claim to exclusive jurisdiction over the waters of Behring Sea, set up by the Americans with such confidence, was without even the shadow of a foundation. The American counsel did not even seriously contend for it before the arbitrators. It follows then that the British sealers were never poachers.

A TALKING MATCH.

The Congress of the United States is just now deluged with talk. The speech-making in the House of Representatives is not at all properly called debate. Members deliver set speeches intended to be read by their constituents. For the most part they are essays which have no reference whatever to what has been said by preceding speakers. No one supposes for a moment that what is said will influence a single vote. Some, indeed, speak with almost the avowed purpose of killing time.

The country is looking on while Congress is pow-wowing with an impatience which many are at no pains to conceal. They want Congress to act and not to talk. The issue is an important one, and there is no time to be lost. "The time has gone by," the St. Paul Pioneer Press says, "for trifling and trimming. The day has passed when a man might please a few loud talkers by voting for silver coinage, and comfort his friends by assuring them that he was sound enough on the principle of money, but felt that he ought to make some little concession."

Everyone, both in and out of Congress, knows that the speech-making is for show only. Everything is settled in caucus, and those who are in the secrets of the different parties know how every member will vote. Predictions have been made by persons assuming to be well informed as to the comparative strength of the silver and the anti-silver parties in both branches of the legislature. It is said that of the eighty-five members of the Senate forty-four will vote for the unconstitutional repeal of the Sherman law. This gives forty-one against it. The majority of three seems to be a very narrow

one and leaves a good opportunity for the obstructive, who, it is said, are determined to do their best to delay the passage of the bill through the Senate.

In the House of Representatives it is predicted that if the Silver bill, which is for unconditional repeal, passes the danger point it will be carried with a majority of one hundred or more. The anti-silver party in the House of Representatives is composed of both Democrats and Republicans. It is readily conceded that the bill cannot pass without the help of the Republicans.

How long it will be before the question comes to a vote, it is impossible to say, but as the business men of the Union are in better heart than they were a week or two ago, it is only reasonable to presume that some influential men among them have had an assurance that the repeal bill is certain to pass before very long.

one and leaves a good opportunity for the obstructive, who, it is said, are determined to do their best to delay the passage of the bill through the Senate.

In the House of Representatives it is predicted that if the Silver bill, which is for unconditional repeal, passes the danger point it will be carried with a majority of one hundred or more. The anti-silver party in the House of Representatives is composed of both Democrats and Republicans. It is readily conceded that the bill cannot pass without the help of the Republicans.

How long it will be before the question comes to a vote, it is impossible to say, but as the business men of the Union are in better heart than they were a week or two ago, it is only reasonable to presume that some influential men among them have had an assurance that the repeal bill is certain to pass before very long.

THE FRENCH ELECTIONS.

Sunday's elections made it clear that the Republic is firmly established in France. The Imperialists have entirely disappeared and the Royalists are hardly known to exist. The people are, of course, divided as to the policy to be pursued by the Government and as to the men who shall have the management of their affairs; but as to the form of government they shall live under they are at last practically unanimous. The countenance given to the Republic by the Pope, no doubt, influenced many who had up to that time regarded in its favor, Republicanism as inimical to religion. This is, no doubt, why the reactionists fared so badly at the polls on Sunday. Boulangerism which, in spite of many scandals, kept dragging out a feeble existence, received its coup de grace at the hands of the people.

It will be seen, when the Chamber meets, whether the Dupuy Government has been strengthened or not. The people of France, in these days, take very little interest in political changes. They appear to think that one Government is as good, or as bad, as another, and consequently they hardly notice the downfall of a ministry, and they take but a very feeble interest in the one that takes its place. But France is, nevertheless, tolerably well governed. There is very little disorder in the country, and it is fairly prosperous.

THE REPEAL BILL.

The following is the text of the bill to repeal the Sherman law, reported by the majority of the Congressional committee. It bears internal evidence of being carefully drawn up. Although its object is to prevent the Government from purchasing silver, which it cannot use, it is, as the reader sees, very far from being a bill to condemn the use of silver as money.

