The Colonist.

FRIDAY, JUNE 24, 1892.

KEEP ON.

The intelligent and progressive citizens of Victoria are sorry to know that the work of sewer construction is likely soon to come to an end. The City Council evidently does not see its way to go on with the sewers until they are completed. To put a stop to the work of sewer construction would be, just now, a great misfortune, in more ways than one. The sewers are required to keep the city clean, and to preserve the public health, and the wage-earners need the employment which their construction affords. Would it not be well for the City Council to apply the Local Improvement clause of the Municipal Act to the continuation of the work on the sewers? It would not, we think, be at all difficult to include the whole system in one by-law, and let the property pay, by a frontage tax, for what is yet to be done. The property-owners could give bonds to pay the tax—by instalments extending over a number of years. In this way the sewers would be built, and the house connections made without adding to the city's liabilities, and without any very heavy pressure on the owners of property. Business men, we venture to say, could, in a short time, devise a plan by which the drainage of the city would be soon completed, on the Local Improvement system. That system has been adopted by all the progressive cities of the continent, and the sooner that the law, enacted for its introduction here, is put in operation, the better for the citizens. We trust that this matter will not be lost sight of. The city cannot do without the sewers and other improvements, and the fairest and most effective way of getting them is by the adoption of the Betterment system.

HOME RULERS IN IRELAND.

It is generally supposed that the vast majority of voters in Ireland are in favor of Parnell's policy. The minority, it is believed, is composed of a few fanatical Protestants in the north of Ireland, and a still smaller number of unpatriotic Catholics in the south and middle. A little enquiry shows that this is not the case. The late John Bright, who was one of Ireland's staunchest English friends, in one of his speeches, said: "At least two millions of them (the inhabitants of Ireland) are as loyal to the English Government as Birmingham or Manchester, and I will be no party to a measure which will thrust them from the generosity and the justice of the Imperial Parliament."

It is quite true that Ireland at the last general election sent 86 Home Rulers to the Imperial Parliament to 19 opponents of their policy, but when the election figures come to be examined, it will be seen that the opponents of Home Rule were not anything like proportionately represented in the Irish delegation to Parliament. The Parnellite vote at the general election of 1886 was 293,875, and the anti-Parnellite vote was 147,106. According to the votes actually polled the Parnellites returned should have been a little more than two to one, instead of being a good deal more than four to one. But there were, no doubt, other facts known to Mr. Bright, which caused him to conclude that the Irishmen opposed to Home Rule were nearly equal in numbers to those in favor of Home Rule. It is not by any means likely that the Irish Home Rulers have increased very materially since 1886. Indeed, it is not to be expected that the Home Rule party, divided as it is into warring factions, will, at the coming election, be so successful as when it was under the iron discipline of Charles Stewart Parnell.

It must not be forgotten, too, that there are many Catholics in Ireland who never joined the Home Rule party, and some of that creed who joined it not, from conviction, but from considerations of policy. The opponents of Home Rule in some parts of Ireland have not, of late years, had a very pleasant time of it, and it may be expected that when the pressure to which they succumbed is removed the number who will vote for the supporters of the Government will be greatly increased. Those, then, who are trying to form an intelligent and an impartial opinion of the relative strength of parties in the Mother Country must not take for granted that Ireland will, with the exception of Ulster, be in favor of the Gladstone party. It is just possible that the Government, even in the Catholic counties, will be stronger than many, of even its supporters, believe.

AN IMPORTANT POINT.

The dispute about the power of Parliament to readjust the representation of the Dominion in the House of Commons has arisen from the interpretation given by some of the members to the 51st section of the British North America Act. This is how is reads:

"On the completion of the census in the year one thousand eight hundred and seventy-one, and of each subsequent decennial census, the representation of the four provinces shall be readjusted by such authority, in such a manner, and from such time as the Parliament of Canada from time to time provides, subject and according to the following rules," etc.

