# The Colonist.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1891.

## RUSSIA'S MORAL CONDITION.

E. B. Lanin, in the October number of the Fortnightly Review, draws a dreadful picture of the demoralization of Russia. He asserts that the moral condition of the people of Russia is exceedingly low, and maintains that the Government, by its oppressive methods, is doing what it can to make it lower still. It is, if he tells the truth, literally grinding the souls out of the people. The Russian Government, while it takes the spirit out of the people, takes no care of their bodies. They are so impoverished by the taxation of the Government that their bodily development is retarded and they are becoming, physically, a degenerate race. They are kept so poor that they do not get enough to eat. Their haunts are such that the most dreadful diseases are common among them, and drunkenness is not only not forbidden by the authorities, but actually encouraged. Whether the people are able or not, they must pay the taxes. If they are starving they must find money for the tax-gatherer. If misfortune has overtaken them they must scrape enough out of the wreck of their belongings to satisfy the Government, or suffer the most cruel punishment. Here is a passage from Lanin's article:

"No private misfortune or national calamity seems successfully to appeal for ruth or indulgence to a body which possesses no soul and knows no pity. The sun may refuse for weeks to give its heat, the rain may not moisten the soil till the grass is brown and the crops burnt up, water and fire may destroy whole villages and impoverish tens of thousands of inhabitants; but, in spite of it all, the victims are expected to have their taxes ready, as if gold sprang into existence at their touch. In one district, the misfortunes caused by a failure of the crops were intensified by the ravages of fire which destroyed several villages; and the peasants, abandoned—as it seemed to them—by God, turned to their rulers, not for help, but for human sympathy. Dives in hell had a better chance of being heard when he begged Lazarus to give him a few drops of water to moisten his tongue. The village Elder, inexorable as Fate, came and insisted on being paid to the last farthing. The trembling peasants sold everything saleable in order to scrape together the needful sums, and the taxes were duly collected in all the villages but two, in which there was nothing left to sell. But not even a metaphysical impossibility serms to count in Russia when it is a ques-tion of gathering money into the State coffers. *More than fifty peasants were taken and flogged and then sent to prison.* This happened so very lately that their backs may still be smarting."

It may be said that this must have been the isolated act of some brutal village tyrant, and done not only without the sanction, but contrary to the instructions of his official superiors. It may be supposed that when the incredibly cruel conduct of this Elder became known to those higher in authority, he was called to account and punished for his abominable abuse of power. What happened? The conduct of this Elder was reported to his superiors, and he was arrested and imprisoned, but not for his heartless barbarity, but for "*undue leniency and neglect of duty*," or in the language of their report, "*for lack of zeal.*" He did not send to the Treasury as much money as was expected, and the authorities would make no allowances. The miserable man knew this when he turned a deaf ear to the prayers of the starving peasants; experience had told him that mercy in such cases was, in the eyes of the authorities, a crime for which there was no forgiveness.

The Russians are great drunkards. This is not to be wondered at, when to get drunk is one of the ways that the Russian has of showing his loyalty. The Government has a direct interest in the consumption of ardent spirits. The more that is sold the greater the revenue, and the officials take good care that as large a quantity as possible is consumed. This is part of what Lanin says on this subject:

"So true is it that drunkenness is in Russia the beginning and the end of everything that, as Leskoff remarks, the peasant cannot even pray to God without getting intoxicated. The authorities make no secret of their conviction, that the present political fabric is dependent for its existence on the continuance of this fell disease, nor of their determination to foster and develop it. Whenever a peasant community manifests an inclination to grow sober, it is regarded and treated as a disaffected crew. A governmental organ of the press publishes the following question put to his superior by a superintendent of the rural police, whose *naivete* was more apparent than his knowledge of the system he was administering: "Here in our district sobriety is raging like an epidemic among the common people. The publicans are complaining of small profits and severe losses. Now what's to be done. Am I to treat this sobriety movement as I should the spread of a pernicious religious sect, such as the Eunuchs? or to welcome it as a blessing to the Fatherland? The reply of the *isprawnik*, well versed in the ways of governing, was equally characteristic: 'You just think the matter over for a few minutes and you can't fail to see the solution.'"

