THE ENGLISH SITUATION.

The British Government is still in difficulties. It has, it is true, settled the East African dispute satisfactorily. Stanley, who is rather difficult to please in matters in which the disposition of African territory is concerned, is highly pleased with the arrangement which Lord Salisbury has made with Germany. The result is evidently, in his opinion, peace with honor. To have settled the East African question without making humiliating concessions to Germany—concessions such as were apprehended by Stanley, which would cause the loss to British subjects of a quarter of a million of pounds sterling, and the surrender of a large extent of valuable territory—will strengthen the Government greatly in Parliament and in the country, and revive the confidence in the wisdom and firmness of the Ministry, which has been languishing for some time.

Withdrawing the Irish Land Purchase Bill has also had a good effect. Of course the reproach that attaches to those who have begun to build and are not able to finish has been incurred by the Ministry. But this reproach is nothing like the odium which the Government would have brought on itself by an attempt to settle the Irish Land Question by means that did not meet with the approval of either the people of Great Britain or the people of Ireland. A British Government does not lower itself very much in popular esteem by dropping a measure which is found to be distasteful to the majority of the nation. Mr. Balfour's Bill was considered by competent men to be an honest and an able attempt to solve a most difficult problem. That he has not been allowed to carry out his experiment is not his fault. It is quite likely that it is his critics who are mistaken and not he. Indeed, as he has studied the subject most carefully, and has had the benefit of the best advice, the probability is that if his Land Purchase Bill had become law it would have worked well and have done very much to allay discontent in Ireland. At any rate, there are many who are disposed to give him the benefit of the doubt. Mr. Balfour has of late shown himself to be a very able man, who heartily desires to improve the condition of the people of Ireland. His conduct has been such as to extort the admiration of even bitter opponents. They now give him credit for both ability and sincerity. When he first became Secretary for Ireland they loudly declared that he possessed neither the one nor the other.

But, as we have already said, Lord Salisbury's Government is not yet out of trouble. The compensation bill is most distasteful to a very large section of the people of England and Scotland. The Government's majority on the first clause of the bill was very narrow indeed. It may be said that the opposition forced the vote, but, making every allowance for the surprise, a division of 228 to 224 was a very narrow one, indeed. When the Government's majority on a test question is reduced to four its condition must be admitted to be exceedingly shaky. The state of the country with respect to the question of compensation to publicans is even more alarming than that of Parliament. If the bill permitting the compensation to publicans becomes law there will be such an agitation in the country as has not been seen for many a year. This agitation will not be raised by restless and reckless people of the baser sort, but by the law-abiding respectable classes of the community—and its movers and leaders will be men eminent for their ability as well as their piety and their philanthropy. Looking at the matter from this distance it would appear that the Government which would deliberately place itself in opposition to the immense body of respectable and influential people who are resolutely opposed to the policy of compensation to publicans is bent upon committing suicide.

NEWFOUNDLAND IN ENGLAND.

The people of England are at last beginning to see that the Newfoundland difficulty is a very serious one. Even well informed people in Great Britain, until very lately, thought that the Newfoundland difficulty was a mere local disturbance in which molehills were magnified into mountains. But their eyes have been opened. They see that the people of Newfoundland have, indeed, something to complain of, and that unless some way of settling their grievance is soon found, consequences of the gravest nature may ensue. It is known in Great Britain now that every province in the Dominion of Canada is in sympathy with the people of Newfoundland, that the general impression is that the encroachments of the French are wholly unjustifiable, and that Great Britain should firmly insist upon a settlement in strict accordance with the terms of the treaties, under which French fishermen are allowed to land and cure their fish on the shores of Newfoundland.

The Canadian Gazette, some little time ago, being under an erroneous impression as to the nature of the matter complained of by the Newfoundlanders and the interests and extent of the agitation in their Colony, contained some remarks that the colonists considered calculated to injure their cause in Great Britain. In its issue of May 30th it makes the following retraction:—

The agitation in Newfoundland is, indeed, a national agitation if ever there was one. We say this the more emphatically at the present moment because some Newfoundland journals have, we observe, put an exaggerated construction upon some casual comments made in our columns on this point, a few weeks back. The information which at that time had reached this country as to the movement in Newfoundland was of the scantiest. The holding of large representative mass meetings throughout the Colony, and the purport of Ministerial declarations in the Legislative Chambers were then practically unknown here; and, that being so, it was not unnatural that we should have been led to enquire by what method "delegates of the people of Newfoundland" had been appointed to proceed to Canada and this country. The facts which have come to light since have removed whatever doubts there existed as to the national character of the movement; and we hope that in the further discussion of the question, both in Newfoundland and in this country, party considerations will be entirely put on one side. Only by so doing can a united and successful attempt be made to terminate a state of things which, unless dealt with resolutely and promptly, must bring as face to face with the loss of our oldest Colony, or the possibility of open war with a friendly power.