The question, as we understand it, is, does this section of the Act give Parliament the power to readjust the representation, or does it only give it power to appoint and instruct some authority to do the work? Mr. Davies, Mr. Dalton McCarthy, Mr. Mills and others contend that it is not within the power of Parliament to readjust the representation, and Sir John Thompson, Hon. Wilfred Laurier and other legal authorities maintain that the readjustment is properly and constitutionally the work of Parliament. The question has, it appears, been raised during the present session for the first time. It is one of very great importance, and it is not by any means likely that the people of Canada have heard the last of it.

INEXPERIENCED POLITICIANS.

Parliamentary Government is not working very smoothly in Japan. The Government considers that it rules by some other right than by the will of the people. The ministers cannot be made to understand that they should throw up their places and their salaries and allow their opponents to take their offices merely because there are some wrong-headed and ignorant men in Parliament who will persist in voting against their measures. The following extract from the Japanese Daily Herald Mail leads us to conclude that the public men of Japan, on the Government side particularly, have yet to learn what a vote of want of confidence means:

"To a body of men, who one with another have kept the Government of the country in their own hands without the exercise of popular control, the idea of having to subordinate themselves to the will of the Diet, and to be made to feel that they can only hold office during its pleasure, simply whilst it shall give its consent and no longer, is as unpalatable as a very nauseous dose of physic, but though they make wry faces, in the long run they will have to swallow what Parliament prescribes. To those acquainted with the course of constitutional politics in England, who well know that there, as in this country, the sovereign appoints Ministers to office, receives their resignations or dismisses them, as the case may be, the parrot-like reiteration of the few bare words of the constitution, that the sovereign appoints to office, seems almost childish, more especially when they are pleaded as barring any right on the part of the Diet to determine who shall be permitted to carry on the Government."

The unsophisticated Japanese statesmen will have to take a few lessons in the art and mystery of political make-believe before they can be made to understand that the powers of the sovereign to appoint his ministers and to dismiss them, as well as to veto laws and to do many other things, are mere fictions. It is convenient to say that the sovereign possesses these prerogatives, but it is found that when they come to be exercised the sovereign does exactly what his ministers advise, and they in their turn do very little more than Parliament authorisees and sanctions.

MR. BLAKE IN THE IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

The news that the Hon. Edward Blake has been offered a seat in the Imperial Parliament by the Irish Home Rule Party has not turned out to be a mere sensational report. The seat tendered to Mr. Blake may be considered a safe one, and he may therefore be regarded as good as elected. The appearance of a native Canadian residing in Canada in Parliament will be something new. At least one Canadian has had a seat in the British Parliament, but this was after he had left his native land and had made his home in the Old Country. In 1859 the Hon. Thomas Chandler Haliburton, better known on this side of the Atlantic as "Sam Slick," was returned to Parliament for Launceston, and he held his seat until the dissolution in 1865. Judge Haliburton's record in Parliament was not particularly brilliant but it may be very different with Mr. Blake. That gentleman is admitted by friends and opponents to possess very great ability, and he will enter Parliament at an important crisis. He will, too, be the leading advocate of the Home Rule cause. He will, therefore, have a splendid field for the exercise of his ability, and he will find in the British House of Commons foemen worthy of his steel. If he succeeds, Canada will be proud of his success.

Mr. Blake's call to the British Parliament is important from another point of view. It leads Canadians to realize that their country is indeed a part of the Empire of Great Britain. To do this in these days sometimes requires an effort. Canada is so nearly independent, and its statesmen are so prone to act as if its interests were opposed to those of Great Britain that Canadians are apt to get into the habit of looking upon her as almost a foreign country. But when they see a leading Canadian in Parliament taking an active and, perhaps, a leading part, in the government of the Empire they will then see that they are not the step children of the Mother Country but sharers, to the fullest extent, in the privileges and powers and honors of the most favored of her children. Edward Blake, as Cabinet Minister, would do more towards accomplishing the federation of the Empire than all the Imperial Federation Leagues that can be formed in all the colonies.

LYNCH LAW.

