

POOR DOCUMENT

THE WEEKLY HERALD

CHARLES H. LEWIS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.
FREDERICTON, N.B., FEBRUARY 4, 1882.
REDUCTION OF PROVINCIAL EXPENDITURES.

Has the editor of the *Capital* been asleep for the last two or three years, that he runs away with the idea that the Province of New Brunswick has to pay six per cent. interest for money? He had better make himself acquainted with some of the facts relating to the government of the country before he essays the labor of criticizing those with whom he does not for the time being happen to agree. In his issue of yesterday he proposes to answer an article in *The Herald*, and his first step is to misrepresent what we said. This, of course, was to be expected; yet it is very unbecoming in a journal which professes to anything like respectability. The ground taken by *The Herald* is one which is certain to attract public attention, and it would be far better both for the *Capital* and ourselves to discuss such matters with some little regard to the rules of journalistic courtesy.

The *Herald* said that by simplifying our legislative machinery, by getting it down to a business basis, enough money might be saved to pay the interest on a million dollars. This would require every year, not \$50,000, as our contemporary says, but perhaps not more than \$48,000, and certainly not more than \$50,000. The *Capital* estimates the greatest reduction which can possibly be made in the present Provincial expenditure at \$24,000, and propounds the startling proposition that the effect of diverting the outlay of that amount of money into new channels would mean "nothing more or less than ruination to this city and County." One can readily understand how a person whose sole idea of business prosperity consists in getting as much Government patronage as possible, can hold such views; but how an intelligent journalist can put forward such a statement is inexplicable. We imagine that the great agricultural interests of York County, which amount annually to over a million dollars, its great lumbering interests, which lead to the outlay of as much more, its manufactures, which are by no means to be despised, could manage to survive, if even more than \$24,000 a year was saved from the expense of the Provincial legislative machinery. But before discussing the financial question, which requires more consideration than we can give it to-day, we wish to say that the ideas advanced by the *Capital* that any reduction in expenditure is so much money taken from Fredericton, is erroneous. Let us take for example the *Capital's* estimate of the amount which can be saved by the most prudent management, without admitting its correctness, for there is a mistake in every item and it does not go half far enough, as we shall show upon another occasion. Says our contemporary: "We will put down the amount to be saved as follows:

Abolition of Legislative Council.....	\$10,000
Doing away with Gov't House.....	4,000
Reducing No. of members by 15.....	4,500
Combining two portfolios in the Gov't.....	2,000
Dismissal of five officials.....	3,500
Total saving.....	\$24,000

The number of members in the Legislative Council is by law eighteen, not fourteen as the *Capital* says. Their indemnity would amount to \$5,400, and their other expenses to about half as much more, or say \$3,000 for both. The allowance to the President and engraving clerks will swell this to \$9,000, but there are other large items which we have not mentioned. Of the above amount not one-half is spent in Fredericton; but let us put it at one-half; and say the Legislative Council spends of the \$10,000 to be saved \$5,000 here. The doing away with Government House as an official residence would not make a dollar's difference to Fredericton, for the Governor would have to live here just the same. The fifteen members whom the *Capital* thinks might be struck out of the Assembly spend, say, half their allowance or \$2,250. The departmental officer to be abolished, if he was like some we could name, would spend nothing here. The five officials, whoever they may be, would probably spend their whole salary here. This would give us \$10,250 of the \$24,000 which would be spent here, and we venture to say that if the people of Fredericton had their choice between that amount of annual expenditure and a bridge across the river, they would choose the bridge without a moment's hesitation. But as we have said the estimates of the *Capital* are all wrong we shall show in a subsequent article. We wish to add that the *Herald* did not suggest the reduction of the Assembly or the discharge of Government clerks. We question the wisdom of the former step and from our knowledge of the amount of work to be done in the Departments we are not prepared to favor the latter without more consideration. We are glad that the *Capital* has taken the matter up; because in correcting the mistakes, which it is sure to make, we will be able to deal with phases on the question which would not otherwise be likely to suggest themselves. We would like to understand our contemporary on one point. Does it object to the doing away with any expenditures, however useless, provided it is made in this city?

THE COMPLETION OF THE NEW BRUNSWICK RAILWAY.

