Martin's Day Of Reckoning.

Ex-Attorney General Declares Implacable Feud and Macpherson His Ally.

Will Use Every Means to Hurl from Power Recent Provincial Colleagues.

From the Vancouver News-Advertiser.

Mr. Joseph Martin, M. P. P., last night invited "his supporters" to attend a public meeting in the city hall "for the purpose of discussing the present political situation." The hall was fairly well filled when Mr. A. M. Tyson took the chair and Messrs. John Towers and G. F. Cane seated themselves in the wings. Later the hall was crowded to the doors.

The Chairman, in introducing Mr. Martin, said the latter had some statements to make regarding "things that have occurred."

Mr. Martin began his address as follows: "Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: As you are aware, several things have occurred since the last general election took place about a year and a half ago, in connection with the party to which I belong, and which was victorious at the polls, and it occurred to me that, as the house was about to meet, it was a proper thing that I should ask my constituents to hear what views I have with regard to the present situation in connection with those events. * * * I may say that I thought it advisable to ask Mr. Carter-Cotton, who is one of the members for this city, and who is a member of the government—and in connection with whose action my remarks to-night will necessarily deal considerably—I say that I thought it advisable to ask him to appear here to-night in order that I might say before his face what I have to in regard to him, and in order that he might have the opportunity, if he desired, of answering or making any explanations." Mr. Martin went on to say that in his letter to Mr. Carter-Cotton he said his remarks would refer particularly to two subjects—"first in connection with the government's action with regard to the construction of a mill on Deadman's Island, and second with regard to my expulsion from the cabinet last July. I had a reply from Mr. Cotton to my letter, which I will read. I may say that I would not desire, for the purpose that I have in view in addressing this meeting, a better text than the letter which Mr. Cotton has chosen to write me. I will read it:

"'Victoria, Dec. 20, 1899.

"'Joseph Martin, Esq., M. P. P., Vancouver, B. C.:

"'Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 15th instant. I think, however, that same must have been written without due consideration. You are well aware that a full discussion of the government's action in regard to Deadman's Island must involve questions which are now in controversy with the Dominion government, and while the matter is in the courts I should be guilty of a serious breach of my official duty it I made such the subject of a discussion in a public meeting.

"'In regard to what you call your expulsion from the government, I am under the impression that you resigned your office after ascertaining that the views of the government supporters in the house were against your remaining in the cabinet. But in any case it is not a matter which it would be proper for me to discuss.

"'His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor and the Premier are the persons who, by the constitution, are entrusted with the selection and dismissal of the ministers of the crown. I know of nothing which gives any authority in regard to the matter to any other member of a cabinet, and I must decline to put myself in the position of seeming to usurp an authority which I do not possess.

"'Yours truly,

(Sgd.) "'F. CARTER-COTTON.'"

Mr. Martin remarked that according to the letter he had just read, the government's action regarding Deadman's Island was a sealed book until the courts decided the question of ownership; in other words, Mr. Cotton's action was not to be discussed by the speaker or the voters. The only question before the courts was as to the title to the island, and he (Mr. Martin) did not intend to discuss that question that night. It was immaterial. Mr. Cotton was not stupid, whatever else he might be, and he was perfectly well aware that the speaker did not propose to discuss here the question of the title to Deadman's Island, "but the question of Mr. Carter-Cotton's action with regard to that island, which is not before the courts, but is before the people who voted for him a year and a half ago."

At great length Mr. Martin then went into the Deadman's Island controversy, and Mr. Martin's "claim that it was his duty to protect the interests of the province." He declared that Mr. Cotton's action was very much opposed to the best interests of this city.

