The Colonist.

FRIDAY, JUNE 6, 1890.

PUBLISHED EVERY DAY EXCEPT MONDAY BY

W. H. ELLIS. A. G. HARMON. } ELLIS & CO.

THE COLONIST BUILDING, GOVERNMENT ST.

TERMS:

THE DAILY COLONIST

Per Year (Postage free to any part of the Dominion or United States)..... $10 00
Per Month (If delivered)..... 1 00

THE WEEKLY COLONIST.

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY MORNING.

Per Year (Postage Free to any part of the Dominion or United States)..... $ 2 00
Six Months..... 1 00
Three Months..... 1 00

Subscriptions in all cases are payable strictly IN ADVANCE.

ADVERTISING RATES:

TRANSIENT ADVERTISING—Per line solid Nonpareil—First insertion, 10 cents; each subsequent consecutive insertion, 5 cents. Advertisements not inserted every day, 10 cents per line each insertion. No advertisement inserted for less than $1.00.

SPECIAL NOTICES—Nonpareil, in the first column of third page, 20 cents per line each insertion, or $1.00 per line per month. If inserted among local or other reading matter, 30 cents per line each insertion, or $2 per line per month.

Special notice inserted for less than $2. Each.

WEEKLY ADVERTISEMENTS—Ten cents a line solid Nonpareil, each insertion. No advertisement inserted for less than $2.

REGULAR COMMERCIAL ADVERTISEMENTS as distinguished from everything of a transitory character—that is to say, advertising referring to regular Mercantile and Manufacturing Business, Government and Land Notices published at the following rates: Per line, Solid Nonpareil, the duration of publication to be specified at the time of ordering advertisement:

More than one fortnight and not more than one month—40 cents.

More than one week and not more than one fortnight—40 cents.

Not more than one week—30 cents.

No advertisement under this classification inserted for less than $1.50, and accepted only for every-day insertion.

Theatrical advertisements, 10 cents per line each insertion.

Advertisements unaccompanied by specific instructions inserted till ordered out.

Advertisements discontinued before expiration of special period will be charged as if continued for full term.

Liberal allowance on yearly and half yearly contracts.

Where Cuts are inserted they must be ALL METAL—not mounted on Wood.

SINGLE TAX APPLIED.

A clear-headed correspondent of the Times, who had read the very full report which that paper published of the speeches of the single-tax advocates, and was no doubt disgusted with the candidates, Messrs. Beaven & Grant, who gave their assent to a scheme for robbing the owners of land of their property, writes as follows over the signature of "Resident":

"My case will serve as an illustration of the iniquitous character of the proposed single tax theory. Because of the natural beauty of Victoria and its delightful climate, which, without disrespect to Messrs. Jackson, West and others, have given a value to its land greatly in excess of their labor—in fact, nature, and not Messrs. Jackson, West & Company, have had all to do with it. I have come here to reside. I have paid $12,500 for land, which I have laid out in ornamental grounds, and have expended over $20,000 on a residence, the building of which has given employment to mechanics and others. You will see I have in this way been a benefit to the workingman and deserve fair treatment, but what Mr. West proposes is most unfair. I who brought money into the city and expended it to the advantage of mechanics and others, am to be taxed $1,000 per annum, and Mr. West, who brought only himself, and who has done nothing worth mentioning to build up Victoria, is not to be taxed at all, but is to have the benefit of government without contributing to the cost of it."

What the Times correspondent says is bad enough, but he does not expose the whole of this single tax iniquity. The single tax advocates propose to rob not only rich men like "Resident," who spends thousands of dollars every year in giving employment to working men and in making the city and province attractive to capitalists of other countries, but would despoil industrious and economical working men of the earnings of, it may be, half a life time of toil. There is John Brown, the carpenter. He came to this country without a dollar. He worked hard and lived frugally to save enough money to buy himself a snug lot in what was then the suburbs, but which is now well in the residential part of the city. That property is to-day worth twenty times more than he paid for it, and Brown feels comforted to think that, if anything should happen to him, his wife and children would be left in comfortable circumstances. But the single tax men say that he is a robber, and declare that when they get into power the land on which his cottage stands and his trees grow, shall be taxed at their full market value. What good will that land be to Mr. Brown or his children if the Single Tax Government puts a tax on it equal to the interest on its full market value? Who will buy property burdened with such a tax? "Ha! ha!" say the single tax advocates, among whom are Mr. Beaven and Mr. Grant, "that is just the state of things we are bound to bring about. We are determined that neither Brown nor his wife nor any of his children shall own a single foot of land in this city or anywhere else, and we intend to tax land in such a way that it cannot be bought and sold. Brown's house and fruit trees shall not be taxed, but Brown's land must be taxed for all that it is worth. The rent of it belongs to the State, and the State will have it no matter what becomes of Brown's wife and children or Brown himself in his old age." But Brown's cottage is old and is intrinsically worth very little, indeed. It is the land which, as things are now, that is valuable. "So much the worse for Brown" is all that the single-tax men have to say in reply. "Land shall be no longer private property; the rent it can bring belongs to the State."