The following is another paragraph showing how successful the Imperial policy of encouraging the sale of strong drink had been in the dominions of the Czar:

"The complete success of this selfish policy is writ large in all departments of public life; halt the soldiers in a regiment lie down in the ditches while on a march against the enemy; the cultured artist makes his bow to an appreciative public and drops down helpless on the floor, while the audience, learning that he is dead drunk, humanely sympathises with him and goes quietly home for the night; the priest appears in church to intercede for his people, as Moses of old, before the Lord, but can only hurl his thick tongued mumblings with hoarse, drunken voice up to the throne of the Almighty in Heaven, while poisoning the atmosphere breathed by his fellow mortals on earth. The judge, on the bench, the professor in his chair, the policeman arresting the drunken man, occasionally become living illustrations of the depth to which this moral disease has eaten into the national constitution."

There are in the article many passages showing that immorality of the grossest kind is tolerated by society in Russia, and something more than winked at by the Government. The virtue in Russia, which covers a multitude of sins, is loyalty to the Czar, and the sin for which there is no forgiveness is disaffection to the Government. The student who lives a "fast" life, if orthodox as regards religion and loyalty, is petted by the professors, and the path of even scholastic distinction is made easy for him, while the youth, no matter how talented he may be, or how studious or how pure his life, if he is even suspected of being liberal in his political views, is always on the verge of expulsion, and the slightest indiscretion exposes him to punishment as a political offender.

It is said that Lanin exaggerates, and that his pictures of Russia are very far from being true to life. If this is the case, why is he not exposed? If the facts that he adduces in support of his statements are not facts at all, but mere falsifications, nothing can be easier than to show that he is endeavoring to support a false theory by manufactured testimony. And if his statements can be disproved this would very soon be done, for the Czar has in his service legion of ready writers who would gladly hold Lanin up to the civilized world as a liar and a slanderer, if only they could do so in a way calculated to convince intelligent and enquiring men. But this is where the difficulty is. The ignorant and the credulous would give them no trouble, but there is in these days in every country, a class of able and intelligent men who can be neither bullied nor bought, who are ready to fearlessly examine and mercilessly criticise any statement or argument that may be presented to them in defence of tyranny or in palliation of oppression. If E. B. Lanin could be discredited he would have been discredited long ago.

## THE AMENITIES OF THE BENCH.

We are surprised not to be able to find in the Mainland newspapers a prompt and emphatic denial of the statements made by our Westminster correspondent respecting the way in which Chief Justice Begbie addressed the jury and the prisoner in the Greer case. We find that the same telegram was sent to the Sound papers, for we see it reproduced word for word in the Seattle Telegraph. It is not pleasant to see a British Columbia judge placed before the American public in such a light. We Canadians are proud of our judges. We maintain that they are gentlemen who invariably perform their duties, not only impartially and with ability, but with dignity and courtesy. But, when a judge roars at a jury and calls them uncomplimentary names because the verdict which they have brought in is not correct in a legal sense, he proves that there is at least one judge on the Dominion Bench that Canadians cannot speak of in such high terms. The conduct attributed to Sir Matthew Begbie by that wretched reporter would be unseemly in one of the elected judges of the United States, who appears on the bench in his shirt sleeves, with a cigar in his mouth and who listens to the arguments of counsel and the testimony of witnesses in an attitude in which comfort is considered more than either grace or dignity. If one of these judges of the rude and uncouth democracy roared at a jury and scolded a prisoner, he would only be acting in character. Nothing better could be expected of him. But that a venerable British Judge, in gown and wig, should violate the decencies and amenities of the Bench, in this way, seems to us altogether incredible. Sir Matthew Begbie must have been misrepresented.