Leaving for a moment the question of Deadman's Island Mr. Martin went on to deal with his expulsion from the cabinet. In this connection he gave a history of his entry into British Columbia politics. He told how he had been brought out as a candidate at the last election and how he and his friends "united our forces with Mr. Cotton and his friends in the city in order that we might, if possible, defeat the government at Victoria." But Mr. Martin first of all assured the convention that under no circumstances would he be bound to support Mr. Semlin. It was never intended that when Mr. Semlin was elected leader of the opposition he should continue in that position. A deputation, before the general election, went to Mr. Semlin and asked him to make way for Mr. R. V. Bodwell. Mr. Semlin asked for time to consult his supporters, and later announced that personally he had no desire to be leader, but his supporters did not wish him to retire. The Bodwell proposal was abandoned. Mr. Bodwell himself was unwilling to accept the position. Later another deputation asked Mr. Semlin to retire in favor of Mr. Martin and later he returned the same answer as before. In these circumstances they went into the campaign. The speaker proceeded to give his version of the results of the election, what took place at the caucuses, the interviews with Mr. Robert Beaven when the latter was called upon to form a government, and the appointment of Mr. Semlin as premier, a position, he claimed, which Mr. Semlin came by dishonestly. The Semlin government had no trouble until this Deadman's Island question came up. Mr. Cotton made up his mind that in order that he should have his own way in this and other matters, it was absolutely essential that Mr. Martin should be got rid of. Personally the speaker did not desire to be a member of the house or of the government. Prior to coming to British Columbia he had been very much engaged in political life without any great satisfaction to himself. He came to British Columbia to get away from his Manitoba political connections and to devote himself solely to the practise of law. However, he gave way when asked to enter British Columbia politics. He went into the government against his better judgment. Personally he would be pleased if he could honorably sever his connection with politics and devote himself for some little time longer to his business. But these were considerations that had to take a second place in view of Mr. Cotton's successful effort to expel him from the government.

On July 1st last Mr. Semlin asked him for his resignation, and gave three reasons. First the Premier accused him of neglecting the duties of his office. In reply to this, Mr. Martin elaborated his previous argument that Mr. Semlin himself was incompetent. As to the charge, Mr. Martin repudiated it. "I rather prided myself," he said, "both in Manitoba and here, on attending to matters of business in the attorney-general's department as well as any previous attorney-general had done. I do not think the people of this province and my constituents will take much stock in that reason." (Cheers.)

The second charge was that he had divulged cabinet secrets. That led Mr. Martin to a dissertation on his charge against Mr. Cotton of falsifying the records of the cabinet. After various references to the criminal code and the penitentiary, the speaker passed on to deal with Mr. Semlin's third charge against him, namely, as Mr. Martin put it, "this occurrence at Rossland." He might say with regard to that that Mr. James Martin, M.P.P. for Rossland, was present on that occasion and when that question came up for consideration at Victoria stated most emphatically that nothing occurred at Rossland to cause the government to suffer. "I am quite willing to admit," said Mr. Martin amid laughter, "that I might have done better than I did on that occasion, but everybody falls once in a while." These were the only reasons that Mr. Cotton, through Mr. Semlin, put forward as justifying him in asking the speaker to resign. Then Mr. Martin came "to the object of this meeting." He said:

"You have heard from he the explanation of what has occurred and the stand that I have taken as your member in accepting a position in the government. But for the reasons I have stated I have come to the conclusion that I shall have to alter my position in that house, and that is a serious matter upon which it appears to me I should have some consultation with you. Now, why is it that I think I should no longer support this government? I consider the government to be simply Mr. F. Carter-Cotton. Mr. Cotton monopolizes the two important portfolios in the government, and I fancy there is no other member there who is likely to interfere very much in Mr. Cotton's disposition of public affairs. I propose to oppose the present government on account of the gross injury it has done to the best interests of this city in connection with the matters to which I have referred. Now, when I say that I propose to oppose the government I do not mean that I intend to go down there and sit in my seat and wait until some motion comes up with regard to Deadman's Island and then register my vote abstractly in favor of the proposition that the city should be entitled to erect a mill on that island, and drop it at that. No, I think that would be a very inadequate way of asserting myself. On the contrary, having come to the conclusion already expressed, it is my intention to take every means in my power to hurl from power Mr. Carter-Cotton and the other gentlemen who sit behind him. (Cheers). I think that what this province wants is another election. (Renewed cheers). I have been of that opinion ever since the last election. (A laugh). We were handicapped in that last election. * * * I want an appeal to the country at once. Believing that this government is no longer worthy of support, I will take every means in my power to see that it is removed from office. I have made up my mind, if I continue to represent this constituency, to do all in my power to bring about another election by defeating the present government. Now, if my constituents do not agree with these views of mine, and if they think I shall be doing an injustice to this constituency of Vancouver by putting the present government out, all they have to do is to say so to me, and I will at once resign and make room for some better man. (Cheers). That is what I have called you together for."