This is how the single tax men will rob Brown and then treat in the same way Jones, Smith, Robertson, McDonald, Murphy and hundreds of honest saving workingmen who are in the same position. The single tax men would take from them all the land they own and give them—what? Any number of fine promises. When land is no longer private property they say this earth will be a kind of Heaven for the workingman. There will be no more poverty. Everybody will have everything that he or she needs. There will be no more oppressive governments, and grinding taskmasters will be banished from the earth. It seems to us that a sensible man who cares for his family wants something better than promises that may never be performed that, indeed, cannot be performed as long as human nature is as it is, for a bit of land and a cottage, worth, say, from five to ten thousand dollars.

Yet this robbing industrious, prudent men of the fruits of their toil and their self-denial is what Mr. Beaven calls "a reform" and what Mr. John Grant, in his gushing way, declares to be "a fair and equitable basis of taxation."

It may be said that these single-tax men will never be able to carry out their theory into practice. We must not be too sure of that. In these days, and in this country, these men have votes, and we see that politicians, who call themselves respectable, are ready to praise their scheme and to take credit to themselves for having done something towards embodying its principles in the law of the land. Mr. Beaven boasted that he had inserted the thin edge of the wedge, which when driven home would give the country the single-tax law. Mr. Grant said that the principle of single tax is just, and therefore, of course, ought to be adopted. Here we have two leading politicians in this province declaring in favor of single tax. It is not for us to enquire into their motives, but it is easy to see that the same influence which caused these men to favor single tax would induce them to vote for a single tax measure in the Legislature. The only safe way is to nip this form of socialism, and, as Mr. Gladstone called it, robbery, in the bud, and to say to the candidates who, in the Victoria theatre, declared themselves favorable to taking the land from its owners without compensation: "Gentlemen, we do not want you to represent us. We are honest men. We do not want to rob others, and we are determined not to be robbed ourselves." It was something like this that the workingmen of Melbourne said to Henry George himself when he paid them a visit not long ago.

DISQUALIFIED BY BEING ON TWO LISTS.

"Then it was placed there by the Government on purpose," was the remark made by Mr. Charles Wilson, when his attention was called at the nomination, on Friday last, to the fact of his name appearing on the voters' list for Cariboo, as well as on that for Victoria city. The remark certainly did not display any friendliness towards, or confidence in, the Government of which Mr. Wilson announces himself an independent supporter.

That Mr. Wilson's name appears upon two lists is a fact which any one may satisfy himself of, by perusing the respective rolls of voters for Cariboo and Victoria, and that the fact of his name being on two lists disqualifies Mr. Wilson from voting, and hence from being a candidate, is patent to any one who chooses to read the law.

Section 30 of the Constitution Act provides that no person shall be capable of being elected a member of the Legislature who shall not be *duly* entered on the register of electors for some electoral District of the Province. Now to become duly entered on a register of voters one must have sent in his claim to vote at least two months before the election (Pro. Voters' Act, Section 2), and, by section 10 of the same Act, no person whose name is on the Register of Voters for an Electoral District shall send in his claim to vote in any other Electoral District, until he shall have caused his name to be removed from such register. Mr. Wilson's name was on the register of Cariboo at the time he sent in his claim to vote in Victoria; such being the case he is not duly entered on the Victoria list, and he cannot be said to be duly entered on the Cariboo list because he has permitted his name to remain on the Victoria list.

In other words, by being entered on two lists, Mr. Wilson is not duly registered on any, and not being duly registered on any voters' list he is not qualified to be a candidate.

It is well that the matter ends thus, as the possible effect of having a fifth candidate, ostensibly in the Government interest, but in reality, and secretly, a decided opponent, might be to distribute and weaken the Government vote. If Mr. Wilson were not an opponent, if there was a spark of reality in his professed friendship for the Government, he would never have placed himself in the position of, by any possibility, doing harm to the cause he professes to espouse.

As it is, we understand that Mr. Wilson has taken a declaration before the Returning Officer that he is duly qualified to be a candidate. The law seems to constitute this declaration sufficient warrant to the Returning Officer to allow the person making it to go to the polls, taking upon himself the entire responsibility of his statement; but it is also perfectly clear that, even if he were elected, the election would afterwards be declared null and void. The same point was practically decided eight years ago in the case of the Esquimalt election petition, when Mr. Hett was unseated by the Supreme Court on account of some of the persons voting for him being on two lists.

If, therefore, Mr. Wilson insists on going to the polls, it is quite clear that all votes cast for him will be thrown away.

MR. GRANT'S DENIAL.