That so much of the act approved July 14, 1890, entitled "An act directing the purchase of silver bullion and the issue of treasury notes, and for other purposes," as directs the Secretary of the Treasury to continue the purchase of time to time silver bullion to the aggregate amount of 4,500,000 ounces, or so much thereof as may be offered in each month, at the market price therefor, not exceeding \$1 for 371.25 grains pure silver, and to issue in payment for such purchases treasury notes of the United States, be and the same is hereby repealed. And it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money, and to coin both gold and silver into money of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value, such equality to be secured by the Secretary of the Treasury by and through international agreement, or by safeguards of legislation as will insure the maintenance of a parity in the value of coins of the two metals and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the markets and in the payment of debts. And it is hereby further declared that the efforts of the Government should be steadily directed to the establishment of such a safe system of bimetallic coinage as will maintain at all times the equal power of every dollar coined or issued by the United States in the markets and in the payment of debts.

A LITTLE TOO FAST.

The Times believes that the Americans are allowed by the Award of the Behring Sea arbitrators to kill seals on the Pribilof Islands. The reason it gives is that, "the United States would not for a moment think of consenting to the regulation of sealing on its territory being taken out of its own hands." But we see that it must consent to permit the regulation of sealing on part of its territory at any rate to pass out of its hands, for by Article 1, American citizens are not allowed "to kill, capture or pursue at any time, or in any manner whatever, the animals commonly called fur seals," in the territorial waters around those islands. Our contemporary knows that the three-mile limit belt is as much American territory as the soil and rocks it surrounds. There is no doubt that the regulation of the sealing in that part of its territory is taken by the Award out of the hands of the United States, and if in the part of its territory covered by water, why not in that part of it above high water mark? It remains to be seen whether any one, either American citizen or British subject, can, after the Award is ratified and goes into effect, go nearer the Pribilof Islands for the purpose of killing seals than the rim of the sixty-mile belt.

NILHILISM IN TROUBLE.

St. Petersburg, Aug. 22.—An alleged conspiracy has been discovered in Kharkov, capital of the government of that name, 420 miles southeast of Moscow. It is said that the object of the conspiracy was to bring about the separation of the Ukraine from Russia. The Ukraine was an old subdivision of Russia and southeast Poland, which now forms the governments of Kiev, Poltava and Kharkov. Twenty-six arrests have been made in connection with the conspiracy. One of the conspirators is Milla, Pulawski, who was employed as a governor.

The Syrian silk merchants exhibiting at the World's Fair will make a trial of California combs.

NEWS OF THE PROVINCE.

Captain Thain Gets a Threatening Letter—Westminster Public Schools Open.

Sockeyes Make Another Big Run in the Fraser—Interior News.

(Special to the Colonist.)

VANCOUVER, Aug. 21.—The report that W. England, foreman of the water supply of the G.P.R., was killed in England, is unfounded. John England, W. England's son, received a cable to-day: "Am all right. (Signed) W. England." Captain Murray Thain has received an anonymous letter which warns him if the removal of shakhtes is persisted in, his life and property are in danger. Captain Thain thinks it is a silly joke.

VANCOUVER, Aug. 22.—Pipes have arrived for a second water works main across the Narrows. No water now reaches the high parts of the city, and the pipe from the Narrows to the intake will soon have to be doubled in order to furnish all the water required for the city's ordinary consumption.

Sunday was full of boating accidents. Two young men upon the coasting schooner, the Knight, and they had to swim ashore. A man in swimming at English Bay became exhausted when beyond his depth, and with difficulty was rescued by Mr. J. O'Rourke. The Knights of Pythias held a moonlight excursion to-night.

On Sunday the steamer Comox started out with a pleasure party for Sechart Indian Mission, and landing a man at a ranch along the way, touched a rock and was obliged to lie there till midnight with a very disheartened party aboard.

McMillan & Hamilton, wholesale produce merchants, have given up their branch in Kailo, and Mr. Hamilton has returned.

The eight-year-old son of W. H. Irwin died on Sunday of lockjaw.

Rev. W. C. Weir, of the Baptist church, has resigned owing to some slight differences with a few of his congregation. Since he came three years ago the membership and the attendance at the Sunday school have tripled, while a mission church on Mount Pleasant has been established.

Mayor Cope, D. M. Guigan, T. F. M. Guigan, city clerk, and Captain Cope, have returned from a trip to Tacoma.

The steamer Marmaduke, which took a party of excursionists to Buanon Bay. This is a new pleasure ground, with one of the finest beaches within easy reach of the city.

Mr. W. G. McLaughlin, a New York newspaperman, is here, writing up his trip across Canada for the New York Advertiser.