Mr. Alexander Philip then stepped on the platform and moved the following resolution:

"That we endorse the action of Mr. Joseph Martin as explained by him in his address to-night as one of our representatives in the legislative assembly, and express our sympathies by tendering a vote of our entire confidence in him."

At the conclusion of the reading some one in the audience gave a whistle expressive of surprise.

Mr. Philip proceeded to eulogize Mr. Martin, though he remarked that there were some things in Mr. Martin's private life that they might not have liked.

Chairman Tyson was eager to put the resolution, but a workingman in the audience desired to move an amendment. In response to cries of "Platform!" Mr. McLean faced the audience. He said that in coming to the platform he was told to be careful what he said or he would get into trouble. If there was to be trouble let it come right away. (Cheers). The speaker then started to talk about labor matters, and there was an uproar and cries of "Question! Question!"

Mr. Martin appealed for silence and was heard, after more uproar, to say to Mr. McLean: "Did you vote for me at the last election?"

Mr. McLean: "No, sir, but I will be a candidate and fight you at the next election."

Mr. Martin: "I have no desire to interfere with this gentleman, but I will say at once that my invitation to this meeting was addressed to those who supported me at the last election, and those are the only people from whom I desire advice. This gentleman's remarks are entirely out of order."

Mr. N. McLean: "I am always prepared to abide by majority rule. (Voices: 'Go on' and 'Chair'—uproar.) I move an amendment that the best way in which the government can meet the views of the people is to dissolve at once and let us have a general election." (Loud laughter).

The chairman did not ask if there was any seconder of the amendment, he treating the matter as a joke. He then put the original motion in this wise: "Those in favor of the resolution put their hand up." ("Both hands?" queried a voice). About half the people in the hall sent up their hands. Then Mr. Tyson tried again. "Those in favor of the resolution stand up," he cried. About two-thirds of those present stood up, while a gentleman, who refused to give his name but who was gently requested by the audience to take the gum out of his mouth, called out to the chairman that he desired to move an amendment. "You're too late—the motion's carried," declared the chairman, never troubling to call upon the large number of people who remained sitting to register their votes against the motion.

Mr. Martin stood up to speak again, while the gentleman anxious to be rid of his amendment hastened to the platform. By the time he arrived there Mr. Martin was in the middle of a vague speech about the referendum, whose principle he was thoroughly in accord with, but thought the present system all right. He also remarked that Mr. Tisdall was going to stand by Mr. Cotton, but he (Mr. Martin) knew that Mr. Macpherson took the same view that he did. He hoped, therefore, that when he and Mr. Macpherson went over to Victoria they would be able to fight together.

The gentleman with the amendment, who refused to give his name, once more tried to get a hearing, but Mr. Philip called out "Three cheers for the Queen," and the meeting broke up in not exactly orderly fashion.

To the retreating backs a member of the Deadman's Island committee announced that as none of the three city papers could be relied on to support the Deadman's Island movement in the present campaign, they had made arrangements to publish a paper called the Argus for eight days, but they wanted a guarantee of $500 worth of advertisements. Collectors would call on the advertisers on Wednesday.

By this time the meeting had broken up.

SOLDIERS OF FORTUNE.

Men Who Have Served Under More Than One Flag in This Century.

From the Pall Mall Gazette.