Colonists are continually complaining that the people of England know very little about their affairs and care less. There is, perhaps, some ground for this complaint. It might be supposed that if there is any newspaper in Great Britain that should be well informed on everything that is going on in British America it is the Canadian Gazette, which has been established for the express purpose of diffusing exact information in the Old Country respecting Canada, of which Newfoundland is so near a neighbor, that intelligent English people, we see, believe that it forms part of the Dominion. But we notice that even the Canadian Gazette did not know enough about the Newfoundland question to prevent its falling into serious error with regard to it. What then is to be expected of other British newspapers, to the managers of which Newfoundland is little more than a geographical expression?

THE OPPOSITION'S POLICY.

We would like the Times to point out to us which of the men, who have been elected as independent members, has accepted the one plank of the Opposition platform which Mr. Beaven can claim as his peculiar property. The Leader of the Opposition's railway policy is his own. His followers have, we presume, accepted it. It has not yet, at any rate, been repudiated by any one of his corporal's guard of followers. This policy is to make the Government a builder and an operator of railways. He would not give to a railway company a single acre of land, or any interest in what the land produces or contains. When a railway is to be built the Government is to build it. It is to raise all the money that is needed on the credit of the province. The men who are to build the railroads are to be Government contractors, and the men who are to work them Government officials. If the Government is too poor to build the roads needed, if it cannot raise the money that their construction requires, the country is to do without railroads. Private companies are, we presume, to be permitted to build railroads in the province, but it must be solely out of their own resources. The Government will, perhaps, give them the right of way through public lands without charge, but Mr. Beaven said nothing about this. What he did say was that the land was to be kept for the people, and that none of it was to be given to the railway companies. Has any independent member expressed his willingness to accept this feature of the Opposition policy? The man who has done so may fairly be claimed by the Opposition. This railway policy is no unimportant matter and cannot be included in the subjects that are common to the platforms of the Opposition and the Government. It is a distinctive policy and is opposed to the policy established by the Government. It may therefore be taken as a fair test to distinguish between a supporter of the Government and a supporter of the Opposition. Let our contemporary go over the list of members returned and enquire how many of them are ready to adopt the Leader of the Opposition's railway policy. Those who express approval of it may be set down as followers of the Hon. Mr. Beaven, and no others. We venture to say that the journal or the politician who applies this test to the members-elect will have very little difficulty, indeed, when the business is done, in adding up the Opposition column.

It is not hard to see what would happen if a majority had been returned to carry out Mr. Beaven's policy. Either no railroads would be built at all, and the province would remain, as long as the Beaven party were in power, at a standstill, or the Government in the attempt to build railways, would plunge the province hopelessly in debt. Between the policy of doing nothing and the policy of wasteful and useless expenditure it is easy to guess which Mr. Beaven would choose, and the province would stick in the mud as long as his administration lasted.

AN ANSWER AT LAST.

While the election was in progress the Times more than once told us that the stand we took with respect to single tax showed that we had given up all hope of getting the workingmen's vote. From this, of course, we concluded that our contemporary knew exactly how the workingmen thought and felt on that subject. So, when the election was over, we asked it in a neighborly way to inform us whether or not the workingmen of this city are in favor of single tax, as set forth in the works of Henry George. The Times at first evaded the question but, on Friday, it answers plainly that it doesn't know. This is precisely as we thought. The assumption of superior knowledge while the election was going on was a mere pretence. We believe that the workingmen of this city are too thoughtful and too honest to be led away by the plausible speeches of a few visionaries, who imagine that because their fellow workmen listen to them with patience they have become converts to their theories. But we have more faith in the sterling honesty and good sense of our countrymen than to believe that any considerable number of them would accept a scheme of alleged reform that is based upon robbery. The single-tax advocates, we notice, kept the true nature of their scheme carefully concealed. They led their hearers to believe that it meant only a modification of the system of taxation that now obtains—a system that it is devised for the purpose of preventing men keeping unimproved land out of the market with the view of obtaining for it a higher price. Believing this to be what single tax means, some working men have favored it, but when they came to find out that it means taking from every man his lot and preventing any one ever becoming a land owner, they would give it no countenance. Because we stated plainly what the main object of the advocates of single tax is, we have brought down upon our heads the wrath of the apostles of plunder. They are angry at being unmasked. We are rather pleased to see them raging, for the howls they utter show that we have hit them hard.

