

# Messenger and Visitor.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER,  
VOLUME LXIII.

Vol. XVII.

ST. JOHN, N. B., WEDNESDAY, APRIL 3, 1901.

{ THE CHRISTIAN VISITOR  
VOLUME LII.

No. 14.

**The Riots in Russia.** Riotous demonstrations and collisions between the populace and the police and military forces continue to occur in St. Petersburg. A collision is reported to have taken place on Sunday, March 24th, between factory operatives and the police, in which there was much bloodshed, and many arrests were made. Other demonstrations were held in check only by the massing of large bodies of the police. It is said that those behind the scenes in Russia take a very grave view of the present situation and regard the demonstrations which have occurred as being the beginning of more serious trouble. A circular issued by the minister of the interior blames the police for not crushing the demonstrations at the outset by the dispersion of the gathering crowds. The police are instructed that they must learn when and where demonstrations are planned and mass their forces accordingly. Order must be restored at any cost and the authorities are empowered to employ the military for this purpose when necessary. A very serious feature of the situation are the attempts upon the life of the Czar, which, if the despatches are to be credited, have been of a determined character. There is a report which comes by way of Paris and is said to rest on the highest authority, saying that a mine has been discovered beneath the palace of the Czar at Tsarskoe Selo, seventeen miles south of St. Petersburg. The Russian press, it is said, was not permitted to mention this affair, and it is further reported that several persons of note are implicated in the plot against his Majesty.

**The Murder of Morgendal.** The report of the barbarous and murderous treatment which Mr. J. J. Morgendal met with at the hands of General DeWet and one of his subordinate officers appears to be fully confirmed. Mr. Morgendal, who had taken the oath of allegiance to the British Government and was a Justice of the Peace, accompanied Mr. Andries Wessel, an ex-member of the Volksraad, to the Boer laagers for the purpose of making known the terms of Lord Kitchener's proclamation. After they had met a board of Boer officers at Paardekraal and had been ordered to return to Kroonstad, they were, on their way back, stopped and finally taken to DeWet's laager east of Lindley. What happened to Morgendal at DeWet's laager is told by a Boer who had taken letters from ex-Commandant P. DeWet to his brother Christian DeWet, the Boer general, and this man's story is confirmed in its essential features by a native driver who was also a witness of what occurred. On the morning of January 9th, a native brought a report that the English were approaching and an order was given to saddle up. The prisoners also got up and made preparations. Morgendal was washing his hands when Commandant Stoffel Froneman rode up and said to Morgendal: "Why are you standing and not inspanning (harnessing)?" He then began sjamboking him, (striking him with a heavy whip) across the face. The unfortunate man tried to ward off the cuts and cried out: "General, why are you thrashing me when I am trying to carry out your orders?" DeWet who was about fifty yards off shouted: "Shoot the—." Froneman unstrung his rifle and shot Morgendal. He then rode twice around Morgendal and asked the burghers present to see if he were dead and if not to give him another shot. Mr. Morgendal, it is said, lived eleven days in great suffering, and his wife who had heard that he was wounded came from Kroonstad and arrived in time to see her husband alive. The Boer doctor was so disgusted with the killing of Morgendal that he refused to shake hands with Froneman, saying to him, "You are a murderer," and he resigned his place with the Boer ambulance, but on the entreaty of the burghers, afterwards resumed his duties.

**The Hay-Pauncefote Treaty and the U. S. Senate Amendments.** The United States Government has now published Lord Lansdowne's despatch setting forth the reasons of the British Government for declining to accept the United States Senate's amendment to the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. The latter treaty, as is generally known, modified the terms of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty respecting the relations of Great Britain and the United States in Central America, permitting the construction by the United States of the Nicaraguan Canal across the isthmus, on the condition that the neutrality of the canal should be preserved and that it should be open on equal terms to the ships of all nations in times of war as well as in peace. Of the Senate's three amendments to the Hay-Pauncefote convention, the first proposed the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty by which it was provided that neither of the two contracting nations should occupy or fortify or colonize or assume or exercise any dominion over any part of Central America, nor attain any of these objects by alliance with any state or people of Central America. The second amendment reserved to the United States the right of taking any measures which it might find necessary to secure by its own forces the defence of the canal, while the third amendment would strike out the article of the convention, under which the contracting parties engaged, immediately upon the convention being ratified, to bring it to the notice of other powers and invite their adherence. Naturally Lord Lansdowne objects, in the name of his government, to the summary method proposed by the United States Senate of abrogating a convention of so much importance and so long standing as the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. He objects more particularly, however, to the second amendment on the ground that it involves a distinct departure from the whole principle of the Hay-Pauncefote Convention and on the ground that it would leave the United States free, whenever that nation might choose to consider that its safety demanded it, to take such action as would close the canal to the commerce and the navies of the world. In reference to the third amendment Lord Lansdowne says that if the adherence of the other powers were given, the neutrality of the canal would be secured by the whole of the adhering powers, but without that guarantee it would depend only upon the guarantee of the two contracting powers. The amendment, therefore, if accepted, would place Great Britain in a position of marked disadvantage as compared with other powers. If his Majesty's government were to consent to such an agreement, while the United States would have a treaty right to interfere with the canal in time of war or apprehended war, and while other powers could with a clear conscience disregard any of the restrictions imposed by the convention, Great Britain alone, in spite of her enormous possessions on the American continent, and in spite of her Australasian colonies, and her interests in the east, would be absolutely precluded from resorting to any such action, or from taking measures to secure her interests in and near the canal. For the reasons thus briefly stated the British Government finds it impossible to accept the proposed amendment of the United States Senate and prefers to retain unmodified the provisions of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty.