Rev. A. H. Baldwin, of All Saints church, Toronto, left for the East to-day.

The first divorce case ever heard here came up in Chambers to-day before Mr. Justice Drake. The petitioner, John Bray, a mill hand, now residing in Victoria, stated in his affidavit that he married Annie Griffiths at St. Ann's church at Audsworth, London, England, on May 23, 1890.

In 1892, he ceased to live with her, she having confessed to adultery. His Lordship granted an order nisi to divorce the couple.

Mr. Justice Drake granted an order nisi to divorce the couple. The petitioner, John Bray, a mill hand, now residing in Victoria, stated in his affidavit that he married Annie Griffiths at St. Ann's church at Audsworth, London, England, on May 23, 1890.

In 1892, he ceased to live with her, she having confessed to adultery. His Lordship granted an order nisi to divorce the couple.

Mr. Justice Drake granted an order nisi to divorce the couple. The petitioner, John Bray, a mill hand, now residing in Victoria, stated in his affidavit that he married Annie Griffiths at St. Ann's church at Audsworth, London, England, on May 23, 1890.

In 1892, he ceased to live with her, she having confessed to adultery. His Lordship granted an order nisi to divorce the couple.

Mr. Justice Drake granted an order nisi to divorce the couple. The petitioner, John Bray, a mill hand, now residing in Victoria, stated in his affidavit that he married Annie Griffiths at St. Ann's church at Audsworth, London, England, on May 23, 1890.

In 1892, he ceased to live with her, she having confessed to adultery. His Lordship granted an order nisi to divorce the couple.

Mr. Justice Drake granted an order nisi to divorce the couple. The petitioner, John Bray, a mill hand, now residing in Victoria, stated in his affidavit that he married Annie Griffiths at St. Ann's church at Audsworth, London, England, on May 23, 1890.

In 1892, he ceased to live with her, she having confessed to adultery. His Lordship granted an order nisi to divorce the couple.

Mr. Justice Drake granted an order nisi to divorce the couple. The petitioner, John Bray, a mill hand, now residing in Victoria, stated in his affidavit that he married Annie Griffiths at St. Ann's church at Audsworth, London, England, on May 23, 1890.

In 1892, he ceased to live with her, she having confessed to adultery. His Lordship granted an order nisi to divorce the couple.

Mr. Justice Drake granted an order nisi to divorce the couple. The petitioner, John Bray, a mill hand, now residing in Victoria, stated in his affidavit that he married Annie Griffiths at St. Ann's church at Audsworth, London, England, on May 23, 1890.

In 1892, he ceased to live with her, she having confessed to adultery. His Lordship granted an order nisi to divorce the couple.

Mr. Justice Drake granted an order nisi to divorce the couple. The petitioner, John Bray, a mill hand, now residing in Victoria, stated in his affidavit that he married Annie Griffiths at St. Ann's church at Audsworth, London, England, on May 23, 1890.

In 1892, he ceased to live with her, she having confessed to adultery. His Lordship granted an order nisi to divorce the couple.

Mr. Justice Drake granted an order nisi to divorce the couple. The petitioner, John Bray, a mill hand, now residing in Victoria, stated in his affidavit that he married Annie Griffiths at St. Ann's church at Audsworth, London, England, on May 23, 1890.

In 1892, he ceased to live with her, she having confessed to adultery. His Lordship granted an order nisi to divorce the couple.

Mr. Justice Drake granted an order nisi to divorce the couple. The petitioner, John Bray, a mill hand, now residing in Victoria, stated in his affidavit that he married Annie Griffiths at St. Ann's church at Audsworth, London, England, on May 23, 1890.

In 1892, he ceased to live with her, she having confessed to adultery. His Lordship granted an order nisi to divorce the couple.

Mr. Justice Drake granted an order nisi to divorce the couple. The petitioner, John Bray, a mill hand, now residing in Victoria, stated in his affidavit that he married Annie Griffiths at St. Ann's church at Audsworth, London, England, on May 23, 1890.

In 1892, he ceased to live with her, she having confessed to adultery. His Lordship granted an order nisi to divorce the couple.

Mr. Justice Drake granted an order nisi to divorce the couple. The petitioner, John Bray, a mill hand, now residing in Victoria, stated in his affidavit that he married Annie Griffiths at St. Ann's church at Audsworth, London, England, on May 23, 1890.

In 1892, he ceased to live with her, she having confessed to adultery. His Lordship granted an order nisi to divorce the couple.