There is more than one form of Lynch Law in force in the United States. One has to do with serious crimes and the other takes cognizance of offences against good morals. The punishments of both sets of lynchers are terribly severe. One set will hang a man accused of a crime, riddle him with bullets or even burn him to death without a trial, and the other set beats the person suspected of committing an offence with rods, tars and feathers him, rides him on a rail and winds up by giving him notice to leave the neighborhood within a certain time or a worse thing may befall him. We have used the masculine pronoun for convenience sake, but the victims of these last-named lynchers are almost as often women as men.

An example of this kind of lynching is given in the San Francisco Examiner of the 13th inst. A Methodist clergyman named Vancleave was, one morning, not long ago, visited by a number of "white-caps"—as these self-constituted conservators of morals are called. They seized him, dragged him from his house and whipped him unmercifully with large switches. The unfortunate man's flesh was dreadfully lacerated and his body was covered with bruises. Vancleave showed fight. Disregarding the threats of his tormentors and the revolvers which they pointed at him he resisted until he was overpowered by numbers. The preacher had not been guilty of any crime. He, it appears, took part in a church dispute which had caused a good deal of unpleasantness in the neighborhood, and had been warned that he must stop his "racketting," but it does not appear that he had done anything to deserve the ill-will of his neighbors.

This kind of lawlessness prevails in many states. A number of persons constitute themselves the censors of the morals of the neighborhood in which they live, and if any one says or does anything which, in their opinion, is not proper, he or she is first warned and, if the warning is disregarded, is brutally treated, and that in the most cowardly manner. As a rule those who commit these outrages escape punishment. The law which they violate and defy is not put in force against them. They are, in fact, in the locality over which they terrorise, above the law.

PASSIVE RESISTANCE.

Passive resistance, such as the Ulster men contemplate, appears to us to be simply an impossibility. Suppose, for a moment, that the inhabitants of Ulster would, as they threaten, passively resist the Government—that they would refuse to pay the taxes imposed by Parliament, and would ignore the officials of the local Government and deny their authority. Such a course would, in the first place, create inextricable confusion in the administration of the affairs of the country, for how were they to separate the authority of the Imperial Government to which they profess to be loyal, from the authority of the local Government, which derives its authority from that Imperial Government. In point of fact, in resisting the local Government, passively or actively, they will be resisting the Imperial Government, for what will the local Government be but a creature of the Imperial Government? Imagine what a mess the affairs of this province would get into if the people of any section of it refused to acknowledge the authority of the Provincial Government.

But the passive resistance must, if continued in for any length of time, be changed to active resistance. If the people would not obey this law, the only course left to the Government would be to enforce obedience. If this could not be done by moral suasion, physical force would have to be used. It is not to be supposed that the North of Ireland men would in a few weeks be turned into quakers. Does anyone suppose that if they had made up their minds to repudiate the local Government, they would not meet force with force, and that there would not be civil war and bloodshed in the North? In that case could the Imperial Government, which extended Home Rule to Ireland, stand aloof and leave the local Government to assert its authority unaided? Such a state of things is simply inconceivable. There can be no possible resistance in Ulster except as a preliminary to civil war. Such civil war in Ireland, without the interposition of the Imperial Government, is an impossibility. From present appearances, however, this is a matter of mere speculation, for it does not seem at all probable that Home Rule will be extended to Ireland in the near future.

AN UNJUST ACCUSATION.

The President's message contains a serious charge against the Government of the Dominion. It is no less than that that Government has not acted in good faith with the United States with regard to the canal tolls. We are not among those who cry out, whenever there is a dispute between Canada and any other country, "Our Government is right and the other is wrong," no matter what the merits of the dispute may be. This is a fooliah as well as a dangerous way of dealing with international questions. But in this matter we cannot but believe that the President's accusation is unjust. The Government of the Dominion, if actuated by no higher or better motive than prudence, could not think of dealing with the United States in this, or any other matter, except in perfect good faith. It would be foolish, as well as unprincipled, to attempt any sharp practice in its dealings with the United States. If the Dominion Government has entered into an obligation "To secure to citizens of the United States the use of the Welland, St. Lawrence and other canals in the Dominion on terms of equality with the inhabitants of the Dominion," it has, no doubt, carried out that obligation to the letter. The President must surely be laboring under a delusion when he supposes that our Government has not been as good as its word. It must be remembered, too, that Great Britain is a party to the treaty to which the President alludes. Even if Canada were disposed to interpret the terms of the convention unfairly as regards the interests of the United States, it is not to be supposed that the British government would be a party to any such disingenuous interpretation. It is most strict in the performance of its agreements with foreign nations and it would, no doubt, be equally scrupulous with respect to any treaty requiring the co-operation of Canada. This canal toll business is rather complicated, but we cannot bring ourselves to believe that Canada is not acting in it with perfect good faith toward the United States.