There were circumstances which made the duty of the jurymen particularly difficult in this case, and which demanded some little consideration and sympathy from even the Chief Justice himself. "Sam Greer," as he is called, is an old-timer, and old-timers are looked upon with peculiar indulgence in British Columbia—and properly so. He has been for some considerable time down in his luck. People generally, to their credit be it said, sympathise with the unfortunate, and they are not prone to enquire too closely into the cause of their misfortunes. This is another good trait. Greer is a man with a grievance. He considers that he has been robbed and ill-used, and unjustly treated in many ways. What he regards as injustice has rankled in his mind until it has made of him what people calls "crank." Reasonable on all other subjects he, when he comes to talk about his grievance, is most unreasonable. It was in defending what he believes to be his just rights that he committed the crime for which he was being tried. We do not say that Greer is insane or that he is not responsible for what he does with respect to the property he claimed. As every one knows, a man may be very far astray without being actually insane. He may become possessed by an idea which may cloud his mind, or he may cherish strong and invincible prejudices which may unconsciously warp his judgment and affect his conduct. Sensible and sympathetic men will treat people of this kind with gentleness and consideration. They are apt to think that, whatever they may do or say in connection with the subject that excites them, they are more to be pitied than blamed. It was, we are satisfied, by a feeling something like this that the jury were actuated when they recommended Greer to mercy. We are free to admit that they may have been logically and legally wrong, but their error was one that leaned so far to virtue's side that the Chief Justice might have regarded it with toleration, if not with sympathy. We are quite sure that the public feel for, and with, that jury, and can understand how it was that they could not readily give His Lordship a reason for their recommendation to mercy. It may appear very strange, indeed, to Chief Justice Begbie, but it is quite certain that people generally approve what was done by the illogical but kind-hearted jury, while they feel indignant at the treatment which those twelve conscientious men received at his hands—that is, if his language and his manner were such as are reported. Juries in these days are composed of men who possess both intelligence and self-respect. They know that they are free men, and are entitled when in the performance of their duty to consideration and courtesy from the judges on the bench. It is, therefore, not to be expected that they will submit, without protest, to be insulted and chidden like school boys, even by Sir Matthew Baillie Begbie, Chief Justice.

## WANTED.

Boss Buckley may not, after all, find Montreal a safe retreat. The San Francisco Grand Jury are after him with a sharp stick, and they will perhaps overtake him if he does not take care. The offence for which he is indicted is bribing street supervisors in the matter of granting a street railway company the franchise it sought. There appears to be some doubt as to whether this is, under the treaty, an extraditable offence. It is feared that the crime of bribing officials is not on the list, and there is talk of getting the Governor of California to make an application to the Canadian authorities for the boss's surrender, whether his offence is an extraditable one or not. We hope that the crime of which Boss Buckley is accused, and for which he is indicted, is an extraditable one, for we are inclined to believe that if it is not included in the treaty list, the champion corruptionist of California will not get his deserts as soon as the friends of honest government in both countries would like. The Canadian Government is not likely to give up any one who has taken refuge in Canadian territory without a legal warrant for so doing. Giving up Boss Buckley might be quoted as a precedent when the surrender of some offender to whom the privilege of asylum ought to be extended is demanded.

## INCONSISTENT POLITICIANS.

The advocates of unrestricted reciprocity in trade with the United States pride themselves on their liberal views with respect to matters of trade. Many of them wish to be considered free-traders, and they condemn the national policy of the Dominion because it is avowedly protectionist. Yet these Canadian free-traders would have their country adopt the tariff of the most exclusively protectionist nation in the whole world.

No one now has the hardihood to deny that unrestricted reciprocity between Canada and the United States means the adoption by Canada of the United States tariff. That tariff is greatly more protectionist than the national policy tariff which the advocates of unrestricted reciprocity, on this side of the line, condemn because it is protectionist. The American duties on many manufactured articles are so high as to be almost prohibitory. For instance, in Canada the duty on boots and shoes is 23 per cent. This is found to be quite sufficient for the purpose of protection. In the States it is 35 per cent. Ready-made clothing in Canada is protected by a duty of 10 cents per pound, and 25 per cent. *ad valorem*; the United States duty is 50 cents on the pound, and 50 per cent. *ad valorem*. The duty on gloves in Canada is 30 per cent., in the United States it is 50 per cent., or $1.75 to $3.50 per dozen. Cotton shirts in this country are protected by a duty of 35 per cent.; across the line the duty on the same articles is 55 per cent. The duty on nails and spikes is by the Canadian tariff 1½ cents per pound; in the McKinley tariff they are set down at 4 cents a pound. Saws are protected here by a duty of 30 per cent.; there the duty is 40 per cent. Manufacturers of glass in Canada are protected by a duty of from 20 to 30 per cent.; in the States the duty is from 40 to 60 per cent. It is estimated that the average duty in Canada is 30 per cent., while in the United States it is over 60 per cent.