Mr. Justice Drake granted an order nisi to divorce the couple. The petitioner, John Bray, a mill hand, now residing in Victoria, stated in his affidavit that he married Annie Griffiths at St. Ann's church at Audsworth, London, England, on May 23, 1890.

discount United States treasury notes and silver certificates and United States National bank bills 1 per cent. and ready money.

Reports from the La Ral creek, in Trail Creek district, are encouraging. Drifts are being run east and west on the ledge from the 200-foot station; the east drift being in thirty-five feet and the west one about the same distance. Assays vary from \$56 in gold to \$45, \$55.50, \$60.10, \$37.20, \$72.30, \$99.11. The ore carries an average of 65 per cent. copper. There are now 1,500 tons on the dump, and 15,000 tons in sight. The mine is owned by a syndicate made up of Spokane lawyers, I. N. Peyton holding the controlling interest.

NANAIMO, Aug. 22.—At a meeting of temperance workers last evening an organization was formed to be known as the Nanaimo Gospel Temperance Union. Rev. Mr. Cairns was elected president, and Joseph McKenzie secretary.

Three Northfield men were fined \$50 each this morning for supplying liquor to Indians at Harrow Bay.

Permission has been granted to the promoters of the District Telegraph Co. to string wires through the streets for use of the new messenger service.

DUNCAN, Aug. 21.—Ashdown Green, J. C. Prevost and H. A. Morley, visited Duncan on Saturday.

B. W. Pease, returned on the stage Saturday from a fishing excursion to Cowichan lake, and went down to Victoria.

J. Jukes, J. A. T. Cato, Mrs. Cato and family are at the Quinlan hotel.

Dr. and Mrs. A. M. Watson, of Duncan, are paying a short visit to Nanaimo and Departure Bay.

W. McC. Hutchinson went up to Cowichan lake by this morning's stage.

McMillan & Hamilton, wholesale produce merchants, have given up their branch in Kailo, and Mr. Hamilton has returned.

The eight-year-old son of W. H. Irwin died on Sunday of lockjaw.

Rev. W. C. Weir, of the Baptist church, has resigned owing to some slight differences with a few of his congregation. Since he came three years ago the membership and the attendance at the Sunday school have tripled, while a mission church on Mount Pleasant has been established.

Mayor Cope, D. M. Guigan, T. F. M. Guigan, city clerk, and Captain Cope, have returned from a trip to Tacoma.

The steamer Marmaduke, which took a party of excursionists to Buanon Bay. This is a new pleasure ground, with one of the finest beaches within easy reach of the city.

Mr. W. G. McLaughlin, a New York newspaperman, is here, writing up his trip across Canada for the New York Advertiser.

Rev. A. H. Baldwin, of All Saints church, Toronto, left for the East to-day.

The first divorce case ever heard here came up in Chambers to-day before Mr. Justice Drake. The petitioner, John Bray, a mill hand, now residing in Victoria, stated in his affidavit that he married Annie Griffiths at St. Ann's church at Audsworth, London, England, on May 23, 1890.

In 1892, he ceased to live with her, she having confessed to adultery. His Lordship granted an order nisi to divorce the couple.

Mr. Justice Drake granted an order nisi to divorce the couple. The petitioner, John Bray, a mill hand, now residing in Victoria, stated in his affidavit that he married Annie Griffiths at St. Ann's church at Audsworth, London, England, on May 23, 1890.

In 1892, he ceased to live with her, she having confessed to adultery. His Lordship granted an order nisi to divorce the couple.

Mr. Justice Drake granted an order nisi to divorce the couple. The petitioner, John Bray, a mill hand, now residing in Victoria, stated in his affidavit that he married Annie Griffiths at St. Ann's church at Audsworth, London, England, on May 23, 1890.

In 1892, he ceased to live with her, she having confessed to adultery. His Lordship granted an order nisi to divorce the couple.

Mr. Justice Drake granted an order nisi to divorce the couple. The petitioner, John Bray, a mill hand, now residing in Victoria, stated in his affidavit that he married Annie Griffiths at St. Ann's church at Audsworth, London, England, on May 23, 1890.

In 1892, he ceased to live with her, she having confessed to adultery. His Lordship granted an order nisi to divorce the couple.

Mr. Justice Drake granted an order nisi to divorce the couple. The petitioner, John Bray, a mill hand, now residing in Victoria,