With respect to the other matter dealt with in the message, the President makes it quite clear that those who maintained that the Americans would agree to no reciprocity treaty that did not give the United States a preference over Great Britain were right. We see that it was because the Canadian Ministers would not agree to a trade arrangement, of which this was an essential condition that the negotiations in Washington early in the spring, fell through. The President cites the following passage from ex-Secretary Blaine's report of the Trade Conference:—

"It seems impossible for the Canadian Government to extend to American goods preferential treatment over those of other countries. As Canada was part of the British Empire they did not consider it competent for the Dominion Government to enter into any commercial agreement with the United States from the benefits of which Great Britain and its Colonies were excluded."

This, according to ex-Secretary Blaine, was the reason why the Dominion Cabinet Ministers left Washington without having done anything to advance reciprocity in trade between the two countries, and not because, as was telegraphed all over the continent, they had no power to enter into an agreement with the United States. They were too loyal and too grateful to Great Britain, to give an exacting foreigner, preference over her in matters of trade. We are pleased that the President has stated so clearly the cause of the failure of the reciprocity negotiations with Canada last spring. It is to the credit of the Commissioners that they would not entertain ex-Secretary Blaine's proposition for a single moment. The Americans themselves would despise them if they preferred a stranger to their Mother Country.

A WIDE DIFFERENCE.

The course which Mr. Gladstone has pursued on the labor question shows, in a very striking way, the difference between the statesmen of England and the politicians of America. It is admitted that the labor organizations of Great Britain now exercise a large amount of political influence—that the labor vote is one which the politicians of both parties are eager to secure. It is known, too, that legislation on the hours of labor is strongly desired by a very large number of working men. Mr. Gladstone knew all this as well, and perhaps better than, any other man in the Three Kingdoms. When, however, a deputation of workingmen, representing, it may be, hundreds of thousands of votes, waited on him to find out what course he intended to pursue if he should be returned to power, on the eight-hour question, he told them frankly and plainly that he could not entertain it, that all his time and all his energy would be devoted to the furtherance of another and a very different cause. Mr. Gladstone did not temporize, he hardly tried to soften the terms of his refusal. There was none of what is generally called "policy," in his reply to the deputation of the workingmen. There was, we believe, policy, policy of the highest and best kind, at the bottom of Mr. Gladstone's treatment of the labor deputation, but such policy is considered foolishness on this side of the Atlantic.

If such a deputation, at such a time, had waited upon a political leader in the United States, they would have been received with the utmost courtesy, and the reply to their request—if it was considered ill-timed and inconvenient—would be pleasantly ambiguous. The politician would strain his ingenuity to send the men away well pleased with him and having the vague impression that he was their warm friend, and would some time, in some way which he took very good care not to define, do for them all that they desired. There would be any amount of non-committal palaver, but there would be no plain talking. The deputation, when they left the great man's presence, would be completely at a loss to know how he felt towards them, and what course he proposed to take.

THE CAUSE OF THE IMPROVEMENT.

Now that the election is at hand people are directing their attention to Ireland for the purpose of finding out whether its condition is better or worse than when Lord Salisbury became Prime Minister. The decision is that the condition of Ireland has greatly improved under the Salisbury administration. It is more peaceful and more prosperous; there is less crime of all kinds, and political agitation is not so general and not so fierce. The Conservative and Liberal Unionists give the government credit for the improvement, but the Gladstonians attribute it to the better understanding which their leader has brought about between the people of Great Britain and the people of Ireland. As soon as the Irish people, they say, were convinced that they had warm friends in England who were doing all they could to obtain Home Rule for them, their hatred of the "Saxon" almost disappeared and they were careful not to do anything that would prejudice their cause in the minds of their English sympathizers. This, it is contended, is the secret of the greater peacefulness of Ireland during the last five years, and the diminution of agrarian crime.