**South Africa.** The Boers appear to have suffered quite a serious blow in the defeat of Delarey's force which was engaged by Babington and Shekelton near Ventersdorp which is situated in the country to the westward of Johannesburg and about midway between Krugersdorp and Lichtenburg. Delarey's force was 1,500 strong. Having defeated the Boers, Babington followed them up rapidly, with the result that their rear-guard was driven in, and their convoy, including their guns, was captured. The official despatch announcing this battle is dated March 25. Lord Kitchener says: "Our troops displayed great gallantry and dash. They captured two fifteen-pounder guns, one pom-pom, six maxims, 320 rounds of big ammunition, 15,000 rounds of small ammunition, 160 rifles, 53 wagons and 24 carts, besides taking 140 prisoners." He reports the British losses light while many Boers were killed or wounded. The Boers are also reported to have lost heavily in an attack upon Lichtenburg, where more than seventy burghers are said to have been shot at one spot among wire entanglements.

**The Cook Charges.** During a part of the past week the Dominion Senate has been engaged in the investigation of certain statements published just before the last general election by Mr. H. H. Cook of Toronto, to the effect that he had been offered a senatorship if he would pay \$10,000, and that at least one member of the government was concerned in the offer. The investigation which has just been held was entered into on the motion of Sir Mackenzie Bowell. When Mr. Cook came to give his evidence before the Senate Committee, it appeared that the member of the government indicated in his statement was Sir Richard Cartwright. To a full understanding of the matter it is necessary to read the report of the investigation which has been given in quite an extended form in the daily press and will doubtless be found complete in the proceedings of the Senate. It must suffice here to say that the evidence of Mr. Cook goes to show that in 1896 he was asked by the late Mr. M. C. Cameron, who died while Governor of the Northwest Territories, to pay \$10,000 for a senatorship, and that in October 1896 Mr. Cameron showed Mr. Cook a letter which purported—and which Mr. Cook believed—to have been written by Sir Richard Cartwright, in which it was said: "Surely our friend must do something in this connection," words which Mr. Cameron interpreted to mean that Mr. Cook must pay for the senatorship. This proposal which was repeated later by Mr. Cameron on Mr. Cook's renewing his application, the latter declares that he regarded as infamous and indignantly refused to consider. The fact however that, for years afterwards, Mr. Cook continued to be a member of the Liberal party on friendly terms with Sir Richard Cartwright and other members of the government and persistently renewing his claim for appointment to the Senate, would go to show that Mr. Cook was not greatly troubled about the principle of paying for senatorships. What he objected to was the personal application of it in his own case. So far as concerns Mr. Cook's having been asked by Mr. Cameron for a contribution of \$10,000 on account of the Senatorship, the fact seems to be pretty well established on Mr. Cook's and other confirmatory evidence, especially that of Mr. Biggs who acted as his friend and solicitor in the matter. Whether Mr. Cameron wanted the money for party purposes or for others in which he was more personally concerned is a matter in regard to which there will doubtless be different opinions, and respecting which Mr. Cook himself, according to Mr. Biggs' testimony, had expressed a doubt. In regard to the government's connection with the matter, it is to be said that the Premier on his oath before the Senate Committee denied explicitly and emphatically any connection with, or knowledge of, any such offer as that alleged to have been made to Mr. Cook by Mr. Cameron in reference to a senatorship. Sir Richard Cartwright likewise quite positively denied any connection with the offer alleged to have been made to Mr. Cook by Mr. Cameron. He declared that he had supported Mr. Cook's claim for a senatorship on the grounds of the services rendered to the party by Mr. Cook and his family, but never in connection with any money consideration, that he had never employed Mr. Cameron in the matter, that he had written no letter such as that alleged, that such a thing as a money consideration for the senatorship had never been mentioned between himself and Mr. Cook or Mr. Cameron, and that the first he had heard of any such offer having been made to Mr. Cook was when the latter published his statement just before the general election last fall. Mr. Cook had stated to the committee that he had told Sir Richard of Cameron's having asked him to pay \$10,000 in connection with the senatorship, and Sir Richard had replied—yes, that Mr. Cameron wanted—or that he (Sir Richard) supposed that Mr. Cameron wanted money for party purposes and had taken this means of getting it. Sir Richard in his evidence distinctly contradicted this statement of Mr. Cook, declaring that, to the best of his knowledge, the latter had not even mentioned Mr. Cameron's name to him in connection with the matter. This, as we gather from the reports published in the papers, is the case substantially as it has come before the committee of the Senate. The finding of the committee will be awaited with some interest, but the real jury in the case is the people of Canada.