Mr. John Grant, in terms as offensive as he could make them, denies that he ever called the principle of taking men's property from them without giving them anything for it, a just and honest principle. This is the paragraph in which the sentence, the truth of which Mr. Grant denies with such violence, occurs:

Henry George's theory is therefore nothing more nor less than a scheme of wholesale robbery. To take from men their land without giving them a cent by way of compensation, is what Mr. Beaven calls "a reform," and to stigmatize the ownership of land as "robbery," is what he denominates "truth." The principle of taking men's property from them without giving them anything for it, is what Mr. Grant calls "a just and honest principle."

Our readers will be able to see what Mr. Grant's most vehement denials are worth, when they read the following extracts from the speech which he delivered in Victoria Theatre on Friday night last. After the advocates of single tax had spoken, Mr. Grant, as reported in the Times, said:

"He had listened to what had been said this evening with a great deal of satisfaction. For his own part he had taken the paper dealing with this particular principle—single tax—for some years, and as far as the multiplicity of his duties would permit had endeavored to post himself concerning it. The principle of single tax to his mind suggested a fair and equitable basis of taxation, and to bring it into practical use it would no doubt remove many of the existing abuses under the present systems."

The concluding sentence of the Times' report is as follows:—

"In concluding he repeated that he considered that the single tax contained a just principle, and the question now was how could it be fairly and equitably brought about."

THE COLONIST's report of Mr. Grant's speech is not nearly so full as that of the Times, but is the same in substance. The first sentence is as follows: "The principle could not be denied as being a just and honest one, but the question was how it was to be brought about on a fair and equitable basis." It would be difficult to find a more complete assent to the single tax doctrine than that given to it at the meeting on Friday night by Mr. John Grant. What the doctrines are which he endorsed so heartily may be seen in the speeches made by the single tax advocates, and in the extracts which we have given from Henry George's works.

THE ORGAN'S EXPLANATION.

The Times accuses us of having misapplied the quotations which we made from Mr. Beaven's speech at the single-tax meeting. We do not want to do Mr. Beaven an injustice. We must say that we read his speech with the greatest surprise, and we submit that no man of intelligence can read that speech in connection with the speeches that preceded it without coming to the conclusion that Mr. Beaven gave emphatic assent to the doctrines of taxation promulgated by Henry George.

The chairman, Mr. J. L. Reid, recommended the doctrines of Henry George to the meeting, and stated that the abolition of private property in land was the main feature of George's system. He said:—

"Readers of the daily papers know that labor uprisings are threatened at all times in European countries. What was the reason for this? The single tax men claim that PRIVATE OWNERSHIP OF LANDS is the prime cause of this state of affairs. * * * The Henry George theory was the only sensible theory that had been offered. It had been said if personal ownership of land was not allowed, no improvements would be made, but this would be contradicted by turning to large blocks in this city built by parties who did not own the land absolutely."

Mr. Jackson moved the following resolution:

"Resolved, That we, a portion of the electors of the city of Victoria, in mass meeting assembled, demand from those who seek our support that they pledge themselves to use their influence in securing legislation based on the principles of single tax, AS SET FORTH IN THE WORKS OF HENRY GEORGE."

Mr. Jackson, too, expounded the Georgian doctrine at considerable length, and gave an example of what was meant by single tax. We have quoted it before, but it will bear a second citation. It was this:

"Down by the old French hotel is a lot, an eyesore and a nuisance to the community. Now, if this lot were worth $10,000 as it stands, we would put a tax of whatever was the current rate of interest upon its full value of $10,000. If the owner chose to erect a building on it, no matter what its value, his tax would not be increased by five cents."

Mr. Byron H. West was the next expounder of Henry George's doctrine of single tax. Among other things he said:

"The people should demand their rights, and should see that an aspirant for political honors was elected who would go THE FARTHEST TOWARD THE SINGLE TAX SYSTEM irrespective of party or politics. They were not present to say bad things of landowners, but the land question should be discussed on its merits. First the, land was the prime source of all supply and should be free to those who would till it. As it now stood the holder of the land could state his price, and the would-be tiller of the soil had to pay the price or starve. * * * The precepts of Henry George were becoming known, and his teachings were becoming studied to the good of mankind. Those candidates for the suffrages of the people should study the theory and practise it, and the electors should demand something from the candidates besides courtesy before the elections and contempt afterwards."

Mr. Bragg, the last of the single tax workingmen who spoke, said in the course of his remarks:

"Many were opposed to the single tax because they said Henry George would turn things upside down. He claimed that he would turn things right side up. Henry George proposed improved systems of government."

It would be an insult to Mr. Beaven's intelligence to assume that he did not understand the drift of the speeches of the single tax advocates. We do not think so meanly of Mr. Beaven's understanding as to suppose that he could listen to the speeches of these gentlemen and not know precisely what they advocated. The object of these disciples of Henry George is conspicuous in the speeches as reported in the Times, it would be still more easily seen in the speeches, of which the report is a condensation.

