

The Colonist.

FRIDAY, AUGUST 21, 1891.

HUDSON'S BAY RAILWAY.

The passage of the Hudson's Bay Railway Bill is an example of the power of persistence and perseverance. The Hudson's Bay Railway scheme was strongly opposed from its very inception. Its promoters had to face difficulties that appeared to be insurmountable. It was contended that Hudson's Bay was not navigable by vessels engaged in any regular trade, that it was obstructed by ice for the greater part of the year, and that vessels which entered might not be able to get out of it for a year or more. The experimental voyages of the Alert and the Neptune, it was maintained, did not by any means demonstrate the navigability of the Bay and Strait. The opponents of the scheme declared that the road would run through a country the greater part of which is unproductive now and will always remain so. They asserted, too, that as the grain of the Northwest would never be taken to Europe by the Hudson's Bay route in the same year as that in which it was raised it could never become the outlet for the wheat-producing districts of the Northwest. These and many other objections had to be met, and the capitalists of Europe and the public men of Canada convinced that the route would be a feasible one, before a dollar could be raised for the construction of the road. But the promoters, the chief of whom was Mr. Hugh Sutherland, were indefatigable and undismayed. They kept on representing the advantages of the road and the claims it had on the Government for support, until they succeeded in getting capitalists to take hold of it, and in prevailing upon the Government to give it their support. Their greatest difficulties being overcome, they will doubtless now go on with the work of construction energetically.

We see by the speech which the Premier made in support of the bill, in its passage through the Senate, that the Company are not to have one dollar of the subsidy until the road is constructed to the Saskatchewan. As far as that river, and for some distance on the other side of it, the road, we understand, passes through a fine agricultural and pastoral country. Its construction will therefore promote the settlement of that part of the Northwest. The unproductive country, it is said, is between the Saskatchewan and the shores of Hudson's Bay. As the company has received the aid it asked for, it will soon be seen whether the objections of the opponents of the road are valid or not. It will not build the road to Hudson's Bay until its promoters have satisfied themselves beyond a peradventure that the Hudson's Bay is navigable for wheat-laden ships. The route to Europe, by way of Hudson's Bay, if established, will effect a wonderful change in the Northwest. When Winnipeg is brought as near to Liverpool as Montreal now is, we may expect that the Northwest will fill up with great rapidity. The changes consequent upon peopling that immense region, it is impossible even to imagine. The men who succeed in establishing a route from the Northwest to Europe, via Hudson's Bay, will confer an incalculable benefit upon not only that part of the Dominion but upon the whole of the British Empire.

THE GOVERNMENT'S COURSE.

The Liberal newspapers, great and small, are doing their best to create the impression that the Government are not desirous to find out the whole truth with respect to the frauds and the irregularities which are being investigated by parliamentary committees. They also accuse the Government and its supporters in the House of Commons of endeavoring to screen the guilty and of assisting them to escape punishment. They, indeed, seem to take for granted that Conservatives generally are ready to condone the offences of members of their own party. This is not true and not in accordance with facts that are known to every one who reads the newspapers intelligently. The Liberal censurers of the Government and its supporters appear to have forgotten that the member chiefly instrumental in bringing the contract scandal to the attention of Parliament is a Conservative, and it is now no secret that in taking proceedings in Parliament against the parties accused he was encouraged and supported by influential Conservatives. Mr. Israel Tarte had no difficulty in getting his case referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. When before that Committee no one can say with the least appearance of truth that there was the slightest attempt on the part of any member or any supporter of the Government to stifle enquiry. On the contrary, every facility was afforded the committee; and the attitude assumed by Sir John Thompson was so impartial and so helpful as to extort a compliment from even the Toronto Globe.

When it was proved that any official, high or low, Conservative or Liberal, had been guilty of improper conduct, or dereliction of duty, he was swiftly and severely punished. Perley, Burgess, Arnold and the other civil servants were all treated alike. They were made to feel that the Government would not keep in its service men who had betrayed the trust reposed in them or violated their oath of office.