In the Transvaal to-day the soldier of fortune is making his last stand. No other country in the world is likely to offer the alien adventurer of the future the same positions and profit that have hitherto been the portion of Schiel, Von Albrecht and the other European mercenaries of Krugerdom. And in this very fact we may seen the decline of the soldier of fortune, if we compare his gains with the colossal harvests of his predecessors in history. Perron, the wonderful Frenchman who commanded the Maharatta army, arrived in Hindustan a pennyless petty officer from a man-o'-war, and in nine years had amassed between one and two millions sterling. Even more rapid was the progress of Col. Hannay, who had to leave "John Company's" service to avoid the bailiffs. He entered the service of the Nawab Wazir of Oude in 1778, and left it after three years with a fortune of £300,000. Many other French and English adventurers were nearly as lucky.

At that time there was not the prejudice against these mercenary swords which the military ethics of modern Europe have fostered. Fed foreigners have risen to eminence in the English service, but large numbers of aliens were recruited for us in the Napoleonic wars. Besides the famous Hessians, there were the French Chasseurs Britannique, three Swiss regiments, the Corsican Rangers, and the Greek Light Infantry. In the Crimean war a German legion was recruited in Heligoland, but they never distinguished themselves on the field, and the precedent is not likely to be followed.

In spite of the chilling effect of modern ideas, the soldiers of fortune of the nineteenth century form a picturesque gallery—heroes and rascals, Fenians and Royalists, Poles, Englishmen and adventurers of no country. Some of them like Lord Cochrane and Hobart Pasha, have established themselves on a higher plane than the mercenary can usually hope to occupy. The former's brilliant record with the English, Chilian, Brazilian and Greek navies in turn is probably unique, though Paul Jones may be set down as a bad second. The ex-apprentice of a Whitehaven collier, who was the most successful American officer in the war of independence, and held command thereafter in the French, and then in the Russian navy, is not the heroic figure which modern eulogists in the United States like to picture, but he was a fine seaman and a gallant fighter. In fact, he has the typical soldier of fortune (for the accident that he fought at sea does not rob him of his place in that gallery.

The revolutionary wars of the continent have naturally attracted many of these adventurers. Count Ilinski was a Pole who fought the Russians in his native land, and when all was lost took service under Schamyl, Prince of Circassia. The Hungarian war of independence in 1848 next employed his desperate valor, and at Tameswar he had three horses killed under him. Finally, he became colonel of a Turkish cuirassier regiment, and was known as Iskander Bey. In the Hungarian revolt, and at Tyrnau he held his ground until he had lost three-fourths of his battalion and the village streets were streaming with blood. A less attractive personality is General Cluserat, who served as a captain in the French army in Algeria, then under Fremont, in the American civil war; was next a Fenian "general," and then war minister under the Commune. Dombrowski, another "general" in the Commune, and in far abler and braver man than the ex-Fenian, had fought in Poland and under Garibaldi. He was killed at the barricades in 1871. Among continental forces of aliens one ought to mention the French Foreign Legion, which still includes men of half of Europe, and the Irish Brigade, which fought for the Pope in 1860, under the command of Major Myles O'Rielly, M.P. An old soldier of the Papal Zouaves, another Irishman, is now Gen. Coppinger, of the United States army. Garibaldi himself is of course entitled to a niche in this gallery of fame, and his son Ricciotti has since his Italian campaigns fought for France in 1870 and for Greece in 1879, in both bravely fighting for a lost cause.

The New World offers us condottieri of a new type, like Walker, the filibuster, who became dictator of Nicaragua and might have ruled Honduras but for a British man-o'-war. Gen. Caroll-Teviss, who served in the Franco-Prussian war and a good many South American struggles, was a Fenian hero. So was Capt. John McAfferty, who served in the Mexican was of 1855, and was then an officer in the Confederate army. He was in all the Fenian plots of 1866-67, and was twice tried here for treason-felony. He was acquitted at one trial, and annnestied after the second, a leniency which he repaid by renewed activity in the ranks of the Clan-na-Gael. He was said to be the real "No. 1" behind the Phoenix Park murders.

Egypt has employed many aliens. Muzinger Bey was a Swiss who had been British consul at Massowah; Gessi Pasha, an Italian, who, after serving as interpreter to the English army in the Crimea, became Gordon's lieutenant in the Soudan, and smashed the native slave hunters' revolt in Darfur. Loring Pasha was an American soldier; Lupton Bey, governor of the Bahr-el-Gazel, who died in the Mahdi's dungeons, an Englishman. Slatin and Emin were both Austrians.