Having heard the speeches of the single tax advocates, as delivered, what does Mr. Beaven say? He complimented the speakers and told them they had handled the question well. What question? Only one question had been discussed, and that was the question of single tax. But Mr. Beaven went further than merely complimenting the speakers. He said that "he had been impressed with the truths of what had been expounded." He went even further than this; he claimed credit for having introduced legislation in accordance with the principle advocated by the speakers, and held out to them the hope that the "reform" they sought would, in time, be obtained. These are his words as reported in the Times:

"Without egotism, he would review some of his work. In the matter of municipal taxation, he had, many years ago, before a general municipal act had been the law, brought in such a measure, one object of which was to change the municipal taxation. He could never see why a man who had a three-storey house on a lot should be taxed more than his neighbor, who had only a one-storey building. He could not see why improvements should be taxed as high as the land. The proposition was met in the House with disfavor, and he was forced to abandon it. He believed he was right, but at that period he was ahead of the times. Lately a different feeling had obtained, and last session he had brought in a bill which gave powers to the municipalities to make a distinction for the purposes of taxation, between improvements and the land itself. This bill had become law, and now improvements could be taxed 50 per cent. less than the land. THIS, AS HE NOW LEARNT, WAS A STEP IN THE DIRECTION OF THE SINGLE TAX, ALTHOUGH HE WAS NOT AWARE OF IT AT THE TIME, AND THUS, BY ENTERING ONE THIN EDGE OF THE WEDGE, THE FULL RESULT WOULD IN TIME BE ASSURED. PUBLIC OPINION HAD TO BE EDUCATED UP TO THESE REFORMS, AND NO GREAT SWEEPING MEASURES COULD BE MADE IN ADVANCE OF PUBLIC OPINION."

Were not the single taxmen warranted in concluding, after they had heard this declaration from the Hon. Mr. Beaven that they could count upon the leader of the Opposition as an advocate of the doctrines of Henry George? Can it be said, with any appearance of truth, that his remarks had reference only to "the principle of relieving improvements made upon land from a large proportion of the taxation." Mr. Beaven himself said the bill he had brought in was "a step in the direction of the single tax," that it was "the thin edge of the wedge," and that "the full result would in time be assured." What did he mean by the "full result"? Undoubtedly the triumph of the doctrines of Henry George in the direction of which his bill was a step. Would a man, we ask, who was opposed to the single tax and the nationalization of land speak of such measures as "these reforms"? Would, indeed, a man who was opposed to Henry George's doctrine, after he heard the resolution read and the speeches of the men who supported it, take any part in the meeting unless it were to show those who attended it what Henry George's doctrine really is, and warn them against having anything to do with a system the main feature of which is the spoliation of all who own land, no matter what use it is put to or how it was obtained?

But the Hon. Robert Beaven, the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, uttered no protest against this scheme of public plunder. He did not even remonstrate. On the contrary, he flattered the men who spoke in favor of George's theories, and claimed credit for having done something towards having reduced those theories to practice. In view of these facts, every one must see that the Times' explanation is most unsatisfactory.

TRADING UPON DISTRESS.

Those who, last winter, read the accounts of the distress in Nicola could not but feel for the unfortunate people who, through no fault of their own, were reduced to such straits. When the Legislature voted a sum of money for the relief of the unfortunate settlers, every feeling person in the province was pleased. It was universally considered that the Government had done its duty. But there is everywhere some spiteful, ill-conditioned cur, who is ready to misrepresent his neighbors, let their condition be what it may. That there is at least one of these in Nicola we have the best reason to know. If this envious creature could prevent relief being sent to his suffering neighbors he would not hesitate to misrepresent their condition and, since the Government has done what it could to mitigate the sufferings of the poor inhabitants of Nicola Valley and shorten the period of their distress, he does not scruple to lie about them in order to manufacture political capital against the Government because it had done what humanity dictated. We are a little surprised that the Opposition, badly as it is off for ammunition would utilize, for that purpose, the falsehoods and the misrepresentations of the Nicola slanderer. Even if the Government has been, by one or two unprincipled individuals, deceived and had given aid to persons that did not need it, it is not to be blamed. This always happens when distress is relieved, whether by Governments or individuals. But are the charitable and the humane to refuse to succor those who are afflicted, merely because there may be among the applicants for help one or two impostors? In a matter of that kind we agree with those who hold that it is far better to run the risk of being imposed upon than to allow those who are in real distress to go unrelieved. We do not know whether there were any cases of imposition in Nicola or not. It would be surprising if some mean sneak who possessed ample means did not make "a poor mouth," and succeed in obtaining part of what was intended for those who are needy; but we are satisfied that help was wanted in Nicola, and that the aid which the Government sent them has succored despairing settlers, who felt that they were ready to perish, and lightened many care-burdened hearts. The politicians of the Opposition must, indeed, be badly off for a grievance against the Government when they try to make the people believe that its attempt to minister to the wants of the suffering settlers in the Nicola Valley is a crime. We think that we could give the Times the first letters of its Nicola correspondent's name.