If, as Canadian Liberals contend, Canadian protection is bad, then United States protection is twice as bad, yet they are prepared to exchange the light protective tariff of Canada for the heavy protective tariff of the United States. They cannot say with truth that the advantages of interstate free trade are so great that the Americans do not consider their high tariff burdensome. They do find it hard to bear. People in the States complain bitterly of the weight of federal taxation. So much is this the case that the tariff is now the issue between the two great parties, and if the people were permitted to express their wishes freely they would soon throw off the yoke of the McKinley tariff. But they are not free to vote as their judgment dictates. The protected interests of the States possess and exercise over the electorate tremendous power. Rings, and syndicates and trusts, and plutocrats, united, form a combination, which it is almost impossible for the moneyless classes to resist. That combination by bribery of many kinds and by intimidation in a thousand forms, influences the elections. It is rich enough, if the exigency requires it, to buy up whole States. And the electors who are supposed to be free and independent can be swayed by the corrupt and demoralizing influence of this powerful and tyrannous combination.

If the Canadians united commercially with the Americans, if they adopted their protective system, they would come under the yoke of this plutocracy which honest free traders, on the American side of the border, find to be so galling, and from which they are struggling with might and main to free themselves. Yet Liberal freetraders, who are so glaringly inconsistent, and so false to the principles which they profess to hold, expect their fellow countrymen to respect them and to aid them in placing on the shoulders of Canadians a burden which a very large proportion of the people of the United States find themselves unable to bear. There are thousands of American citizens who envy Canadians their freedom from the tyranny of the syndicates, yet our own countrymen are trying to persuade us to place our necks under their yoke.

No true Liberal, no man who is honestly a freetrader, can consistently advocate unrestricted free trade with the United States, for the reason that before such a relation can be established Canada must consent to place itself under a system of the most rigid protection, which, so far as can be seen, will become still more rigidly protectionist before the time for successful revolt arrives.

## SOMETHING IN A NAME.

What are we to call the two parties who are now contending for supremacy in Brazil? Are we to consider Fonseca and those who are fighting on his side as "the Government;" and must we stigmatize those who resist his authority as "rebels?" Or should we look upon the military dictator as an usurper, and speak of those who are in arms against him as patriots? We frankly confess that we feel disposed to take the latter course. During the Chilian civil war the want of names by which the contending parties could be properly designated was much needed. Great injustice was done to men who were fighting for freedom when they were stigmatized—as was generally done at the beginning of the struggle—as rebels. They were not rebels any more than Hampden and the host of heroic Englishmen who resisted the unlawful authority of King Charles I. were rebels. They were fighting for the constitutional rights of which Balmaceda sought to deprive them by force. They were on the side of true liberty, and were entitled to the sympathy, and, at least, the moral support of all lovers of freedom everywhere. They, as patriots and as champions of the cause, not of the people of Chili alone, but of all peoples in all countries, had, in a sense, a right to demand that much. But they did not get it. Men who had obtained the freedom which they declare is dearer to them than life itself, at the cost of the life's blood of thousands of patriotic self-sacrificing heroes, looked on while the Chilian patriots were struggling against an usurper for the same freedom, with cold-blooded indifference, some of them, indeed, feeling inclined to give their support to the cause of the tyrant. This treachery to the cause of freedom filled some of the beholders with amazement. They could not account for the degeneracy which they found where it was least expected.

Will the same mistake be made by the observers of the struggle in Brazil? Will men who are proud to call themselves free, be ready to extend their moral support to the man who is endeavoring by brute force to destroy free institutions in Brazil—the man who has already treated the representatives of the people with contempt, and assumed an authority which the constitution he has sworn to uphold does not give him, and will they speak with reprehension and contempt of the men who are risking their lives and sacrificing much that is dear to them to regain the liberty and the constitutional privileges that have been wrested from them? Men of the Anglo-Saxon race profess to hold in honor the men who fought and suffered for their liberties, will they treat with contempt the men who are fighting and suffering in the same way for the same liberties?

Little is as yet known of the struggle in Brazil. The world at large is ignorant of the circumstances that brought about the present crisis. Indeed, they do not seem to be very well known to the Brazilians themselves. But we do know that the constitutional President has assumed the supreme power, and that part of the people are fighting for the rights of which they have been deprived. Should not men who are free themselves, and who prize their rights as free men highly, sympathize with those who have taken up arms for the restoration of constitutional freedom, rather than with the man who, setting at naught all constitutional checks and restraints, and disregarding all his obligations as a servant of the people and as a citizen of a free country, has robbed the people of Brazil of their powers and privileges. To treat him as if he were a constitutional ruler, and to set those who withstood his usurped authority down as rebels, is, in our opinion, treason against popular liberty.