Discussing the propriety of the construction of the missing link in our railway system between Edmundston and Riviere Ouelle, the *Sun* says: As for the Riviere Ouelle route, which has been a good deal talked about in the *Telegraph*, we do not profess to know much about it, but a gentleman who is "posted" says of it: "The Riviere Ouelle route has no one living on it except old Hicks and a jackass, and the jackass would not live there if he was not a jackass. No one will ever live on it if he can help it. Its cost would be enormous. For it is in question either is not well 'posted,' or he has been filling up the editor of the *Sun* for a little recreation. The Riviere Ouelle route is treated of by our contemporary as though it were a surveyed line, which it is not. The original project for connecting St. John with the St. Lawrence contemplated a line via Lake Temiscouata to Riviere du Loup, and upon this line Mr. Joseph Hickson, of the Grand Trunk, had a farm, and we suppose he is the old Hicks of our brilliant, but rather glibly contemporary. Subsequently Riviere Ouelle was suggested as a terminus of the road; but we think we are correct in saying that no surveyor ever set his instruments upon any line between Edmundston and that point. Any Company building the extension of the N. B. Railway would have a choice of three routes. Of these the late Mr. Ramsay, C. E., in his report to Mr. H. G. C. Ketchum, C. E., in 1870, said, speaking of the elevation of the Riviere du Loup station above the St. Lawrence:

This would indicate that a better approach to the St. Lawrence should be looked for. The fact that the highest ground passed over west of Temiscouata Lake is not the summit between Blue River and Saint Francis, tributaries of the Saint John, as well as the fact that Quebec cannot get to Riviere du Loup seems to point south as the direction in which to look for that approach. From Little Falls to the Grand Trunk Station at Riviere du Loup is nearly 78 miles by the post road, and it is doubtful if a Railway up the shore of Temiscouata Lake can be obtained quite as short as that. This would make 88 miles to the wharf. By reference to the map it would appear that if a line could be got from Deguy and going to Pole Brook, thence across by the head of Baker Brook, to the foot of Long Lake, following Blue River a-piece, crossing St. Francis below the forks and thence to Kamouraska about 90 miles from Little Falls, it would bring us to the Grand Trunk and allow six miles more to get to the water so that there would be no more road to make, and we would be twenty-five miles nearer to Quebec than at Riviere du Loup. This, we probably, is the shortest line to Quebec that could be obtained, but I fear the ground will be found very difficult. By following up the main River St. John and Baker's Brook to Long Lake, the distance would appear to be about the same, and we would avoid one summit, but, whether or not, it would be an advantage can only be told by a survey.

By following the main River St. John and the St. Francis to the Boundary Lake, we would not increase the road to Kamouraska more than ten miles (perhaps considerably less), over the shortest. There would still be fifteen miles less road to Quebec than by Riviere du Loup, and there would be no summit to contend with until we reached the main summit between the St. John and St. Lawrence waters. Besides, the road would command all the trade of the valley of the St. John, which, I would judge, to be of more value as a way business than any that could possibly find its way to a road located further north. It would, no doubt, be advisable, and very proper, to explore the shorter lines; indeed, it would be wrong not to explore them to some extent; but I shall be disappointed if this does not turn out to be the most economical line to make and work.

The writer has made many enquiries respecting the Pole River route, referred to by Mr. Ramsay, and from the best information which could be obtained from persons who were familiar with the country, he is of the opinion that Mr. Ramsay's conclusion as to the difficult character of the country was somewhat hastily formed; but a strong objection to any such line would be that it would pass through the wilderness for almost its whole length. There are, however, yet some lumber reserves of value along the course which it would traverse. The St. Francis route is by all means the best that could be chosen to tap the St. Lawrence from the N. B. Railway.

We think the *Sun* takes a rather narrow view of the question, when it objects that St. John would lose a certain portion of the up-river trade in the event of the Riviere Ouelle extension being built. That a portion of the trade of that district would go to Montreal is undeniable, but if the people can trade to better advantage there than in St. John, they should not be prevented from doing so. A very large proportion of the supplies used in the woods on the upper St. John come over the Portage from Riviere du Loup, or by a shorter route direct to the head of the river; and much of the merchandise handled by the storekeepers above Grand Falls is bought in the upper provinces. But while we admit that there would be some loss to St. John, we are not by any means prepared to assent to the proposition that there would be no compensatory advantages apart from the importance of having a through Canadian line of which that city would be the terminus, and we have the authority of Sir Charles Tupper for saying that a through Canadian line is of vast importance. So far as Fredericton is concerned, the objection which the *Sun* makes, that it would become a mere way station, is

answered by the fact that every city of importance is a way station, and the fact that trade is arrested there and made pay tribute is due to the energy and enterprise of its business men.

