

THE VICTORIA HOME JOURNAL

Devoted to Social, Political, Literary, Musical and Dramatic Gossip.

VOL. II., No. 41.

VICTORIA, B. C., JULY 22, 1893.

\$1.00 PER ANNUM

TALES OF THE TOWN.

*"I must have liberty
Withal, as large a charter as the wind
To blow on whom I please."*

IN winning the match at New Westminster last Saturday the Victoria lacrosse club appears to have been guilty of an unpardonable crime, and the aid of the strong arm of the law has been invoked to prevent a recurrence of the offense. The gentleman who feels constrained to redress this grievance is one Andrew Leamy, who is said to be deeply read in the law, and whose knowledge of Blackstone has been rewarded by the Provincial Premier by entrusting him with the preparation of Crown cases for New Westminster district. Now, it may occur to many that Mr. Leamy, the interpreter of the law, has proceeded on rather peculiar lines to manifest his usefulness in the way of working up business for the next Westminster assizes. Whether his employer will regard the arrest of Morton in this light or not remains to be seen. One thing is certain, and that is Mr. Leamy could not have struck on a better plan to earn the contempt of all lovers of the national game than the one adopted by him. I trust that the New Westminster lacrosse club has not confused the innocent game of lawn tennis with lacrosse. From what I can understand, Morton was by all means the worst used up man in the field, and Lewis, who it is claimed was wounded nigh unto death, was not half as badly bruised as the man who was arrested. It may transpire that it was something more than indignation which caused the arrest of Morton. In fact, some go so far as to attribute it to the fact that several Westminster people dropped money on the result.

On New Westminster's account, I regret exceedingly the circumstance of Morton's arrest. The club of that city has deservedly earned the reputation of playing a square game and taking their medicine, no matter in what form it was administered. If the trouble had occurred in Vancouver, I would not have given the matter a second thought; for there hoodlumism and thuggism, in their most virulent forms, are practised and encouraged under the seal and sanction of a certain newspaper, which is said to derive a considerable revenue from such sources. But that any man in New Westminster should have resorted to such unwarrantable conduct as to cause the arrest of a player and one who has submitted to the severest punishment all summer without a murmur, is certainly a matter of surprise. Mr. Lewis, the gentleman who is said to have been injured, has half-a-dozen or so scalps hanging to his belt; in fact, he has

always been noted for rough playing, as many Victoria players will testify. I understand that Mr. Lewis is opposed to the prosecution, but the fact will not relieve the club and the citizens generally from the odium which attaches to the arrest of a player for what a dozen or more are willing to prove was nothing more than an accident. If the Victoria club desires to maintain the support and respect of the citizens, they cannot play another game in Westminster. What guarantee have they that they will not all be arrested and imprisoned?

There are very few wealthy men who are not philanthropists and benefactors to a greater or less extent, according to their natures and their means. There have been some exceptions, it is true, among some of the excessively rich, but they are the exceptions which prove the rule. When a man acquires enough of the goods of this world to secure him immunity from future labor and anxiety, he generally begins to think of the wants and needs of those less fortunate, and if he is a wise man, does a great deal of good intelligently and with a freedom of ostentation. Some men are content to assist individuals and in a short time secure a long list of pensioners, who learn to look upon the largest of their benefactors as their just due.

That this kind of assistance is harmful to the individuals who receive the help, and to society as a whole, is well known, and many useful lives have been spoiled by those well-meaning lovers of their fellow men who give not wisely but too much. The other class looks upon the community and not the person. They look for collective wants; they perceive the necessity of broader and freer education; they realize the necessity for better hospitals and more skilled attendance for the sick and suffering poor; they are aware of the good accruing to the people as a whole from extensive parks and handsome buildings and desire that the riches of literature should be accessible to all as to the rich who can afford their private libraries. And these men do a great deal of good, and their good actions are appreciated. They found libraries, build churches, endow colleges, build hospitals, construct parks, encourage the love of the beautiful by establishing picture galleries, and in many other ways open to the public the avenues of education, health and æsthetic development, which since the beginning of time have been the exclusive highways of the plutocrats. But while these men deserve all praise for what they do, the question naturally arises whether they give for the love of giving and ameliorating general conditions, or

because they feel that fortune has given them more than they deserve, and their consciences prompt them to share some of their wealth with the rest of the less fortunate society. Does not a vague communistic sense, not formulated or understood, urge them to this division?

Is it genuine altruism, or justice? Is it generosity or an involuntary concession to the demands of communism? The communists demand that every man have his share of goods and property, but they want a division made on the basis of personal selfishness, and each considers himself and not his neighbors. The capitalist feels that he should give of his substance for the benefit of the rest of mankind, but he looks upon society collectively, and seeks to do the greatest good for the greatest number. The capitalist gives millions for schools, hospitals and countless other things which improve the conditions of those of the masses who are willing to take advantage of all that is freely offered, while the communist only wants to get hold of his fraction of those millions for the mere gratification of his personal desires in idleness. So it seems that the rich are actuated by motives of communism, which would not be active were it not for the inherent philanthropy which gives the material expression. Give a communist all he wants and he ceases to be a communist, but the philanthropic millionaire becomes more and more a practical communist as his wealth increases. It would seem, then, that all great charities are born of justice and that inborn love of man for his fellow; and while these two parents live extremes will diminish and rapid advance will be made towards the millennium of altruism.

Filial devotion is one of the most commendable as well as one of the most natural attributes of a youth. The child who does not love its father and mother, always providing that father and mother are worthy of the love of their child, lacks the elements of true manhood or womanhood. One of the saddest cases of the lack of this quality which has ever come to my knowledge, I heard the other day. It is of a woman who strove hard, worked night and day to rear her family, and is now thrown out on the cold world. The sons have all got work, but refuse to contribute towards the support of the mother who reared them. The poor unfortunate woman, who has been thus left to shift for herself in her old age, has, for the past year or so, been a tax on the resources of the British Columbia Benevolent Society. The president of that society has repeatedly assisted the mother, and, if it were not for his generous offerings, the mother