EDITORIAL COMMENT.

THE Organ has given up laying down the law about the remission of the $105 tax. Has it found out at last that it knows even less about law than it does about politics, or has it seen that in face of the opinion of the Attorney-General and the President of the Council it is folly to attempt to make mischief among the miners?

HEAVEN AND GRANT'S PRINCIPLES.

Mr. Beaven, on Friday night, commended as a reform the theory of single-tax advocated by the speakers who had preceded him. He declared, too, that he had been impressed by the "truths" that had been expounded. What are these truths, and what is this reform?

The chairman, in his address, said that the Henry George theory was the only sensible theory that had been offered. He said, too, that the private ownership of lands is the prime cause of the evils with which society is at present affected. Henry George himself, whose scheme of single-tax was adopted by Mr. Beaven, and pronounced honest and just by Mr. Grant, says in his work, "Progress and Poverty:"

"The examination through which we have passed has proved conclusively that private property in land cannot be justified on the ground of utility—that, on the contrary, it is the great cause to which are to be traced the poverty and misery and degradation, the social disease and the political weakness which are showing themselves so menacingly amid advancing civilization. EXPEDIENCY, therefore, JOINS JUSTICE IN DEMANDING THAT WE ABOLISH IT."

This then is the "reform." Private property in land is to be abolished; no man, rich or poor, shall, if these single-tax men can get their way, own one foot of land for any purpose whatever. It must all belong to the state. And how is the state to get it? it may be asked. "The people own it already," say Henry George and his disciples, among whom is the Hon. Robert Beaven, "and all they have to do is to take possession of their own." But, how are the present owners to be compensated? Henry George laughs at the idea of compensating the owners, and his disciples laugh in chorus. The way the state is to take possession of the land is very clearly set forth by one of the speakers whom Mr. Beaven warmly praised for the truths he had expounded. The illustration is well worthy the attention of all who want to know what this doctrine of single tax means.

"Down by the old French hotel," said Mr. Jackson, "is a lot, an eyesore and a nuisance to the community. Now, if this lot were worth $10,000 as it stands, we would put a tax of whatever was the current rate of interest upon its full value of $10,000. If the owner chose to erect a building on it, no matter what its value, his tax would not be increased five cents."

Assuming that the current rate of interest is eight per cent., the owner of that land would have to pay a tax on it of $800 a year. And that not for one year but for all time. In that case who would be the owner of the land—the man who bought and paid for it or the state which appropriated to its own use the whole of the rent that it could be made to pay? And, according to Henry George, this process of appropriating the rent of the land would be applied not to a vacant lot in a street only, but to all land no matter where it is situated or for what purpose it might be used. The farmer could not call the land he tilled his own any more than could the owner of town lots. It would be all confiscated to the state and the owner would not get a single cent of compensation. This is the Henry George theory.

This is what he says:—

"If the land of any country belong to the people of that country, what right, in morality and justice, have the individuals called land owners to the rent? If the land belong to the people, why in the name of morality and justice should the people pay its salable value for their own."

He asserts that the private ownership of land is robbery, and then goes on to say:—

"Why should we hesitate about making short work of such a system. Because I was robbed yesterday, and the day before and the day before that is it any reason that I should suffer myself to be robbed to-day and to-morrow? any reason that I should conclude that the robber has acquired a vested right to rob me?"

This is how Henry George justifies the state in taking from those who have invested their earnings in land, their property, without paying for it one single cent. The reader can see that confiscating the rent of land is precisely the same as confiscating the land itself. What would be the difference between taking from a man his money and taking from him all that it could possibly bring him in by way of interest? If a man is made to pay to the Government every year in the shape of a tax, the interest on the market value of his lands, why should he be called its owner? The absurdity of this is seen and commented upon by Henry George.

Henry George's theory is therefore nothing more nor less than a scheme of wholesale robbery. To take from men their land without giving them a cent by way of compensation, is what Mr. Beaven calls "a reform," and to stigmatize the ownership of land as "robbery," is what he denominates "truth." The principle of taking men's property from them without giving them anything for it, is what Mr. Grant calls "a just and honest principle."

We are not misrepresenting the theory advocated by the single tax men whom Mr. Beaven praised, and whose work, he said, he had already commenced to do. He had entered "the thin edge of the wedge." These single tax men, to a man, call Henry George master. They did so in the resolution passed unanimously at the meeting which Mr. Beaven and Mr. Grant attended, and at which they gave the doctrines of the single-tax men their hearty assent. Mr. Gladstone pronounced the scheme folly or robbery, but Mr. Beaven declares it to be "a reform" and Mr. John Grant says it is "just and honest."