## AN OLD QUESTION.

It is amusing to observe how old questions crop up every now and then, and how men, at different times and in different places, arrive at precisely the same conclusions with regard to them. The question of corporal punishment in schools has been warmly and earnestly discussed in every country in which schools are established. The conclusion which has been arrived at in most places is that corporal punishment should be resorted to seldom, but that the teacher must have it in reserve to be used when all other means of maintaining discipline and securing obedience have failed.

The principals of the schools of San Francisco met, the other day, once more to talk about this much-discussed subject. There was among them the usual diversity of opinion. Some advocated the total abolition of corporal punishment in the schools, declaring that the teacher who resorted to it, confessed his inability to do his work in a legitimate way and by humane means. There were others who thought that the rod or the strap is a good medicine, but that it should be seldom administered, and in small doses. There were, too, the old-fashioned disciplinarians who maintained that flogging is necessary, and that it is both more wholesome and more humane than many of the punishments inflicted by those who boast that they can maintain order without the use of the rod.

The abolitionists seemed to be nowhere in this meeting of pedagogues. The question was at last between those who held that punishment should be administered on the hand alone with a strap, and those who contended that the teacher should be at liberty to lay on the strap where it hurt the most. When the question came to a vote it was found that the party which gave the teacher the widest range of discretion had the majority.

## FINANCIAL AND COMMERCIAL.

New York, Nov. 18.—Money closed at 3 cents, the lowest rate. The highest was 4. Exchange closed quiet, posted rates 4.81½ to 4.84½; actual rates, 4.80¼ to 4.80½ for sixty days, and 4.83½ to 4.82¾ for demand. Governments closed steady, currency, sixes, 111 bid; fours coupons, 116½ bid; extended twos registered, 99½ bid. Pacific R. R. bonds closed as follows: Union firsts, 107¾ bid; Union sinking funds, 105½; Centrals, 106¾ bid. There was decidedly more animation on the stock exchange this morning, over double the amount of business having been done as during the same hours of yesterday. Up to noon 139,100 shares had been sold. Prices were strong throughout, and, under the lead of the stocks named, an advance of ½ to 1½ per cent. had been established by midday. St. Paul was firm on heavy gains in gross earnings for the second week of the current month; but, as a matter of fact, all the other granger shares were even stronger than St. Paul. During the afternoon there was less doing, and in some of the list realizations caused a reaction before the close, but the majority of stocks continued strong and closed at, or near, the highest prices of the day. The improvement on yesterday's prices ranged from ⅛ to 2 per cent., and in some cases even greater advance was noted. The sales of the day amounted to 253,059 shares.

Closing prices: Pacific Mail, 36½; Western Union Telegraph, 81½; Northern Pacific, 25½; Canadian Pacific, 69¾; Oregon Improvement, 86½; Oregon Improvement bonds, 76½; Union Pacific, 50; Missouri Pacific, 101¾; Oregon Navigation, 15½; Central Pacific, 78; Texas Pacific, 31; Manitoba, 110; Fargo Express, 112; bar silver, 16¼; Commercial cable, 139½.

New York, Nov. 18.—Flour fairly active. Wheat—options opened strong and slightly higher on firmer cables and also on account of despatches from abroad stating that Russia would take immediate steps towards prohibiting wheat exports. There was little trading for foreign account, and in a short time the advance was lost. The market then became dull; but late in the afternoon strengthened on reports that a Russian prohibitory ukase had been issued, and on higher prices abroad. Prices closed at ⅜ @ ⅝ cent higher. Spot lots closed strong and ½ higher. Spot sales of No. 2 Red Winter at 108c.; No. 2 Red Winter Nov. 108¼; do. Dec. 107; do. Jan. 105; do. Feb. 110¾. Sugar, raw, slow, but firm. 89 test muscovado 3 1-16c.; 96 test centrifugal 3 7-16c.; refined more active and slightly higher; powdered, 4⅛c.; granulated, 4 5-16c.; cubes, 4⅜c.; mould "A," 4⅝c.; confectioners "A," 4 1-16c. Coffee, spot lots dull; fair Rio, cargoes, 16½c.; futures closed lower; Rio or Santos: November, $12.75; December, $12.75; January, $12.70. Hops, firm, Pacific Coast, 1891, choice, 20c. to 21c.; fair to prime, 15c. to 18c.; 1890, 12c. to 16c., common to choice. In London holders offer sparingly. Petroleum closed 59¾. Tin unsettled, closing dull but steady; straits spot, $19.75; Feb. $19.80. Copper, nominal; lake, Nov. $11.55 asked. Lead dull, but stronger; domestic, spot, $4.25; spelter, unchanged.