The Times, too, which gave the single tax advocates all the countenance it dared, shows signs of a disposition to retrace its steps and to return to the good old paths, and we think that it will be a long time before Messrs. Beaven and Grant will again sit at the feet of the apostles of single tax, pretending to be edified by their instructions, or try to convince them that they were almost persuaded to accept the gospel of Henry George.

IGNORANT OR UNPRINCIPLED, WHICH?

Now, it is the Columbian, of New Westminster, which truckles to the single tax socialists. It makes a distinction between property in land and other kinds of property. It admits that to take a man's watch from him without paying him for it is robbery, but it will not say the same about a man's lot. A man labors for a month and out of his savings he is able to buy a watch. He works for four or five years and by denying himself and his family many things he saves enough to buy a piece of land. Yet the Columbian would have its readers believe that the land, which was paid for by the savings of four years' toil, is not as much the man's own as the watch which he paid for out of the savings of a month's work. It would put the men who stole the watch in the penitentiary, but would make the man who stole the land prime minister. The Columbian holds that to tax the product of the land is the same thing as to steal the land.

Things have come to a very bad pass in this province when its newspapers openly advocate robbery, and when the leaders of the Opposition in parliament publicly countenance the advocates of a policy of wholesale spoliation.

It may be said that the Columbian is too ignorant and too stupid to know what it is doing when it favors the abolition of private property in land. That is very likely. But there are times when men cannot afford to despise ignorance and stupidity. When ignorant men and men who are intellectually too short-sighted to see the true nature of the principles they advocate, or the consequences to which they lead, teach pernicious doctrines and make converts, it is time for those who have a stake in the country—those who would be the first victims of the plunderers—to unite for their own protection. They should take measures to have the true nature of the immoral teachings of the agitators exposed, and they should at once and forever withdraw their support from any public man, no matter who he is or to what party he belongs, who has anything to do directly or indirectly with the men who are trying to persuade the electors that it is not only not wrong but perfectly right to take from the owners of land their property.

When the newspapers and such public men as Mr. John Grant and Mr. Robert Beaven find it to their interest to truckle to these socialists it is time for the owners of property of all classes to be on their guard.

We see that the Times comes out as far as it dare in favor of the policy of plunder. It misrepresents the fundamental principle of single tax. It says that it is equality of taxation. It is nothing of the kind. It is "appropriation" of the rent of land, it is making the land of the country the property of the State. That is the fundamental principle of Henry George's system of single tax, and those who say it is anything else are trying to deceive and hoodwink the public. This is what Henry George himself said a few weeks ago in Melbourne, Australia:

"All they need to do was to impose, in the form of a tax, an obligation on the holder of valuable land that would take for the common good a premium amounting to the value of the special privilege that he held. That was what he (George) aimed at by the single-tax."

What does the Times hope to gain by quibbling and equivocating? Does it expect to lead the people to believe that it knows more about the nature and principles of single-tax than Henry George himself?

NOT BANKRUPT.

In an article on the "Bankrupt Provinces," the Toronto Mail speaks of Prince Edward Island as if it were in a bad financial condition. It says that it is "running behind at the rate of $20,000 a year." This is in a sense true, but nevertheless there is no province of the Dominion in a better financial condition than that little island. It owes nothing and it is not taxed. Here lies the secret of its running behind. It has tried since it went into Confederation to live off the Dominion and it has very nearly succeeded. Except in the two towns, Charlottetown and Summerside, there is no local taxation. There are no country municipalities. The provincial legislature provides for all local wants, education, roads, bridges, poor, &c. The only tax the farmer pays is an old land tax of a trifle—less than two dollars—on every hundred acres, and a small assessment to provide the school house and to keep it in repair. The Davies Government tried to introduce the principle of local assessment, but as soon as the electors got the chance they sent him to the right-about, and the province has ever since had very little revenue, except what it gets from the Dominion. The Government, having the fate of the Davies administration before its eyes, is afraid to pass an assessment act, and so it drifts on depending upon providence or on windfalls from the Dominion. If Prince Edward Island was taxed half as heavily as this or any other of the provinces for local purposes it would have all the money it needs and something over. But the rural population refuses to be taxed and the consequence is that the province is falling behind. But the deficit is no sign of poverty. All that it indicates is that the farmers are impatient of taxation and that the legislature is too much afraid of them to impose the taxes that are absolutely required, and, that in all the other provinces are more or less cheerfully paid.