In more recent years we have had Gen. Kohnes, an ex-major in the German army, who landed a cargo of Mannlicher rifles for the Boers in the Congressionalist, drilled their troops, and defeated Baimaceda. Gen. Ronald McIver, a Scotchman, who has served under fourteen flags, from the Confederate to the Carlist, is another roaming Briton, like Kaid Maclean, an ex-lieutenant in our service, who is now commander of the army of the Sultan of Morocco. Gen. Digby Willoughby, who commanded (in blue and silver) the Hova army, has since fought for the Chartered Company in Rhodesia, but has now turned to the arts of peace.

The Story of a Baby.

The physicians at the Hanemann Hospital of Philadelphia said Baby Moncrieff could not live.

It was against all the laws of nature and of medicine for this eight-month baby to survive a nervous disease of the spine.

The family doctor agreed with those at the hospital.

The mother watched the child as it slept upon the pillow, the faintest flutter of breath telling her that life still lingered.

An aunt who loved her like a mother said "We will try Dr. Williams' Pink Pills. They are prescribed for nervous disorders, perhaps they will help our Ettie." A pill was divided in three parts and given to the baby.

Instead of dying, as the doctors predicted, she lived. Then she opened her eyes and smiled at those around her.

She gathered strength through Dr. Williams' Pink Pills as a flower gathers strength in the mist of the morning.

To-day she is seven years old, the sunshine of the aunt who saved her life with Dr. Williams' Pink Pills for Pale People.

This is a true story. The child is Ettie Moncrieff, daughter of Mrs. Helen Moncrieff, formerly of Hamilton, Ontario. The Aunt is Mrs. M. G. Meek, who now resides with the child at 1317 South 10th Street, Philadelphia. The facts are fully verified by affidavits.

DR. WILLIAMS' PINK PILLS CURE WHEN OTHER MEDICINES FAIL.

THE GAME OF WAR.

Rules and Customs Observed—Use of Flag of Truce—The Office of Spy.

During the progress of the struggle between the British Empire and the two Dutch republics in South Africa attention has been called to a number of questions relating to customs commonly observed between nations at war. Such questions as the status of war correspondents, the use of flags of truce, hospital flags, the use of lyddite, the demand for parole, the capture of horses and other goods, and the seizure of gold have a very real and vital interest to the reading public at the present time, and there are many others upon which it is interesting to know what the practice of civilized nations is and has been in the past.

The first question that arises in dealing with this very large subject is, "What is war?" The most eminent authorities describe war as an armed contest between independent nations, and it can only be made by the sovereign power of a state. When there is war between two nations every subject of the one nation becomes, in the eye of the law, an enemy to every subject of the other nation. This principle, carried, to extreme limits, would authorize the detention, as prisoners of war, of all subjects of one of the hostile parties travelling or resident in the country of the other at the time of the outbreak of war and the confiscation of their goods, an extreme course adopted by Napoleon, who in 1803, detained 10,000 British in prison until the peace of 1814, but one which is contrary to the tactics of modern warfare.

It has been usual to "commandeer" goods. Russians were allowed during the Crimean war to live quietly both in England and France, but in 1870 hostile strangers were ordered out of France on a few days' notice.

But war is not a relation of man to man, but of state to state, and its object, politically speaking, is the redress by force of international injury, while from a military point of view it is to procure the complete submission of the enemy as quickly and as cheaply as possible.

LAWS OF THE GAME.

There are certain laws of the game, the general principle being that in the mode of carrying on the war no greater hurt shall be done to the enemy than necessity requires for the purpose of bringing him to terms.

This principle excludes gratuitous barbarities and every description of cruelty and insult that serves only to exasperate the sufferings or to increase the hatred of the enemy without weakening his strength or tending to procure his submission.

Naturally the use of poison is prohibited; so is assassination; with regard to this latter point, a small force may penetrate into the enemy's camp, and take the general prisoner, or even kill him, without infringing any of the customs of war, or subjecting themselves, if taken, to be treated otherwise than as prisoners of war.