When many of the men who had been proved guilty of corrupt conduct and grave irregularities had been severely dealt with by the Government, and the investigation was still going on, the Premier took occasion to make the following very significant and emphatic declaration of the Government's intentions with regard to the persons accused of wrongdoing:—"I would ask the hon. gentlemen opposite to join with us in trying to find out

what the facts are about this alleged scandal. We ask them to give us the benefit of their experience in this enquiry, to assist us in ascertaining the facts and placing them before the public, in order that they may be dealt with properly, and, if found guilty, that summary vengeance may be exercised upon those who are found guilty of appropriating public money—stealing—be they high or low. THAT IS THE DETERMINATION OF THIS GOVERNMENT and this side of the House, and I appeal to my hon. friends opposite to assist us in an enquiry of a precisely similar kind to that which is proceeding in another place on a subject which is legitimately before us, and help us to probe that enquiry to the bottom, and then join us in punishing the guilty afterwards."

What could be clearer or more definite than this? If the Government sets up to this declaration—and it has already shown that this is its intention—it will satisfy its friends and will take from its opponents all legitimate cause of complaint. We believe, too, that such a course as the Premier outlined in the passage we have quoted will be satisfactory to the people of this Dominion. What the country wants is to see the guilty, and only the guilty, punished. Canadians have no desire to confound the innocent with the guilty. They are not so unreasonable as to believe that, because some men connected with the Government have been originally careless or unfaithful, all its members and all its servants are not fit to be trusted. They do not condemn all for the offences of a few.

We believe that the Government, if it continues as it has begun, will deserve and will retain the confidence of the people of this Dominion. Mr. Abbott's administration and the man who supports it are now on their trial. The people are waiting to see how they will act. We feel confident that they will fully realize the expectations of their true friends, and by showing that they will not countenance evil-doing in any servant of the people, be he high or low, disapprove and confound their enemies.

NOT "VENOMED."

We can assure our Nanaimo contemporary that there is not a trace of "venom" in what we say with respect to the Wellington strike and matters connected with it; and we attack no one in a "rabid" or any other way. The comments which we made on the speech attributed to Mr. Tully Boyce were, we think, such as any fair-minded person of common sense should make. Every sensible man must see that neither violence nor vindictiveness should enter into business transactions. How much business would be done if it were customary for one of the parties to bargain to take the other by the throat, telling him to do what he demanded or by all that is good, or all that is bad, he would choke the life out of him? Yet, is not this something like the attitude which the Nanaimo Miners' Association has taken with regard to the Wellington mine-owners? To tell them that this is not the way for civilized and intelligent men to do business, is surely not attacking them, or doing them harm in any way. It is, indeed, quite the reverse. The surely the Free Press can see that if the methods adopted by the Association were generally practiced, a step would very soon be put to the transaction of all business. If men who have money found that they could not invest it in mines or factories or industries of any kind in which large numbers of work-people were employed without, in case of non-compliance with their demands, being exposed to such evils as the Wellington mine owners were threatened with at the Nanaimo meeting, enterprise would be completely killed and they would not risk their means in new undertakings.

No class of men suffer so severely from blackness or stagnation in business as the wage-earners. It is not, therefore, for them to pursue a policy which is calculated to give men of capital serious cause for alarm. This Wellington strike is a case in point. Who has suffered most from it—the wage-earners or the capitalists? And was the object sought worth the suffering and the sacrifices that were made? If the men had not struck they could have been earning high wages and would have received good treatment. They and their families would have enjoyed all the comforts that can be obtained by miners who have constant employment at fair rates, and, as regards the adoption of pit committees by the mine owners, they would have been quite as far ahead as they are now, and, perhaps, further. Business men do not oppose a change for the sake of mere opposition. If pit committees are found to work well when they have been tried, they will soon be generally adopted without the losses, the annoyances, and the sacrifices consequent upon strikes. And, if they do not work well, both employers and employed will be pleased that the experiment was tried for them by others. We trust that there is no venom in this, and that in taking this view of the Wellington contest we are not attacking any one.

The Free Press says that Mr. Tully Boyce did not use the language attributed to him. We are glad to hear that. But how is it that Mr. Boyce has not repudiated the report of his speech that was published in the Times?

The version which the Free Press gives of Mr. Boyce's remarks, though not so savagely reprobated in tone as are those which appeared in the Times' report, was not such as might be expected from a man who has the interests of the miners at heart. Here in what the Free Press says—on whose authority it does not state—the concluding sentence of Mr. Boyce's speech:—"He (Mr. Boyce) then stated that he believed the boycott which had been placed on Wellington coal in California by the Federated Trades was effectually working, and he believed that it would not take years to bring the Dunsmuir terms or be compelled to close down."