It is more than probable that both causes have combined to bring about the amelioration of the condition of the Irish people which has been witnessed of late years. Balfour's severity tempered by his mildness and sympathy with the suffering poor would have of themselves brought about a salutary change. The consciousness that the cause of Home Rule would be injured in England by lawlessness and outrage in Ireland had no doubt a restraining effect. But whatever may have been the cause of the improvement, it is undeniable that Ireland is in a better condition to-day than it was when the Conservatives came into power, and a political party generally takes credit for any marked improvement that is effected while its leaders manage the affairs of the nation.

BRITISH COLUMBIA'S REPRESENTATION.

There was quite an interesting debate in the House of Commons on the evening of the 14th, while the House was in committee, on the representation of British Columbia. Mr. Mills contended that British Columbia is legally entitled to only four members. He admitted that by the terms of union it was allowed six members, but he held that when once in the Confederation this province is subject to the provisions of the British America Act, as regards the readjustment of its representation. There could, he argued, be no provision in the terms of union contrary to the terms of the British America Act, for the provinces were admitted subject to the provisions of that act. Mr. Mills' argument is a strictly legal one and it appears to us to be much more ingenious than sound.

Sir John Thompson took much broader ground than Mr. Mills. He held that by an Order in Council, the provisions of which the British America Act itself declares shall have effect as if they had been enacted by the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, British Columbia was allowed six members; and that by a special stipulation in the terms of union, the representation could be increased only under the provisions of the British North America Act. Sir John Thompson expressed himself earnestly and emphatically on the subject. He said:

"I take it that, under the circumstances, there is simply no room for interpretation, and unless this Parliament take the responsibility of declaring that Her Majesty in Council had exceeded her authority, that the Order in Council which the statute says is to have this same effect as a statute passed by the Imperial Parliament is null, or *ultra vires*, as being in excess of Her Majesty's authority, the House will not undertake to break faith with British Columbia and violate the terms of union. I submit it is not in the power of this Parliament to do it, and if it were, it would be a striking breach of faith with that province, which has come in under an express declaration that she shall have a certain representation, which may be increased under the provisions of the British North America Act."

This is, we believe, sound law, and we are certain that it is in accordance with common sense and common honesty.

Mr. Mara made a short speech on the subject, in which he presented the case of British Columbia so plainly and so forcibly that he must have convinced the committee that to deprive British Columbia of her full representation in the Parliament of the Dominion would be a flagrant breach of faith and an unwarrantable exercise of the power of Parliament. He said:

"A treaty was formed between British Columbia and the Dominion Government, which was ratified by the Imperial Parliament. One provision of the treaty was that British Columbia should be entitled to three Senators and six representatives in the Commons. At that time it was known that British Columbia could not fairly claim that number according to her population, and it was also known that the *per capita* allowance would not be sufficient to carry on the Provincial Government. The population was assumed to be 60,000, which was far in excess of the real population. But upon that assumed population the treaty was formed, a solemn bargain was entered into between British Columbia and the Dominion Government, which was ratified by the Imperial Government, and this House has no power, even if it had the will, to break that treaty. If this House broke that treaty we would have to apply to the Imperial Government to alter the terms of union. British Columbia entered under a different arrangement, with a different treaty, than did Prince Edward Island. The delegates who were sent here foresaw that there might be a doubt when the next census was taken, whether British Columbia would be entitled to the full representation of six members, and they took good care that, at all events, the representation of the province should never be reduced; therefore the number was placed at six with a right to increased representation according to the population."