Do the electors of Victoria consider the owner of land, whether he is a mechanic who possesses a lot for house and garden or the proprietor of a ranche of ten thousand acres, a robber? Are the men who believe one kind of property, robbery very far removed in principle from the men who denounce property of every kind as robbery?

Children Cry for Pitcher's Castoria.

ANOTHER AUTHORITY.

Our readers will see in another column the opinion of the Hon. A. N. Richards on the constitutionality of the remission by the Lieut.-Governor of the $105 tax on miners. We recommend the legal adviser of the Times to study it carefully. It may just be possible that it may dawn upon him that he has not yet mastered quite all that is to be known about law, and that some respect must be shown for the opinion of a gentleman who is admitted to be as able to give as sound legal advice as any lawyer in the country. He, no doubt, believes that he can safely scoff at the decision arrived at by the Attorney-General. He has only to call him "Theo" to satisfy himself and the little clique of which he is the oracle that no attention ought to be paid to anything he says on any subject. "Theo" is an argument that is manifestly unanswerable. He may, too, make light of the fact that the Hon. Mr. Pooley agrees with the Attorney-General. But when he finds that the learned and respected Mr. Richard's opinion coincides with that of the two legal gentlemen who have seats in the Cabinet he may come to the conclusion that it will be useless to continue his attempt to convince the people of the province that the Government has no power to omit the tax. It is within the bounds of possibility that he may begin to suspect that in confidently declaring that the $105 was not a tax at all, he has, in the opinion of everyone capable of forming an opinion on the subject, been making a fool of himself. If he could at last be brought to see himself as others see him, he might be saved from making a pitiful exhibition of himself in the future.

STATE LANDLORDISM.

The Times is just now very sweet on the workingman. It would have the electors believe that the workingman is in favor of the single-tax fraud. If it really thinks so it is greatly mistaken. The great body of working men in town and country know their own interest too well to favor a scheme which would prevent a workingman getting a lot of his own, and which would take from those workingmen who by hard work and constant saving were able to buy a piece of land, the property that had cost them so much. There are men calling themselves single tax men who keep this feature of Henry George's scheme carefully out of sight. They do not tell the workingmen that under that system they can never own the smallest patch of land, and that before it goes into operation every foot of land the workingmen own will be taken from them, without their getting a single dollar in payment. Under that system workingmen will be the tenants of the Government, liable to be turned out at any moment if they fail to pay their rent punctually. There will not then be such a thing as a freeholder in all the land. Every man who occupies land in the country where the single tax system prevails will be the tenant of the Government. How would the workingmen like to have the Government for a landlord? The Times and the single tax speakers are not honest enough to tell the workingmen the truth. George's system would, we are satisfied, be found to be, by the workingmen, worse than Irish landlordism.

THE ORGAN'S CONFESSION.

The Times is obliged to admit that the Opposition has been wanting in energy. It will have also to allow that it is deficient in intelligence. It says that the Government has made mistakes, and instances the Redistribution Act and the Mineral Act. Were the Opposition wide awake when these measures were passing through the Legislature?

We do not admit that the Redistribution scheme is a mistake. We regard it as the very opposite. We consider that it was the best measure that the Government could devise as matters are at present. The Opposition evidently thought so too, for it opposed it in a perfunctory way and was altogether unable to suggest anything better. By the way, is it not pretty nearly time that Mr. Grant showed his hand? Every one remembers his famous proposal to give three additional members to the Mainland, and his oracular response when he was asked to tell the House the changes he, in that case, would make on the Island. He looked very wise in order to lead people to believe that he had devised a wonderful scheme of representation, for which the three additional members for the Mainland constituencies were only a part. He was mysterious then. He is mysterious still. He has not yet explained the cause of his extreme generosity to the Mainland. Was his liberality a mere electioneering dodge, intended to strengthen the enemies of the Island on the Mainland? It looks very much like it. He saw that sectionalism was rampant on the other side of the Gulf, and his suggestion was intended to make it a good deal fiercer. Was that his "hand"? Was there anything in it for Victoria? This is an instance of the kind of opposition which is very properly called factious. Mr. Grant opposed the Government's scheme; but had nothing to offer in its place. What he did do was to try to make mischief on the Mainland, by endeavoring to lead the inhabitants of the Lower Fraser to believe that they had been badly treated. He said they ought to have three more members than were allotted to them by the Government; but of the scheme of which these additional members for the Mainland were a part he had not a word to say. Why not? Simply because there was no scheme. The Opposition has no reason to be proud of the part it played when the Redistribution bill was before the Assembly. One intelligent and energetic member could have done far more than the whole six.