ENFORCE THE LAW.

It is greatly to be regretted that the laws against gambling are not enforced in this city. It is well known that gambling in many forms is carried on within the city's bounds, and that nothing is done to check it. It is true that the police now and then feel it to be their duty to preserve the morals of Chinatown by raiding a gambling den frequented chiefly by the heathen Chinee, but the more dangerous saloons and other gambling places where white men waste their time and their money, and where many of them are ruined, are indulgently left alone. We would not have the police less severe on Chinese gambling, but we would have them do their duty by fearlessly and impartially enforcing the laws against gambling by white men. It does look most inconsistent to see the law enforced against Chinamen while white men are allowed to violate it with impunity.

The harm that the habit of gambling does in the community is incalculable. That it gives a number of unprincipled men a chance to prey upon the public is the least of its evils. If the gambling was done among professional gamblers alone harm enough would be done. But these professional gamblers must have their victims. Those victims are too often young men who have to make their way in the world and who are the hope of their families. These young men acquire the habit of gambling in places in which, if the law were carried out, there would be no gambling. They begin by throwing dice for the drinks or the cigars, and soon learn to play for high stakes. The descent to Avernus is proverbially easy, and these men have acquired a taste for gambling before they believed themselves to be in danger.

Are the city authorities by their slackness and by the persistence with which they shut their eyes to what is going on around them, to be accessories to the ruin of many young men in this city and to the irreparable injury done to many more?

As long as they allow the laws against gambling to be, as far as white men are concerned, a dead letter, they are the accomplices of the keepers of gambling hells and of professional gamblers. They help these classes to prey upon the public. There is no getting out of this dilemma. There are laws against gambling. They are the men whose business it is to enforce those laws. If evil consequences follow the habitual violation of the laws they are responsible for those consequences, and are quite as guilty as the violators of the law themselves.

We should like to know why this iniquity of gambling by white men is winked at by the police or those whose duty it is to instruct the police and to see that they enforce the laws. It is simply folly to suppose that they are ignorant of what is going on. They cannot be ignorant of what is known to persons who have not nearly so many or such good opportunities of knowing what is taking place in the city at all hours of the day and the night. It may be that they are reluctant to interfere in what they look upon as the harmless amusements of the "boys." They do not want to be disagreeable and to make enemies out of men that they like and who do not belong to the criminal class. There may be a good deal in this. But the authorities should try and realize that gambling is not a harmless amusement, but that it is to very many who indulge in it most harmful, and that they are acting as the friends of the "boys" and not as their enemies when they do what they can to prevent their going to the bad by the gambler's road. If the city authorities realized that every gambling place in this city is a nuisance, and that it is their duty to the community to close every one of them, whether frequented by white men or Chinamen, they would bestir themselves to enforce the law, and earn for themselves the thanks of every right-minded and conscientious man and woman in the city.

THE RIGHT RING.

The tone of the London Times with respect to the Behring's Sea question is firm and decided. It evidently does not think that Great Britain ought to stand by with folded arms while her subjects are being treated with insult and contumely. It is its opinion that British subjects should be protected in Behring's Sea as well as everywhere else. This is what it says in its leader of June 4th:

"For a long time past, as our readers are aware, negotiations have been pending between Her Majesty's Government and the Government of the United States with respect to the rights of British subjects to engage in the seal fishing off the coasts of Alaska and in Behring's Sea. We recently published, however, news to the effect that while the diplomatists were still at work, and while the question was being discussed whether or not British-born subjects had any right whatever to engage in seal-fishing in the wide expanses of Behring's Sea, the American Secretary of State, acting, no doubt, under party pressure, had gone back to the position he appeared to have abandoned and had induced President Harrison to issue a proclamation, on March 25, closing Behring's Sea to all persons not licensed by the Government at Washington to hunt for and capture fur seals. In consequence, about a fortnight ago, three cruisers were ordered to start from the Pacific coast ports, and to join the American war-ship already stationed off the seaboard of Alaska. British vessels of war must inevitably be ordered to follow the American cruisers to Alaskan waters, in order to give efficient protection—more efficient, it is to be trusted, in the future than it has been in the past—to our Canadian fellow-subjects against outrages justified neither by municipal law nor by treaty obligations. Of course, we need hardly say that considerations both of prudence and of courtesy would restrain British and American officers from doing anything to aggravate the bitterness of the dispute, but it is obviously impossible that naval squadrons enforcing mutually incompatible rights should remain facing each other without exerting a paralysing effect over the conciliatory operations of diplomacy.

"The points in dispute between the British and the American Governments in regard to the rights of seal fishing in Behring's Sea are assuredly not of a character which can be settled by confronting gunboats with gunboats and cruisers with cruisers. That is a method of dealing with territorial controversies which has too often disturbed the peace of the world. We do not know why Mr. Blaine should withdraw from his apparent desire to arrive at a diplomatic settlement of the affair, unless, in some of the underground movements of politics in the States, he has once more been subjected to the pressure of the Irish-American enemies of this country."

Stanley Eulogizes Lord Salisbury.

LONDON, June 19.—Mr. Henry M. Stanley, in replying to the address presented to him at Berwick to-day, took occasion to refer to the recently consummated negotiations between Great Britain and Germany on African territorial affairs. Mr. Stanley unqualifiedly glorified the wisdom of Lord Salisbury, which, in its exercise, had resulted in the addition of 500,000 miles of territory to the British empire. Mr. Stanley said that instead of being called upon to intone a doleful jeremaid, he could cheerfully sing a psalm of praise in honor not only of the happy outcome of the Anglo-German negotiations, but of the premier, who had made the result possible. Continuing, Mr. Stanley said that the realization of the great dream of those who had been, and were, engaged in the work of exploring and civilizing the African continent from the Cape of Good Hope to Cairo, now became a possibility. "God," he added, had given the premier the wisdom to act to this end, and long might he live and flourish."

THE MODERN SHOP WINDOW.

The Present Day Desire for Display in Every Branch of Business, as Well as Life.

The Taste that Should be Cultivated and that which Should be Avoided in Window Dressing.

The ruling desire of the shop keeper nowadays is to catch the public eye as easily and effectively as possible; a desire which finds vent in many ways, as different as they are numerous. The principal, and in reality the best mode is by extensive and judicious advertising, but behind advertising there must be sound judgment, a thorough knowledge of the public taste and what they require. Without this, advertising is as ineffectual as cannonading a fortress with blank cartridge. Unless the public are touched, hit, there will be no good gained by deafening them with sound. So that it can be readily seen that something else must be done to assist advertising; and this something else suggests itself in an ability and taste in displaying wares to the best advantage and in the most enticing manner. An extreme may be reached in either direction; there may be too much display, and there may readily be too little. What is most advantageous is a medium that is not a medium, a profusion that is not satiating to the taste and a sparingness which will rather point to better things in the background than any semblance of limited stock. In no business is the risk of over or under-doing this display so imminent and difficult to avoid as that of the retail dry goods. The multiplicity of colors and the positively innumerable designs at the command of the salesman make his profession a bewildering maze to the uninitiated, commonly called the public. The present age is one of display in every department of life; it manifests itself in all stages and at all points; but perhaps the criteria by which this spirit is actuated is the window dressing of the modern merchant. It has been developed and cultivated till it has reached the acme of perfection and become, not simply an art, but a science. Art is free to roam where fancy wills; science is governed by laws and rules. Take the example cited—the retail dry goods. In this business window dressing has become a department in itself in the large establishments, and even in the small houses one or more persons are delegated to this particular duty. Usually these gentlemen have been trained specially for this, but it more often happens that the possession of taste and a good knowledge of the delicate effect of colors are primary qualifications; indeed they are indispensable. Noticing an extremely well dressed window yesterday, and being struck with the elegance of display, the quiet but sweet harmony of color, and the unquestionable beauty of its tout ensemble, a reporter ventured to enter and enquire for the gentleman who executed the work. He came forward and engaged in conversation with the scribe; the subject under consideration naturally enough falling on window dressing.