Well, if the contest resulted in "closing down," who would be benefited? Certainly

not the miners. They would have no work, and the province would be deprived of the benefit derivable from the working of the Wellington mines. It would be a poor satisfaction to miners to see the Wellington coal mines closed, and the miners and the host of other working people, whose living depends upon their continued activity, adrift upon the world to seek the means of existence. Yet, there is nothing surer than that the policy of intolerance and revenge which the Nanaimo mine favor, if followed up, result in closing not only the Wellington mines, but other mines and other industrial undertakings which, if carried on on sound business principles, would enrich the country and be the means of supporting thousands in comfort.

We wish, before we conclude this article, which we hope is not "venomed," to correct a slight mistake that our contemporary has made. It says, not very accurately to be sure, that the Dunsmuir and the Colonist are "anonymous terms." This is very far, indeed, from being the case. The significance of the two terms is altogether different. What the Colonist says about the Nanaimo meeting and the Wellington strike is in the interest of the whole community, including the Nanaimo miners. The "Dunsmuir" has had no more to do with it than the editor of the Free Press himself. We wish it to be distinctly understood that the Colonist is alone responsible—in every sense—for what appears in its editorial columns.

MIGHT OR RIGHT?

The little breeze about the seizure of the steamer City of Panama will, no doubt, soon blow over. The small republic of San Salvador is too weak and too insignificant to hold its own in a dispute with what is considered, par excellence, the "Great Republic." Might is still, in too many instances, Right in this wicked world. The question involved is the right of a nation to exercise jurisdiction over the ships that are in its harbors, no matter what flag they fly. The City of Panama, when in the harbor of La Union, had on board passengers whom the Government of San Salvador regarded as offenders against the laws of the country. An attempt was made to arrest those offenders, which was resisted by the captain of the steamer. When the City of Panama was ready to leave, the customs authorities of La Union refused to give her captain the usual clearance papers. After waiting some hours in port, the steamer sailed without her clearance. When she arrived at La Libertad, another port of San Salvador, the City of Panama was declared confiscated because of her resistance to the law of the land, and papers to that effect were served on her captain. No violence was used in either port, nor was any attempt made to detain her forcibly. The Salvadoran authorities did only what was necessary to assert what they considered the law of nations when it was set at naught by the American sea captain. It is said that the passengers on board the American steamship were political offenders and not ordinary criminals. Admitting this to be the case, can foreign ships be made an asylum for political offenders against the nation in whose territory the harbor is situated? If, for instance, when Dillon and O'Brien were making their escape to France, they had taken refuge in an American steamship lying in one of the harbors of Ireland, could not the officers of the law have pursued them there, and could they not have compelled the captain to give them up? There would not have been in this case any question as to the competency of the British officers of the law to take the men, and if it were necessary, to use force. But circumstances alter cases. Great Britain is different from San Salvador, and what was done with impunity in La Union would not be attempted, say in the Cove of Cork.

INCORRUPTIBLE.

There are people who are fond of saying that every man has his price. You have only to offer enough, they say, to make the best of men or the most virtuous of women your own. Sometimes it seems as if there was too much truth in this cynical estimate of human virtue. But, now and again we hear of men and women who would not do what they believe to be wrong or dishonorable for any earthly consideration. A man of this kind died at Poland Springs, Me., on Wednesday last. His name was George Jones, and he was a newspaper proprietor. This journalist bearing a plebeian name gave the very best proof that he was incorruptible. He was one of the proprietors of the New York Times and its managing editor. Boss Tweed and his gang of bloodsuckers flourished in those days, and to George Jones was due the credit of exposing their infamous doings. He did this, too, after refusing the greatest bribe that, we suppose, was ever offered to any man in any position. This is how the story is told in the sketch of the life of George Jones that appears in the San Francisco Chronicle of the 13th inst.:—"While James O'Brien was Sheriff of New York County he got a place in the Controller's office for a protégé of his named Speard. This man had charge of the city and county ledgers. He saw enormous sums of money passing through the department, and, suspecting that something was wrong, he made a transcript of the figures and showed them to O'Brien. O'Brien had no love for Tweed at this time, and he took the figures, with all his evidence, to a New York daily newspaper for publication. The paper examined the matter and returned it. Then O'Brien took his figures and other evidence of fraud to Mr. Jones. The Times decided to publish the figures and make a full exposure of the ring's doings. When this determination was communicated to O'Brien he took away the papers, but brought them back in a few weeks, and told Mr. Jones to go ahead with the publication. O'Brien never made any condition as to the publication, nor did he ask for any compensation for furnishing the proofs of the Tweed frauds.