With respect to the Mineral Act there was a mistake. Did the Opposition see that the Government had committed a blunder? Not they. They were dozing as usual. They permitted the $105 clause to pass without a word of objection. They did not see that there was anything wrong in the measure. And now, when the mistake has been discovered by the Kootenay miners and corrected by the Government, they assume an air of superiority and severely censure the Government. The course pursued by the Opposition in this Mineral Act business is not creditable to them. They were too sleepy or too stupid to see how the law would work, when it was passing through the legislature, and then, when the mistake that had been made was corrected, their organ does its little best to make the miners believe that the Government does not possess the power to set the matter right. It was first blind and dull, and afterwards factious.

AN OUTSPOKEN PLUNDERER.

There is one thing about Henry George that we admire. He is plain-spoken. He does not beat about the bush, as many of his followers do, and try to conceal his real intentions. He writes a style which is beautifully clear. Here is an example. He is discussing the claim of land owners to compensation:—

"The Anti-Slavery movement in the United States commenced with talk of compensating owners, but, when four million of slaves were emancipated, the owners got no compensation, nor did they clamor for any. And by the time the people of any such country as England or the United States are sufficiently aroused to the injustice and disadvantages of individual ownership of land to induce them to attempt its nationalization, they will be sufficiently aroused to nationalize it in a much more direct and easy way than by purchase. They will not trouble themselves about compensating the proprietors of land."

Proprietors of land who read this must see what is in store for them in any place in which the disciples of Henry George are elected to make the laws. They will, whether the tracts they hold are large or small, be deprived of them without compensation. The Georgeites look upon the man who owns land in the same light as the abolitionists did the man who owned slaves. It is no wonder then that they advocate its being taken from them by force.

Here is another paragraph from "Progress and Poverty" equally clear:

"If the land belong to the people why continue to permit the landowner to take the rent, or compensate them in any manner for loss of rent. Consider what rent is. It does not arise spontaneously from land; it is due to nothing that the landholders have done. It represents value created by the whole community. Let the landholders have, if you please, all the possession of the land would give them in the absence of the rest of the community. But rent, the creation of the whole community, necessarily belongs to the whole community."

Mr. John Grant says that the principle here enunciated is fair and equitable, and Mr. Beaven calls the policy which would take from the owner the rent of the land he had bought and paid for, a "reform."

AWAKENED.

The Columbian is very angry at THE COLONIST, and scolds us with considerable vigor. We are rather pleased to see that we have roused our sleepy contemporary. It is encouraging to see it exhibiting some signs of life. It ought to know that it is necessary, at times, to use words that are not complimentary. When a newspaper does what is shabby and mean and inconsistent, it cannot expect to be noticed by its contemporaries in eulogistic terms. The sudden and complete somersault which the Columbian has turned, and the malignant way in which it speaks of the Government that, but the other day, it supported and the men it praised, cannot raise it in the respect of those who witness its strange and unsightly vagaries. When it comes to think the matter over, it will see that when we noticed its extraordinary conduct and its bitter denunciation of those whom, until very lately, it admired, we were obliged to use a few terms not calculated to raise it in its own esteem. It is necessary at times, our contemporary must admit, to call a spade a spade. This is what we did in the article it finds so much fault with. When it changes its course, and when a different class of epithets will be required to characterize its doings, we will only be too happy to use them.

THE JUBILEE HOSPITAL.

The inhabitants are to be congratulated on the completion of the Provincial Jubilee Hospital. The institution is in every respect most creditable to the Province. A much larger city than Victoria and a greatly more populous province than British Columbia, might be justly proud of so fine an institution. It is built wholly out of resources within the Province, and will, for generations to come, be pointed to as fitly commemorating the fiftieth year of the reign of the best of England's Queens. The credit of suggesting that British Columbia's monument in honor of the Jubilee year, take the shape of a hospital, is due to Mr. William M. Chudley. The suggestion was enthusiastically adopted by many who saw that a charitable institution whose object it is to alleviate suffering and to bring back to health persons suffering from disease or from the effects of accidents, would be as appropriate a memorial as the loyal subjects of Queen Victoria in this Province could erect.

Having once decided what was to be done, the work went on apace. The Provincial Legislature contributed twenty thousand dollars to the Jubilee Hospital fund on condition that a like sum would be given by private subscriptions. That sum, and more, was collected by diligent and philanthropic persons. For so small and so scattered a community the number and the largeness of the contributions were surprising. A beautiful and very suitable site was, after some discussion, selected and the erection of a hospital on the plan approved by the most advanced medical men of the day was commenced.

Before the project had arrived at this stage much work had been done. The late Alex. McLean, Esq., was elected chairman of the managing committee. Although he and the other members of the committee did their duty diligently and carefully by far the greater part of the labor and nearly all the responsibility fell to the share of Mr. Chudley. That gentleman worked zealously and perseveringly. Difficulties and discouragements seemed only to increase his ardor. He was incessant in his exertions and gave to the work all the time he could spare. If he only met with a fair measure of success, he seemed to think nothing of the sacrifice he was making. And he did succeed. Difficulties disappeared before his persistent energy, and that the hospital is now finished and in working order is chiefly due to the strenuous and untiring effort of the public-spirited and self-sacrificing Secretary.