Mr. Davies of P. E. I., Mr. Corbould and Mr. Gordon took part in the discussion, but nothing new was advanced by any of these gentlemen. The Liberal members seemed to regard it as anomalous that British Columbia should be permitted to retain her six members while Prince Edward Island, which entered the Confederation with the same number of representatives in Parliament, and whose population is greater than that of this province, had hers reduced to five. But it was shown that the bargain made by each province was different with respect to the representation. While British Columbia stipulated that the representation be increased only under the British North America Act, it was provided in the Prince Edward Island terms of Union that the representation may be readjusted from time to time. If the Prince Edward Islanders intended that six members should be their minimum representation in the House of Commons, no matter what figures the census might show, they were not so shrewd or far-seeing as were the British Columbians.

SELF-RELIANT.

The Government of Quebec has begun to extricate itself from its financial difficulties. It is, we are glad to see, depending solely upon itself to get back to a sound and solvent condition. It does not, as was expected, turn to the Dominion for help to get out of the embarrassment in which it involved itself by its folly, its extravagance and the dishonesty of its rulers. It is not scared by the bogie of direct taxation.

In the Eastern provinces the small politicians speak of direct taxation with bated breath and solemn countenance, as if it were the most dreadful of fiscal evils. They try to make the people believe that when a province is compelled to resort to direct taxation to raise a revenue it is on the very verge of ruin, and its people are in danger of being burdened to a greater extent than they can be expected to bear.

We see the people of Quebec commended in some of the papers of the lower provinces because they have consented to put up with direct taxation, as if such taxation were something unusual, and that it required something like heroism in the people to submit to it. The people of all the provinces have been paying direct taxes in one shape and another ever since they undertook to govern themselves. That it has not been resorted to except in British Columbia for provincial purposes is partly accidental and partly on account of the dread with which direct taxes when imposed by the provincial legislature are regarded by unthinking people. If Quebec, when it was falling behind in financial matters, had had the good sense and the courage to resort to direct taxation, it might have saved itself from many of the difficulties which it now has to face. The people, feeling that the money which the government squandered must come directly out of their pockets would insist upon its being economical; but when this money came from they did not know where, and when there appeared to be an inexhaustible supply of it, they naturally concluded that the more the Government spent, the better for them. But they have been somewhat roughly disillusioned, and they are adapting themselves to their changed circumstances quite pluckily.

We see, too, that they are compelling the municipalities to aid in bearing burdens that have been hitherto upon the shoulders of the Government. The municipalities must help to support their destitute poor, their lunatics, and their reformatory schools. The people of Quebec will be benefitted when the Government crutch is taken from them.

WARRING CHRISTIANS.

We are very much afraid that the Christians who are sent to heathen lands to convert their inhabitants, do not always act in such a way as to recommend their religion to those whom they are supposed to enlighten and improve. In Uganda the Protestants and Catholics, teachers and converts, are fighting as fiercely apparently as the unregenerate heathen ever did. They do not, like theologians in older countries, confine themselves to a war of words, but they use weapons that are both carnal and deadly. The information, so far, has come from Catholic sources, and it would be as well to suspend judgment until the other side is heard from.

The Peres Blanc complain that they have been badly treated by the East African Company, owing to the indiscretion of Captain Lugard, who is the English governor or manager in that region, placing arms and ammunition in the hands of the natives. Catholics, it is alleged, were killed and wounded and made prisoners by the Protestant party. The prisoners were treated, it is alleged, with indignity and cruelty. The story told is somewhat indefinite, but there can be no doubt but that there has been trouble, and that the Catholics have applied for redress to the French Government, and that M. Ribot has directed Lord Salisbury's attention to the way in which the French missionaries have been treated by their English and Protestant neighbors.

The German and the French newspapers speak of the feuds in Uganda in very strong terms. They regard them from a commercial and political, rather than a religious point of view. A German paper, the Berliner Tageblatt, is particularly severe. It says:

"It is evident that religious strife has been carefully fomented in order to carry out a long-planned political *coup* for eliminating from Uganda every non-English element. The British missionaries have again shown, what scarcely needed fresh proof—that they are the apostles, not of the Gospel, but of English political interests. If, on the one hand, recent events from Uganda constitute a cruelly sarcastic illustration of missionary enterprise in general and of that of England in particular, it has, on the other, brought once more into relief the reckless, brutal determination with which the English pursue their political purposes. Religion, humanity, the repression of the slave trade are mere empty words to cloak their ambitious designs."