"Are you governed by any specific rules in window dressing?" was the first question.

"No; for myself I may say that sometimes I have not the slightest idea what I shall put into the window. Of course, one must be governed by two things, the goods at disposal and one's own taste. For instance, placing fancy goods in too marked contrast to plain ones is bad taste, although in opposite should always be aimed at. One must show up the other, but quietly; and they must not be too far away from each other, or they weaken the effect. Thus you couldn't place a bright pink against a dark green, you must blend the colors. Invariably you must fit up the back ground of your window with light shades, lace curtains or such; dark spoils the effect of the rest of the display, because no reflection is cast and the person outside has to strain the eyes to see what is in the window. Silks and laces make the lightest as well as the richest window, with lace coverlets and open work as dressing. The principal feature with displaying laces is in drapery; a light graceful fall has a beautiful effect. Some people in dressing a window seem to want to show all their goods; this is a mistake, taste and judicious selection are far more advantageous than stuffed, packed and overcrowded windows. Millinery and light goods greatly enhance the beauty of a window.

Summer windows are always prettier and nicer than winter windows, because there is more variety of color to select from; but you can make a very nice window for gaslight display about Christmas when evening dress goods are largely shown.

Not a small loss occurs in this business through the goods fading from exposure. The window, therefore, has to be changed twice and sometimes three times a week, thus throwing a large amount of plotting and planning on the window dresser.

EARLY BACKWOODS SKETCHES.

Mr. Gilbert Parker Interests an Appreciative Audience With Settlers' Lives in Australia and Canada.

The institution of the lecturing platform dates from the birth of railways on this continent, and as each mile of rail was laid, there was placed on the platform an additional lecturer. Some, like Max O'Reil, have become famous; they have struck out in entirely new channels and soon their ideas became so peculiarly their own that anyone who touched on anything even similar was at once detected in any part of the world and branded as a plagiarist. But there is a somewhat older institution, of which the "lecturer" is a modern type, and that is the reciter. The former is generally a man who takes a railroad trip or a steamboat journey, and on his return, gives a "lecture." Even in this many men of keen observing powers have made fame. The latter "recites" works by well-known authors as a rule, but sometimes his own. Mr. Gilbert Parker must be classed among reciters, and popular reciters are few. The public taste is not in their direction; the liking for them is generally, perhaps exclusively, confined to the literary circle to be found in most communities. It was, therefore, not a matter for considerable wonder when a not very large audience greeted Mr. Parker last evening in the lecture hall of St. Andrew's Church. He told "stories" of Canadian and Australian life; some were good, but none original, either in the idea or the telling. An audience likes to know its lecturer or something about him, otherwise half the time is lost in getting "in touch" with the speaker. Mr. Parker was not introduced; therein he was at a disadvantage. His first "story" was one of the Canadian backwoods, which was not interesting; neither was the second, which was about a "sugar off;" both were well told, as far as the material would allow, although a great deal of Mr. Parker's powerful declamatory efforts seemed to be misplaced. In the third "story" he recited a tale branching from a man with a poor opinion of Canada on to a love story of a "rebel." There was no connection between the two, but the first led into a really pathetic story, told with considerable pathos and moving power, and its recital won the genuine applause it fully deserved.

The next was an episode of Australian life, rather true to nature for the woods of that far-off land are the homes of many a lonely heart, with a secret story of sorrow and sadness. In this effort the reciter rose to a considerable height, he moved his audience, but the interest flagged when the scene of the tale was brought over to England. Why was the conclusion not kept in the southern continent; an audience is mentally disturbed when it has to travel mentally with its subject except in the case of stereoptican views, where the mind and eyes are at once caught. However, Mr. Parker scored in this and the following recital, no small success.

The last story was that of "Adam Henry's Fiddle," another backwoods sketch. Who ever has heard the old recitation of a farmer's account of Rubinstein at the piano, in which his marvellous powers are so stirringly and graphically told, will have small difficulty in recognising the striking similarity between the two. Mr. Parker's is just the same, admirably told 'tis true, but adapted to shanty life, with some domestic coloring and somewhat more romance and pathos. Mr. Parker may have been unhappy in his choice of subjects, for he gave evidence of better powers with better material.