STICK TO THE RIGHT.

Right actions spring from right principles. In cases of dishonesty, open fraud, or any other kind of wrongdoing, the only remedy is to stick to the right. Mr. William Hewatson, a thoroughly practical paper maker, will assume the management of the mills of the B.C. Paper Co. as soon as they are erected.

THE SCHOOL MATTER.

Is the Times doing right when it drags its very small and, we are sorry to say, very crooked politics, into city school affairs. By its own admission, it has been advising the Trustees to pursue a course contrary to law, and it now has the impudence to tell those same Trustees if they want to save themselves from being laughed at they will study the School Act more closely. The Trustees may well pray to be saved from such cynical and such treacherous friends as the organ of the Opposition in this city. First to advise them to take a certain course, and to commend and encourage them when they do pursue it, and then coolly to turn round and tell them if they do not wish to make themselves ridiculous they must pursue another and a very different line of policy, is certainly neither friendly nor judicious. The Trustees now see the worth of the advice which the Times is so ready to offer, and it has, in its self-condemnatory article of Tuesday, shown very clearly how little reliance is to be placed on the soundness of its judgment.

THE RAMBLING ORGAN.

We are beginning to think that the Times does not expect its articles on Dominion and Provincial politics to be taken seriously. Its utterances on those subjects are very far indeed from being couched in words of truth and soberness. It is perfectly reckless with regard to the assertions it makes, and it deals with subjects of all kinds in the most trifling and frothy manner.

Its second article on the way in which Mr. Earle performed his parliamentary duties is a piece of journalistic hodge-podge. It is, indeed, a curious mixture, and has almost a little relevancy to the work that Mr. Earle did during the present session of the Dominion Parliament as it has to do with Mr. Robertson's lecture on agriculture in Canada. It has ceased to accuse Mr. Earle of not looking after the commercial interests of Victoria, and, instead of showing what grounds it had for that accusation, it bodes its readers with a screed on the relative importance of harbor improvements. Nothing that could be obtained in Ottawa is worth mentioning compared with harbor improvements. What the paramount importance of harbor works has to do with Mr. Earle's diligence and fidelity as a representative of the people, our contemporary does not so much as hint. If every word of the Times' rignarole were as true as it is silly, there is nothing in the article to show that Mr. Earle did not do everything that it was in his power to do while in Ottawa to promote and advance the interests of the City of Victoria—the improvement of the harbor, as well as other matters.

Then there is some nonsense about the fishery commission, and the favor in which Mr. Wilnot is held in Ottawa. Whether the canners and the Colonist are flattered by the appointment of Mr. Wilnot as one of the Commissioners is a matter with which Mr. Earle has nothing to do, and for which no one is so foolish as to hold him responsible. There is also a lot of both about reciprocity, in which the leaders of the Conservative party are accused of stealing the Liberal trade policy. What has Mr. Earle to do with this alleged act of petty larceny? But, if our contemporary took a little time to think, it would have remembered that the mission of the Canadian Minister to Washington was promised by Sir John Macdonald, some time previous to the last general election, and that one of the planks of the Conservative platform was a reasonable measure of reciprocity with the United States; if it could be obtained. But our feather-headed contemporary never takes the trouble to think. It rattles on carelessly, whether what it says is true or false—sense or nonsense.

The next jump is to the Esquimalt dock. It tells us that it prefers a new dock to an extension of the present one, and then fretfully complains because the Imperial Government has the right to use the dock for the repair of ships of war. Here again, our contemporary's shallowness and want of thought is very conspicuous. In the first place, the Imperial Government has paid for the use of the dock. It contributed \$250,000 towards its construction. But, if it had not done this, would the Dominion Government do anything more than it ought to do if it provided free of charge dock accommodation for the ships that are sent here to protect us and to remind the nations of the world that the country which hurts any part of Canada hurts Great Britain. Besides, is it for a newspaper published in Victoria, which derives so many and such substantial advantages from being a naval station of Great Britain, to complain because a man-of-war now and then occupies the dry dock? Even when it is whining in this unreasonable and ungrateful way, the Times does not stick to the truth. It asserts that the Imperial Government virtually owns the dry dock. Everyone knows that this is not true. For, by the greater part of the time the dock is open to merchant ships of all kinds and all nations, and, as a matter of fact, many of them avail themselves of the convenience it affords them. The Esquimalt dry dock, even as it is, is of great advantage to the commerce of the Province, but, if it is not, in what way would Mr. Earle be to blame?

