

# THE BRITISH COLUMBIA COMMERCIAL JOURNAL

ISSUED EVERY TUESDAY AT VICTORIA, B. C.

SUBSCRIPTION - - \$2.00 PER YEAR.

Advertising Rates on Application.

D. M. CARLEY . . . . . EDITOR.

L. G. HENDERSON . . . BUSINESS MANAGER.

Office—No. 77 Johnston Street.

VICTORIA, TUESDAY, MAY 5, 1891.

## VICTORIA AND THE C.P.R.

As might be expected, the arrival of the new Canadian Pacific railway steamer, the Empress of India, has given rise to considerable discussion, and on all sides the opinion is expressed that the ship is in every way a credit to the great company which owns her and the shipyards in which she was constructed.

But there are circumstances in connection with the stay of the Empress in this port which will be criticised at this time. The majority of the citizens of Victoria have felt for some time, and certainly with reason, that this ship would come to the outer wharf. But for some reason or other they were disappointed. It is offered as an excuse for her failure to do so, that the condition of Victoria harbour was such as to prevent her coming alongside the outer wharf.

In order to get at the truth of the matter THE COMMERCIAL JOURNAL has gone to the trouble of securing all information possible bearing on the affair, from the most reliable sources. At present we have no authority to use the names from which the information is derived. One thing is certain, the Empress of India could have come in to the outer wharf and remained there until 12 o'clock at least without running any risk whatever. At a distance of 100 feet from the hummock, of which so much has been said, there was a channel leading to the wharf in which the water was deep enough to preclude the possibility of any accident to the ship. Captain Clarke's official survey bears unimpeachable testimony to this fact.

Some time previous to the arrival of the Empress of India, a prominent official of the Canadian Pacific railway wrote to the owners of the dredge, that if it were not allowed to go to Vancouver the new steamer could not

get into the Vancouver harbor. To oblige the Canadian Pacific railway, the dredge was permitted to go to Vancouver, and for this some persons unreasonably blame R. P. Rithet & Co. This company is under no obligation to keep their dredge in Victoria, any more than it suits their convenience, but the simple fact of the Mudlark being either here or at Vancouver really cuts no figure. The Empress could have come to the outer wharf, without running any risk of receiving damage, and the people of Victoria will have to look to the officials of the Canadian Pacific railway for an answer to the question:—Why did she not come in? Victoria is not jealous of her sister city, the prosperity of one means the prosperity of the other, the interests of the two cities are identical, but as the citizens of no mean city they are certainly entitled to a little more consideration at the hands of a railway company which has done so much to develop the resources of this Province.

## IS THIS A FREE COUNTRY?

Judging from the declarations and deliverances of certain who may be spoken of as belonging to the "unco guid"—to look upon them from the standpoint of loyalty—Mr. Jay Ewing, United States Consular Agent, has been guilty of a high crime and misdemeanour, because it is charged that at the recent banquet at Vancouver, in celebration of the arrival of the first of vessel of the India and China fleet, he was lacking in his demonstrations of respect to the crown and dignity of Great Britain. The allegations are vague enough, goodness knows, but let them be ever so true where lies the front of Mr. Ewing's offending? He is the representative of a country the oath of allegiance to which prescribes the repudiation of all recognition of the power and authority of certain potentates, notably the Queen of Great Britain. That banquet was not intended as a demonstration of loyalty; but of satisfaction that the new Canadian line of steamships had been successfully inaugurated.

The American nationality was founded in opposition to the British system, it has been continued upon the same principles. Professedly it objects to royalty and aristocracy, it is antagonistic to the European class system, it believes in government through the

people, by the people for the people. However much it may have been modified in that direction, the British theory is somewhat different to that; even though the Magna Charta, the various crystallizations of law and what is known as the British constitution, assure to every citizen all the rights and the liberties that it is possible to expect. Mr. Jay Ewing, if we are not mistaken, comes of a stock that is intensely Republican. He regards matters through Republican spectacles; he represents a Republican people; and had the celebration been one of a political or loyalist character, he doubtless would have excused himself and stayed away. But as it was a business celebration he may have felt himself justified in attending, reserving to himself the privilege of omitting certain items on the toast list, just in the same way as he would not have felt bound to call for every course in the ordinary bill of fare.

It has not been stated that Mr. Ewing made a disturbance, or that he protested in this British dependency against the Britishers manifesting their loyalty in any way they deemed fitting. He appears to have merely acted as an impassive and uninterested spectator. When a Protestant enters a Catholic Church he is not expected to make use of the holy water that is placed at the door for the use of the faithful. He is not supposed to go down on his knees and cross himself, nor to bow whenever the order of the service requires such action on the part of those who belong to that communion. A teetotaler at a private or public dinner is not bound to drink because his hosts and their friends have champagne and wine upon the table. If such were the case ours would not be a free country. We should be living under a system of coercion. Because religious people go to church on a Sunday, and it is the practice and the law that Sunday should be observed, is any one—parson or layman—justified, in these days of civil and religious liberty, in consigning to temporal flames and everlasting torments those who don't go to church as others do, and who do not kneel at the same altar as themselves?

The intention is not to justify Mr. Jay Ewing that these observations are made, but to point out how supremely