After the work of building the public hospital had once fairly commenced, everything went on like clockwork, under Mr. Teague, the architect. There was not a hitch in the work. Everything was done according to specifications and there is not one dollar to pay for extras.

The hospital will be well and substantially furnished. It is to have everything that such an institution requires, both for the comfort and the treatment of the patients.

Great care is being taken in the selection of the staff. The directors are determined that it shall, from the house surgeon to the humblest attendant, be efficient. If they can help it the inmates of the hospital, whether poor or rich, will never have reason to complain either of neglect or unskilful treatment. Their object is to make the Provincial Jubilee Hospital a model institution of its kind, and we have no doubt that a sympathetic public will liberally aid them in their efforts to make the hospital worthy of the name it bears and the purpose for which it was designed.

CATTLE RAISING.

What is Destined to be Another Great Industry of British Columbia.

A gentleman largely interested in the cattle business, yesterday morning, said to a COLONIST reporter that the present was the best time at which the cattle industry could be successfully inaugurated in British Columbia. The duties on cattle and sheep, and on fresh and salt meats, had placed every advantage in the way of our people and they ought not to hesitate to take hold of them. If the lands of British Columbia were only as well utilized as those of the State of Oregon, there would be no need to bring either beef or mutton from the other side the line. In British Columbia the winters were no more severe than those of Oregon and here with over twenty five years' experience, he was in a position to assert that no cattle had ever been lost through the severity of the weather, the mortality having been altogether due to neglect and insufficient feeding. It was true that many of the nearest and most desirable sections for grazing purposes had been taken up, but there was still a great deal of eligible territory in the Chilcoten country and at Stewart's River, which was a great grass country, and by the building of sheds and the gathering of hay the industry might be made most remunerative. The same remarks might be made of the Horsefly district. Besides, there was a considerable amount of land already occupied, but from which, for lack of capital, the best results were not obtained. He spoke of the great Harper Estate as being capable of the most successful utilization in this way, remarking that the Douglas Syndicate ought to be able to do a great deal in the shape of cattle raising. Considerable sums of money would have to be expended in fencing, ditching and irrigation, and were these works properly prosecuted, he considered there was quite as much money to be made, if not more, than in real estate investments. Were separate ranges established sheep and hogs might be made to go together, while others could be devoted to cattle and horses. With proper management—he meant good feeding and attention—these enterprises might a on be made among the most important in the province and therefore the attention of capitalis a ought to be directed to them.

ESCAPED FROM SIBERIA.

An Exile's Story of Hardship and Suffering—How He Escaped After Eleven Years.

OTTAWA, June 3.—Felix Brant, a Siberian exile who escaped to Canada, is being made a lion of throughout the Dominion. He says his first arrest resulted from a letter sent to a student who had been arrested and searched. He was 21 years old at the time and was charged with inciting students, when, as a matter of fact, he had used all his efforts to show them the uselessness of their proposed plans. He dared not urge this fact, however, or he would have been called upon to give the names of the students. He was finally taken from Moscow to St. Petersburg and again placed in a solitary cell. At the end of two and a half years he was brought to trial and acquitted. His health was completely shattered.

In Odessa he became a member of a secret society for the purpose of bettering the condition of the people. For the third time he was arrested and sent to Moscow, and he was refused books or papers and had nothing to divert his mind, and he became deaf in the dirty prisons at that place, and when finally transferred to St. Petersburg could not hear the knocks of his fellow-prisoners, which before had done so much to while away his time. He spent a whole year in this way, and when he saw his mother it was with difficulty he could think of words to speak to her. Then he began to fight for reason, and the expedient he adopted was of composing a poem and memorizing the lines, having nothing to write with. He waited three years for his indictment. Finally he was brought to trial with 197 others, and was released. As an evidence of the terrible condition they were in, no less than five died during the hearing. They had no jury.

Securing a three months' passport to go anywhere in Siberia, save to places from which he had been expelled, he started on his journey. He reached a Siberian port on the Pacific, found an English steamer, and asked the captain to take him to Japan without a passport. The captain hesitated, and Brant told him his whole story, whereupon the captain promised to take him. Altogether Brant spent seven years in solitary confinement, and his exile in Siberia lasted for eleven years.

Important Negro Conference.

ROSNDOUT, N. Y., June 3.—Ex-President Hayes and daughter reached here this afternoon, en route for Lake Mohawk Mountain House, where he will preside at the negro conference to be held there to-morrow. The conference will be in session three days. It is the first gathering of the kind ever held, and has for its object the education and christinizing of colored men. Scores of college presidents, professors and prominent personages from all parts of the country are expected to be present.