FRIGHTFUL ACCIDENT.

The Four Year Old Daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Archibald Burned to Death at Kamloops.

On Friday afternoon between 2 and 3 o'clock, Annetta, the four year old daughter of of Mr. and Mrs. Atchibald was playing with her brother on the vacant lot in rear of Mr. A. McGregor's residence on Abbott street, Kamloops, when her screams arrested the attention of parties in the neighborhood. On going to her she was found enveloped in flames, her clothing being on fire. As quickly as possible the flames were subdued and the clothing removed, when it was found the little one was terribly burned, the flesh in some places falling off with the clothes. One side of the face, a spot on the shoulder, and the feet were the only portions not burned. Dr. Furrer was at the house shortly after the accident, but found the case a hopeless one for recovery, the only thing that could be done being to relieve as much as possible the intense suffering of the little one. The child lingered in terrible agony until 6.30 p. m., when death came as a welcome relief. She was conscious up to within a few minutes of the end, and it is impossible to convey in words any idea of the pain and agony she endured.

The origin of the accident is not positively known, but the little brother who was with her says she was playing with matches and had some paper on her lap which she set fire to, and then her clothing took fire.

The shock is a severe one to the parents, and the heartfelt sympathy of the whole community goes out to them in their terrible and sad bereavement.—Kamloops Sentinel.

AN AVIARY OF RARE AVES.

Sunday's Police Collections—Monday's Payments and Punishments at the Police Court.

When the mists of Sunday night had cleared away, and the sun of Monday morning was near its zenith, the portals of the city police court were opened to the public. The dock was full of a cosmopolitan collection; it was an aviary of uncommonly dirty birds of still dirtier plumage. Mary, a very unbenevolent looking klootchman, occupied the seat of honor at the top, and her companion, a Siwash almost as dirty, sat a respectful distance from her and smiled apologetically to the court for the company he was in. She had been found with a bottle, or part of a bottle, of genuine "square face." That which was missing out of the bottle had gone behind her own square face. Hence her gracious presence in the court. She had invested all her available capital in the liquid, and being, consequently, unable to meet the law's demand for $5, she consented to ruralize on Topaz avenue for the space of one month. The parting between her and the Siwash aforesaid, Jimmy, was not pathetic; on the contrary, he paid five dollars and declined the cordial invitation to go into retirement. The best of friends must part, and two of these rare aves having flown, there were only four left. Sam Gerber and J. Smith made the usual deposit, and went their respective ways, thus leaving the cage to William Kelley and John Welsh. The charge was drunkenness and fighting on the street, thereby obstructing the public traffic. Developments showed that it was a case of amicably getting drunk together, afterwards getting into a decidedly un-amicable embrace and violently caressing each other with closed fists. Both appeared with very palpable marks of the fray; Kelly scarred with many scars, and looking like Boston's Big 'Un on a medified scale, Welsh like a prize fighter's bottle holder who had accidentally come in for a few stray left handers. Time, five dollars each, for first and last round.

THE POPE AND HIS PENCE.

The Pope is, it appears, greatly disgusted with the report his treasurer makes him of "Peter's Pence" during the last year. Austria sent only £16,000, Spain only £8,000, France only £12,800, Germany, £7,200, Ireland, (how is this for a poor country!), £6,000, England, £3,800, Belgium, £6,200, Switzerland, £2,200, Poland, £3,400, North America, £7,400, South America, £12,400, Africa, £3,800, Asia, £4,000, Roumania, £4,000, Italy, £14,200, Portugal, £6,000. Other sums, making up £24,000, were collected in Australia, Oceanica, Russia, Sweden, Norway, &c. The whole sum received was about £120,000, being less by £6,000 than was received in 1888. The European States which contributed nothing to "Peter's Pence" were Turkey, Montenegro, Greece and Servia. Leo XIII. regards this falling off with the very greatest concern, for he argues, (and justly enough) that if this sort of thing begins there is no telling when it will end, and even a paltry £6,000 is, of course, a consideration to the Vicar of Christ. It must not, however, for one moment be imagined that "Peter's Pence" is all the Holy Father has to go on with, nor, indeed, all that is sent to him yearly. Probably no other man living receives such very important presents in money in the course of twelve months as does the Pontifex Maximus—very many of them anonymous, but most of them accompanied by a name and address and supplication for a blessing.