The enemy may be destroyed by all legitimate means, and the users of high explosives are as much entitled to quarter as anybody else.

A humane commander will endeavor not to hurt non-combatants, but no rule can be laid down on the subject. The United States instructions say that it is lawful though an extreme measure, to turn back non-combatants, in order to predice a surrender, when the commander has expelled them in order to have the less mouths to fill.

THE ENEMY.

The enemy consists of (1) armed forces and (2) unarmed population. The former may be destroyed as long as they resist; the latter are immune, unless they divest themselves of their non-combatant character. Quarter should never be refused to men who surrender, unless they have been guilty of such violation of the customs of war as would of itself expose them to the penalty of death; and, even when so guilty they should, whenever practicable, be taken prisoners, and put on their trial, as it is seldom justifiable for a combatant to take the law into his own hands against an unresisting enemy. Of course the wounded of the enemy are to be cared for second only to caring for one's own wounded. Prisoners may be compelled to aid their captors in military operations, but they may be employed in any other manner suitable to their condition; and the captor should support them in a manner suitable to their condition.

Unless they have given a promise not to attempt to escape, they are justified in making the attempt.

In the act of escaping they may be shot or otherwise killed, but, if retaken, are not liable to any punishment for the attempt. On the other hand, a rising among prisoners in order to effect a general escape may be rigorously punished even with death. A nation is not guilty of any breach of the customs of war if it refuses to exchange its prisoners, but detains them until the close of the war.

RELEASE OF PRISONERS.

Prisoners who are released on parole generally pledge themselves against active service against the enemy during the existing war, but they may drill recruits, quell disturbances or fight belligerents who are unconnected with the paroling enemy. Paroling is a voluntary contract; the captor is not obliged to parole a prisoner of war, and a prisoner may, if he choose, remain in captivity. A prisoner who gives his parole has no authority to pledge himself never to serve against a particular enemy. The pledge must be confined to a limited time, and the laws of the prisoner's own country may make further restrictions.

If a prisoner makes an engagement which is not approved of by his own government, he is bound to return and surrender himself to the enemy.

A soldier cannot, according to the English practice, give his parole except through a commissioned officer. As a general rule a commanding officer has an implied authority to give his parole on behalf of himself and the officers and men under his command, but an inferior officer ought not to give parole either for himself or his men without the authority of a superior officer, if such an officer be within reach. A state has no power to force its subjects to act contrary to their parole, but it may punish those who have given their paroles contrary to the law of their country. A recaptured prisoner who has violated his parole may be punished with death. Such a course is unusual except in an aggravated case.

RETALIATION.

Retaliation is military vengeance. It takes place where an outrage committed on one side is avenged by the commission of a similar act on the other. For example, an unjust execution of prisoners by the enemy may be followed by the execution of an equal number of prisoners by their opponents. Retaliation is the extreme right of war, and should only be resorted to in the last necessity. It may be well to notice, for the purpose of reprobating it, the idea once prevalent that a garrison, which obstinately defended a place after it had, in the opinion of the enemy, become untenable might be put to the sword.

The object of war is compensation for an injury. This compensation may or may not be held to include the expense of the war, so it is lawful to take from the enemy anything that conduces to his means of resistance. It is unusual to wantonly damage churches, museums and the like. Public property is distinguished from private. The use of, and rents and other profits from, public land and buildings form part of the spoils of war, as do the arms, implements of war, munitions of war, and every other description of moveable property belonging to the state. The retention of archives is a barbarism, and prohibited by the customs of war. The seizure of sculptures, pictures, etc., has received some sanction from the repeated practice of civilized nations, but would seem incompatible with the admitted restriction of the rights of war of depriving the enemy of such things only as enable him to make resistance, and can only be justified as a measure of retaliation. No complaint could possibly be made against this country for its practice with regard to requisitions. The Duke of Wellington on entering France sent the Spaniards back soon than have recourse to forced requisitions. But the stern rule of the customs of war is that war may be made to support war, and both French and Germans have constantly exercised the right of levying forced requisitions.