Chicago, Nov. 18.—Cattle receipts, 14,000; market steady; shipping steers, $3 to $6.40; bakers, $1.50 to $3.50; cows and bulls, $1 to $3; Texans, $1.25 to $3.25 Hogs, receipts, 55,000; market weak and 10 cents lower; mixed and medium, $3.70 to $3.90; light, $3.25 to $3.75. Sheep receipts, 6,000; market firm; poor to extra, $2.25 to $5.25; lambs, $3.25 to $3.75.

Vienna, Nov. 18.—Unfavorable advices from abroad caused the Bourse, to-day, to be dull and weak. The market, however, closed steady. Home funds fell ¾ to 1 per cent. Lombardo Venetian Railway and Anglo-Austrian bank shares declined 2 florins and Credit Anstalt 4 florins.

Frankfort, Nov. 18.—The bourse, to-day, was very depressed but closed steadily. All foreign Government securities show a decline in value.

### SALE OF HOPS.

New York, Nov. 17.—Reports from the Coast state that 2,250 bales of Seattle hops, Grower's Association stock, have been purchased at 16 cents per pound there. The block, it is understood, was taken for export. In the local markets 20 cents was bid for a good-sized lot of Pacifics to arrive, or an advance of one cent upon the prices at which similar goods were sold, last week

## ENGLISH AND IRISH IMMIGRANTS IN BRAZIL.

(Rio Janeiro News, June 23rd, 1891.)

Of the English and Irish immigrants who have arrived here in February last, many have already come to grief. They were sent up to San Paulo, where the majority of them still remain; but some have found their way back to this city, a considerable number have gone to Parana, and for a time a large number were living a life of vagabondage in the streets of Santos. There are a dozen or so still there, without means and without employment, and subscriptions are being solicited to send one poor woman back home. Of those who came back to Rio, one case deserves particular mention. Not a month ago two married couples—one English and the other Irish—returned to this city, and appeared to have made a great part of the journey on foot. They arrived here in a state of extreme destitution and exhaustion, and found shelter only through the benevolence of a stranger. The two men obtained work, but both soon took fever and died. The Englishwoman also died, more from destitution perhaps than fever, and left a half-starved little girl two or three years old to the charity of strangers. The other woman escaped the fever, but is extremely poor and in a delicate condition, and will eventually be sent back home. This is perhaps no worse than many other cases which have happened, but it shows what the English emigrant may expect in a country so different in every respect from what he has been accustomed to. All these people complain of the deceptions practiced to induce them to emigrate, while some of them complain of deliberate swindles, which ought to be exposed and punished. One of these appears to be the sale of tickets to interior localities, which are found to be worthless on their arrival here. There are no inducements whatever in Brazil for farm and unskilled laborers, and the more thoroughly that fact is advertised the better.

## AMENITIES OF THE BENCH.

To the Editor:—I have read, not without surprise, your leading article this morning upon the "Amenities of the Bench." Your sympathies seem to be altogether with Greer and against the judge. As to the conduct of the judge—which you criticise so severely—you appear to have obtained your information solely from a brief, and evidently prejudiced, telegraphic despatch, whereas, had you taken the trouble to read the newspapers published in New Westminster, you would have seen there was nothing to justify the language employed in the telegram. You seem to have altogether overlooked the circumstance which occasioned the remarks of judge to the jury, and caused him to send the them back. You speak in terms of praise of the composition of that jury, but surely the average juryman must know that what they brought in as a verdict was no verdict at all, and could not possibly be accepted by the judge. You say, "We are quite sure the public feel for, and with, that jury," and I conclude from the tone of the article that your sympathies go in the same direction. If you knew half as much about Greer, his life and so-called grievance in connection with the land which led up to the present crisis in his life, as Chief Justice Begbie does—and as many others in the province do—I think you would treat the subject very differently. It is well known that Greer has sold several hundred lots of the land on English Bay, to which he has not the shadow of a claim either in law or equity, on the following conditions: $10 down, $20 on receipt of title deed. May not the sale of these lots account for the sympathy for Greer found in certain quarters? To change the subject: I once read a story of an American frontier settler, who, having stolen a quantity of bacon, was tried, and obtained an acquittal at the hands of the jury, every one of whom had eaten of the bacon.