TOO HASTY.

The debate on a British Columbia matter in the House of Commons, on Tuesday, contributed \$250,000 towards its construction. It is this not showing that the Imperial Government has a virtual lien on the dry dock, we should like to know what is the difference between the Times and the Colonist in this matter in that the Times sets down Great Britain's contribution in pounds sterling, and the Colonist the equivalent of that sum in dollars. There is, however, also this greater difference, we cheerfully and gratefully acknowledge the obligation of the

THE SQUATTERS.

with, and that they have no claim whatever to the ownership of the minerals. Provision was made for those squatters in the act, and they were placed in precisely the same position as those who purchase land from the company now. They obtained those lands, subject to certain reservations as to minerals, &c., for a dollar an acre. Nothing can be clearer than the act is on that matter. All that the squatter obtained were what are called surface rights. The Leader of the Opposition must have found before the debate was concluded that, as a redresser of a grievance, he had not a leg to stand on, for the very simple reason that there was no grievance. Both he and Mr. Davies must have blessed the man very heartily by, misrepresentation, or partial representation, indeed then to become the champions of the squatters. But, after all, they had chiefly themselves to blame for the mortification they must have felt when they were shown that they were fighting a shadow. They ought to have known by this time that it is not safe—but very much the reverse—to rely implicitly on the statements made to them by dissatisfied and disappointed men. Experienced men like them should know that there is no one so little to be relied on as the defeated litigant with a grievance.

EXIT MCGREVEY.

The Dominion Government has, we see, steadily pursuing its policy of treating men accused of wrongdoing with strict justice, wholly irrespective of party or social standing. The Hon. Thomas McCrevey is the last man dealt with. He has disappeared, self-condemned. He refused to tell the Committee on Privileges and Elections what he had done with certain monies that had passed through his hands. This is the report of that part of the evidence taken from the Toronto Empire of the 10th inst. Mr. German asked for a ruling on the relevancy of the question he put at the close of the forenoon session to Thomas McCrevey. The question was: "To whom did you give the balance of the \$25,000 you received from Larkin, Connolly & Co. besides the \$25,000 you gave for Le Monde?"

The Chairman—I think the question is a proper one. Mr. German—Then I will ask Mr. McCrevey to give the names of those to whom he gave the money. Witness—I decline to answer; it is a matter of confidence. Mr. German—I move then that the refusal of Mr. McCrevey to reply to the questions be reported to the House. Upon the suggestion of Mr. Dickey it was resolved to defer action upon this motion until there was a larger attendance of members. The Ministers were then engaged in the House, and the Committee agreed to wait until they arrived.

Did you pay anything out of any funds in your hands towards his (Sir Hector Langevin's) election expenses in 1887? I decline to answer on the same ground as before. You decline to answer, on the same grounds as previously—on the ground that the question is not relevant to the enquiry? Yes. Mr. Davies—I ask the chairman to compel the witness to answer. The Chairman—You must answer, Mr. McCrevey. Witness—I refuse to answer even to the chairman. The Chairman—You must answer the question. Witness—I refuse to answer the question on the same ground as before.

Mr. Davies—Then I move that the witness, having refused specifically to answer the question put to him, be reported to the House. The motion was adopted upon a division, which was practically a party one—only one Conservative—Mr. Dickey—voting in favor of the motion. Nearly all the other Conservative members of the committee present, including Hon. Mr. Chapleau, voted against the motion, but, despite their vote, it was carried.

The Hon. Thomas McCrevey, in accordance with the above resolution, was summoned to appear at the Bar of the House of Commons. He, as our readers know, refused to obey that summons. His refusal to answer the question whether he paid anything towards Sir Hector Langevin's election expenses in 1887 shows very clearly and conclusively that he did not consider it safe to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth with regard to the disposal of the election fund, and no doubt, his failure to obey the summons of the sergeant-at-arms is open to an unfavorable interpretation. Mr. McCrevey having found himself guilty, and having taken himself out of the way, Sir Hector Langevin is the only member of Parliament whom the decision of the Committee on Privileges can affect. What the report of the Committee will be with regard to him, and what action the Government will take are matters which excite great interest in every province of the Dominion. The general belief seems now to be that both Parliament and the Government will act without fear, favor or affection; that they will treat the late minister with strict justice. This is what the country wants, and it will be satisfied with nothing less.