This gives the English missionaries and their friends a glimpse of the way in which they are regarded by nations having interests different from those of Great Britain. It is something new to hear of British missionaries being the "apostles, not of the Gospel, but of English political interests." This estimate of them is, no doubt, absurdly unjust. British missionaries, as a rule, care nothing for political interests of any kind. Their object is to benefit the people to whom they are sent, without regard to the political designs of any nation. If their work is helped and their safety ensured by the extension of British rule they are glad, but to say that they are employed as agents to extend that rule is outrageously untrue. We find it very hard to believe that Captain Lugard and the company with which he is connected would take part in or countenance in any way the persecution of Catholic missionaries or their converts. The enquiry into the disturbance, so far, has shown that the Foreign Office has instructed all who are connected with it to take no part in the quarrels between Protestant and Catholic missions, and it is said that the official instructions of the East Africa Company itself to its agents are equally precise and conceived in the same spirit. The pity and the reproach are that these Christian missions should quarrel at all.

COMING TO VICTORIA.

The Minister of Militia Coming to Esquimalt to Inspect the Fortifications.

BELLEVILLE, June 22.—Hon. Mackenzie Bowell, Minister of Militia, and General Herbert, are said to be contemplating a visit to Victoria, B.C., after the session closes, for the purpose of looking into the fortifications at Esquimalt.

IMPERIAL

Cream Tartar

BAKING POWDER

PUREST, STRONGEST, BEST.

Contains no Alum, Ammonia, Lime, Phosphates, or any Injuriant.

E. W. GILLETT, Toronto, Ont.

FOR SALE—A boat 25 feet long, fitted with 2 horse power coal oil engine, and screw, sails, anchor, oars, etc., complete, in good working order; can be delivered June 20th. Apply to E. Musgrave, Cowichan. my15-d w

OFFICE OF

The Black Jack Quartz Mining Co.

(LIMITED.)

BARKERVILLE, B.C., 1st June, 1892.

NOTICE.

ASSESSMENT NO. 8.

An assessment of one cent per share was levied on 28th May, due forthwith to the undersigned at the office of the Company, Barkerville.

Delinquent.....2nd July.
Day of Sale.....6th August.

WM. H. PHELPS, Secretary.

Jul6

NELSON, B. C.

HOTEL TO RENT.

Newly built and centrally located, for a term of years, containing 22 rooms with every convenience for a good paying business. More bedrooms if required. Apply to J. M. BUXTON & CO., Vancouver, or W. GESNER ALLAN, Nelson, B.C. jul8

Ex. Ship Ariadne:

G. H. Mumm & Co. Champagne.
"Dry Monopole" do.
Perrier, Jouet & Co. do.
Moet & Chandon do.
Pommery & Greno do.
Piper Heidsieck do.
Vve. Clicquot do.
Eug. Clicquot do.

ETC., ETC.

Benedictine, Chartreuse, Curacao, Marisquino.

HUDSON'S BAY CO.

ap21

Flaming Headlines

are not always

Vile Distortions

calculated to

Deceive and Disgust

and especially when

ROWBOTHAM

"THE GROCER,"

advertises is this the case. He believes he

TELLS THE TRUTH

when he says he is the best man in

VICTORIA

to do business with.

TRY-HIM-AND-SEE.

"No goods sold at cost." "No premiums given away." "The choicest lines of goods kept and sold at closest living prices."

Tele. 108. } Corner Yates and Broad Sts. { P.O. Box 476.

E. G. PRIOR & CO.,

(LIMITED LIABILITY).

Importers of Iron, Hardware, Agricultural Machinery and Vehicles of All Kinds.

Sole Agents for the Planet, Jr., Farm and Garden Implements.

WAREHOUSES AT VICTORIA AND KAMLOOPS.

Write for Special Catalogue and Prices. mr 1

SEND me 50 or more well preserved Canadian, Columbian, or other postage stamps, (old and new) and you will receive the same number of Swiss or other European ones.—R. Rieser, Postoffice, Wetzikon, Switzerland. a10