In the British Columbian newspaper, published in New Westminster, will be found a very full report of the proceedings in this case. May I ask you to print the remarks of the Chief Justice in pronouncing sentence as reported in that paper, and hereto appended.

A Believer in British Justice.

His Lordship, in pronouncing sentence, spoke as follows: The circumstances of your life, as far as its contact with me is concerned, began at Chilliwhack nine years ago, when you appeared in court before me. I was warned then of what a vile man you were, and as I had the reputation then, which was somewhat undeserved, of being a hard man, a great many people came to see the meeting between two such celebrated men. I was then very much impressed with you as being one of the worst men I had ever met, and I have never had reason since to change my opinion. Shortly after that meeting you took up that land, to which the title was a forgery, and to which you never had the shadow of a claim. The case has been taken before two committees of the Legislature, and both of them settled that you had no claim to it whatever. Every judge who has enquired into the merits of the case has utterly discarded your claim as utterly against justice or common sense. Though on one or two occasions you have succeeded in resisting the sheriffs, or rather they failed to eject you from the land, your claim, founded as it is upon perjury and disgrace, is utterly untenable. Even a commissioner appointed by the Dominion Government to look into your claim found that it was utterly unfounded. The last time you came before the Court you had the impudence to sell the land, to which the title was a forgery, to innocent, unsuspecting people. It was as complete a swindle as ever took place, and the auctioneer refused to sell any more of the land for fear of incriminating himself. It was a rascally piece of work, and you and the auctioneer had a quarrel about the proceeds of that sale. Your career has been one of crime from the time that I first met you, and it will be necessary to put a stop to such a course. It would have been well for you if, at Chilliwhack, you had been locked up and prevented from pursuing such a career of crime as you have led. The full punishment of the statute is three years' imprisonment. In consideration of the recommendation of the jury, I will knock off nine months, but for the twenty-seven months you must be in the penitentiary and cease from troubling, and there I hope that your mind will turn to the consideration of better things. In your life and conduct hitherto, I have not seen a particle of common sense. Remove the prisoner.—Westminster Columbian.

## ASTRONOMICAL.

To the Editor:—I see in your edition of yesterday a paragraph given to our supposed nearest stellar neighbor "Alpha Centauri," which you described as a comparatively insignificant star. For the benefit of your readers, the majority of whom have never seen the bright stars of the constellation of "Centaurus," nor probably never will, as its great southern declination places it out of the ken of anyone living north of the Tropic of Cancer, I must tell you that "Centaurus" is as familiar a constellation to our Australian and Cape colonies as "Ursa Major" is to us living in northern climes, and "Alpha Centauri" placed in the imaginary right fore foot of the "Centaur" is as much a star of the first magnitude as "Sirius," in fact, in latitude 40 deg. south, I believe it appears brighter. Mr. Dunkin, of the Royal University, Greenwich, England, describes the constellation as being the most brilliant of the Southern hemisphere, and states that "Alpha" and "Beta Centauri" contribute principally to its brilliancy. "Alpha C.," of course, stand first and is like "Castor" in "Gemini," a binary, or double star; it was first discovered to be such by the French traveller, M. Louis Feuillee, when in Chili, in 1709. It is also the only fixed star to which astronomers have been able to determine parallax in altitude, from which has been deducted its approximate distance from the earth. The sun is calculated to be some ninety-two millions of miles from us; that distance multiplied by 200,000 will give the distance away of "Alpha Centauri." A ray of light emitted from it will take three years to reach us, and, travelling through space at the rate of 67 miles an hour, it would take thirty-five millions of years to cover the distance between us. Dr. Wollaston has reckoned that if the Sun and "Alpha Centauri" were equi-distant from us, the intensity of its light would eclipse that of the sun some two and a half times. Such, Sir, are some of the facts about this "comparatively insignificant star."