THE DIFFERENCE.

What does the Times mean by saying that "the Colonist would have the public believe that the Imperial Government has not a virtual lien on the Esquimalt dry dock?" Commenting upon its senseless complaint about the Imperial Government having a preferential right to the use of the dry dock for the repair of ships of war, we said: "In the first place, the Imperial Government has paid for the use of the dry dock. It contributed \$250,000 towards its construction." It is this not showing that the Imperial Government has a virtual lien on the dry dock, we should like to know what is the difference between the Times and the Colonist in this matter in that the Times sets down Great Britain's contribution in pounds sterling, and the Colonist the equivalent of that sum in dollars. There is, however, also this greater difference, we cheerfully and gratefully acknowledge the obligation of the

DEATH.

DUMBLETON—In this city, on the 10th inst., the wife of Alan S. Dumbleton, of a son. STRYKER—In this city, on the 10th inst., the wife of J. W. Switzer, of a son. DEATH. ANDREW—At 11 o'clock Monday morning, August 17, 1891, at his residence, Garbally House, John Alexander Andrew, aged 51 years. COSTELLO—In this city, on the 14th inst., John Edward Costello, aged 15 months, only son of Edward and Mary Costello. JONES—In this city, on the 15th inst., Ellen Margarette, infant daughter of Geo. J. and Hattie Jones, aged 3 1/2 months and three weeks. RAYMUR—At Lima, Peru, on January 1, 1891, the Hon. Mr. Raymur, younger son of the late James A. Raymur, aged 38 years and 4 months.

FROM THE DAILY LOCAL AND GRAY V.

The defence in the case of Gray v. The Dominion Government has, we learn, offered the Indian Reserve to the Corporation for \$300,000. Those who profess to know all about the Reserve and the tenure by which it is held by the Indians of the Songhish tribe, assert that the Dominion Government has no right to sell the land. They maintain that it is held in trust for the Indians, and that neither they nor the Government have the power to dispose of it to a third party.

DRIVING IT HOME.

Evidence Accumulating in the Charges Against Premier Mercer—Where the Railway Money Went. OTTAWA, Aug. 19.—Sensational evidence against Premier Mercer was given before the Senate committee, to-day. Mr. La France, cashier of La Banque Nationale, recalled, said that one of Mr. Pascaud's cheques for \$5,000 was paid at his bank on May 18th. The endorser was Senator Pelletier, Hon. Mr. Mercier and Hon. Chas. Langlais. As far as he could recollect, the name of Hon. Francis Langlais was also on this note. Mr. Pascaud at the time paid it out of the proceeds of one of the discounted \$20,000 notes. There were two cheques for \$5,000 each placed to Mr. Pascaud's debit, on July 11. One was used for the \$5,000 note, and the other was used by Mr. Pascaud in application for a bill of exchange for \$5,000 on Paris, France, in favor of Hon. Premier Mercer. This \$5,000 was paid on July 11, 1891, and was one of the \$250,000 cheques which formed part of the \$250,000 paid out of the Dominion subsidies. The exchange drawn on Paris amounted to 25,000 francs. It bore date May 18th. The testimony created a decided sensation. The committee adjourned until to-morrow.

VICTORIA MARKET REPORT.

Table listing market prices for various goods including flour, sugar, oil, and other commodities. Columns include item names and prices per unit.

PHILADELPHIA CASE.

The Caffre boys are the police used to say where they'll be or where they'll not be. A few weeks ago they were in the Philadelphia case, stating that they looked after the boys that they skipped. They were in the way, and next turned burgh, where they were glory. They were in the way, and next turned burgh, where they were glory. They were in the way, and next turned burgh, where they were glory.

PAID-TAX FINE.

In the police court, Mr. Charles Spring, schooner Winifred, a summons issued on the Tax Collector's return. It was summoned for refusing over to him \$3 for poll tax the Winifred. Mr. Spring informed the court that the money had only withheld it required to do so under His Honor informed must plead, whereupon entered. The statutes were Belyea, who expressed objection in the matter, continuance, until Saturday, when the court look up authorities on dictation. Tax Collector's return. Honor's attention to the anxious to have the matter proceeded to argue that maintained that if this port and back into