Looting, in spite of a certain song, is an offence under the Army act, punishable with death, though authorized pillage is an extreme mode of laying contributions on individuals. But this should only be restored to in the last necessity.

MILITARY OCCUPATION.

Military occupation of a country must be real. Its test is exclusive possession, and it ceases directly the invaders retreat or advance in such a manner as to quit their hold on the occupied territory. In the event of a military occupation, the authority of the regular government is supplanted by that of the invading army. The rule imposed by the invaders is the law of war, but it has only relation to the inhabitants of the invaded country; an English army of occupation remains under English military law. But the invader may use his own discretion as regards the inhabitants. He may abrogate any law of the country and substitute other rules. He may make new tribunals or let things go on as before. In punishing the inhabitants for breaking any of the rules by an act which is only a crime through being injurious to him, he should exercise the greatest leniency consistent with the safety and well-being of his army.

THE OFFICER AND SPY.

A spy is a person who is found in a district occupied by the enemy collecting information secretly and in disguise. An officer in uniform, however nearly he approaches to the enemy, is not a spy, and, if taken, must be treated as a prisoner of war. Spies, when taken, are punishable with death, since, as Vattel observes, there is scarcely any other means of guarding against the mischief they may do.

No one can be called upon to undertake the office of spy. A commander may, of course, avail himself of a traitor's information. Vattel says suborning treacherous information is not uncommon, though a thing not boasted of. If an officer voluntarily makes overtures to an enemy, under pretence of being a traitor, and then gives false information, his conduct is dishonorable and contrary to the customs of war. Every mode of deceiving the enemy which is not perfidious is permissible, but no deceit is allowable where an express or implied engagement exists that the truth should be acted or spoken. It is an outrage against the customs of war to use a place protected by a hospital flag for any other purpose than for a hospital.

THE USE OF A FLAG OF TRUCE.

A flag of truce can only be used legitimately for the purpose of entering into some arrangement with the enemy. If adopted with a view to obtain surreptitiously information of the enemy's forces or position it loses its character of a flag of truce, and exposes its bearer to the punishment of a spy.

Great caution, however, and the most conclusive evidence are necessary before the bearer of a flag of truce can be convicted as a spy. The bearer of a flag of truce cannot insist on being admitted and should not be allowed, without permission, to approach near enough to acquire any useful information. When an enemy is in position the bearer of a flag of truce should not, without leave, be permitted to pass the outer line of sentinels, or even to approach within the range of their guns.

When a flag of truce is sent from a detachment during an engagement the troops from which it is sent should halt and cease firing. The troops to which it is sent should if they are willing to accept it, signal to that effect and also cease firing. But it must be understood that firing during an engagement does not necessarily cease on the appearance of a flag of truce, and that the parties connected with such flag cannot complain if its bearers are killed by such firing. When it is intended to refuse admission to a flag of truce the bearer should, as soon as possible, be signalled to retire, and if he does not obey the signal he may be fired upon.

The N. P. liner Queen Adelaide from Yokohama and Oriental ports with a general cargo and a number of Chinese passengers arrived at the quarantine station yesterday afternoon on time to the minute. She did not dock at the outer wharf, however, until 3 this morning, having undergone a severe inspection at quarantine, the prevalence of the bubonic plague in the Orient necessitating great care on the part of Officer Watt and staff. The Queen Adelaide proceeds to Tacoma this afternoon.

BORN.

BERKS—On 28th instant, at 12 South Turner street, the wife of R. B. Berks, of a son.

MARRIED.

DORAN—VEECH—December 27, at Sooke, by Rev. W. E. H. Ellison, Ada, daughter of M. Veech, to John Doran, of Victoria.

DIED.

REID—At the residence of Mr. John Wendt, Robert street, Victoria West, on Monday evening, Mary Anne Kerr, wife of Mr. Thomas Reid.

FRASER—In this city, on the 30th December, Alexander Fraser, second son of the late Paul Fraser, of the Hudson's Bay Company's service, Fort McLeod, B.C., aged 62 years.