M. J. Knight.

## THE CAUCUS.

To the Editor:—"A Ratepayer" who airs his views in Monday's Times, says that "The recalcitrant trustees were appointed to perform certain duties and trusts; they have been doing this, and because they do not agree with Mr. Hayward they must not bring their difficulty before the gentlemen who appointed them." The recalcitrant trustees were appointed to co operate with four others to perform the duties of school trustees according to law. They formed themselves into a caucus or faction in order to be able to do the business without consulting three of their number, and a nice mess they made of it! I ask any intelligent or honest man if it was fair, or was it carrying out the intention of the law for four of the trustees to form themselves into a faction, doing their business in secret, and depriving the schools of the intelligence and experience of three of their number? For my part I look upon it as both a mean and an immoral way of proceeding.

The City Council, when they appointed Mr. Hayward chairman of the Board, did not intend that the other three city appointees should combine to nullify their action by doing the business of the Board behind his back, and treating him as if he did not exist; I am very sure that when the Government appointed Mr. Jessop they intended that he should act in concert with their other two nominees. They did not for a moment suppose that he would combine with other trustees to set them aside. The Government never could have believed that the ability of three men was packed up somewhere in Mr. Jessop's head. I have no doubt the poor old man was beguiled by his cunning colleagues, and that he did not realize the unfair and improper part he was acting in becoming the life and soul of the little faction.

My own opinion is, that by the very act of forming their little contemptible caucus the four trustees composing it showed that they are unfit to act with other men in any capacity.

It is not surprising that the cunning four had not brains enough among them to interpret a simple section of the law according to common sense. They had not sufficient discernment to see that they could not, under a law, which made provision for only seven assistant teachers, add to those seven two more, for this is precisely what they did by that precious resolution, which by Mr. Hayward's promptness and prudence was not allowed to go into effect. Men who cannot see that nine is not more than seven have no business on a Board of Trustees, and they should keep from exposing their stupidity by writing letters to the newspapers. Downright Dunstable.

## THE EVANGELISTS.

### Revs. Crossley and Hunter to Begin Work on Sunday.

The following are brief sketches of the two evangelists, Messrs. Crossley and Hunter, who open a campaign in Victoria against the powers of evil on Sunday next:

Rev. H. T. Crossley.

Mr. Crossley is a Canadian of English-Irish descent. He was converted at the age of seventeen and united with the Methodist church. Having received a first class certificate at the Normal School he was engaged in teaching for four years, during which time he exercised his gifts as a local preacher. Called to enter the ministry, he began his work at Weston, and subsequently entered Victoria University, intending to graduate in arts, but was called away from the college to become the President's assistant at St. Catharines. From St. Catharines he went to Hamilton, where he spent three years in successful labors, not only doing the work on his own circuit, but assisting neighboring ministers in revival work. After spending a year in Brantford by permission of his conference, he gave up his pastoral work to devote all his time and energies to the work of an evangelist.

Rev. J. E. Hunter.

Rev. J. E. Hunter is of Irish parentage, and was born near Bowmanville, July 29th, 1856. He gave his heart to God at the early age of 15, and at 19 was a candidate for the ministry, dividing the four years of his probation between Victoria College and the active work. After his ordination he labored on the Waterdown and Ancaster circuits, where extensive revivals followed his unwearied labors. His health failing, he spent two years in the Northwest, and his work there was greatly owned of God. About this time his heart was also drawn to offer himself exclusively for evangelistic work. The two brethren, far removed from each other, were similarly directed, and the Lord seemed to say, as of old, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them."

IMPERIAL
Cream Tartar
BAKING
POWDER
PUREST, STRONGEST, BEST.
Contains no Alum, Ammonia, Lime, Phosphates, or any Injuriant.
E. W. GILLETT, Toronto, Ont.

THE GREAT ENGLISH PRESCRIPTION.
A successful Medicine used over 30 years in thousands of cases. Cures Spermatorrhea, Nervous Weakness, Emissions, Impotency and all diseases caused by abuse, indiscretion or over-exertion. Six packages GUARANTEED to CURE when all others fail. Ask your Druggist for the Great English Prescription, take no substitute. One package $1. Six $5, by mail. Write for Pamphlet. Address EUREKA CHEMICAL CO., DETROIT, MICH.
For sale and mailed by LANGLEY & CO., Victoria, B. C. jly17-d&w-eod

WASHBURN
Guitars, Mandolins & Zithers
in volume and quality of tone are the best in the world. Warranted to wear in any climate. Sold by all leading dealers. Beautifully illustrated, descriptive catalogue with portraits of famous artists MAILED FREE.
LYON & HEALY, CHICAGO.
se27-eod-d&w