A LIBERAL PLATFORM.

Mr. John Charlton has laid down the following as representing his idea of what the platform of the Liberal party should be:

- 1st. To make war upon monopolies.
- 2nd. To secure prudent management of public affairs.
- 3rd. To lessen and equalize the tariff.
- 4th. To check our rapidly swelling expenditures.
- 5th. To cease running into debt.
- 6th. To protect the several Provinces from Federal encroachment.
- 7th. To protect the settlers of the North-West, by discounting speculation and making settlement a condition of sale.
- 8th. To maintain a good and stable currency.
- 9th. To dismiss useless civil service employees.

In addition to this Mr. Charlton also said that he thought it likely that the party would take ground in favor of the right of Canada to make her own commercial treaties. We commend these propositions to the consideration of our readers and ask them to consider and see if they are not worthy to receive the assent of every intelligent well-wisher of Canada.

To make war upon monopolies. The very word monopoly has a hateful sound to men who have been nurtured in the enjoyment of British fair play and equal rights. "A fair field and a good law" is the watch word of Anglo-Saxon progress the world over, and has proved of inestimable value in the development of that self-reliance, perseverance and courage which have enabled what a century or two ago was one of the least among the nations to girdle the earth with her possessions and make the whole world pay her tribute. It is a grand English ring about it. It is a birth right in itself, more valuable than wealth or power, for it is the key to which alone the future will give its vast unknown riches.

The conservatism and timidity of capital tend naturally to establishment of combinations for the purpose of self-protection. This, of itself, has furnished England and the United States ample safeguards against reckless investments and disastrous rivalry. We do not forget that every year millions of dollars have been lost in speculation, and the railway war in the United States is too plain an instance of ruinous competition to be overlooked; but neither of these things disprove the principle we have enunciated, and the latter, indeed, is a strong argument in its favor. No legislation can prevent commercial gambling, and the losses consequent upon it; and the railway war is simply the result of the effort of certain companies to create a monopoly of transportation, so as to force the western farmer to pay the utmost price for the carriage of his produce to the east. Left to itself, the capital invested in Canada would find means of protecting itself, as effectually as the interests of the public will justify. It cannot be said, in view of the offer of the second syndicate, that if a monopoly had not been created the Pacific Railway would not have been built, and therefore we can only regard the provisions in the contract given the C. P. Railway Company of exclusive privileges of railway construction, and the logical result of them, which we have lately seen in the disallowance of the Manitoba Railway bill, as a gratuitous and unnecessary interference with the cardinal principles of successful commerce, and an unwise and mischievous hampering of the energies of the people. The policy of protection leads directly to the establishment of monopolies, as we have seen in the United States, where, in order that certain manufacturing interests might yield an enormous profit, the mercantile marine of the country has been annihilated, and an extravagant burden of taxation maintained, which the people find themselves almost powerless to rid themselves of, for the reason that the great monopolies control the national Legislature. Such is the tendency of protection here. The cotton monopolists say to the sugar monopolists, "We are content that people should pay dearly for their sugar if you will consent that they shall pay dearly for their cotton," and so it is all along the line of protected articles. No one interest may be strong enough to dictate legislation, but their united wealth and influence are apt to be more than sufficient to overcome the great body of the people, unless the latter are fully aroused to a sense of their position.

It would make this article too long for the columns of a newspaper if we commented upon all Mr. Charlton's propositions in detail, or as fully as we would like to, and reserving the others for future consideration, we come at once to the question of commercial treaties. A despatch of Friday said that the negotiations for a commercial treaty between France and England were broken off. It follows, therefore, that Canadians must, for the present, dismiss any hope of improved trade relations with France, and this because of something which does not concern them in the least, namely the interests of the English cotton and woolen trades. The commercial status of England and Canada are radically different. Canada has, and must for some years maintain, a tariff of a protective character; England is thoroughly given over to Free Trade; Canada is a great exporter of food and raw material; England an importer of both and practically an exporter of neither; yet the commercial treaties which affect us are made in the interest of England. This is of course inevitable in the present state of things, and we should most heartily sympathize with a movement calculated to secure us a right to make our own international trade compact. Canada has come to full manhood, and has a right to all the privileges of its majority.

THE CENTRAL RAILWAY.

A meeting was held at Briggs' Corner, Queen's County, on the 24th inst., in the interest of the Central Railway Company. It was attended by a number of prominent gentlemen, and although not very harmonious, apparently, for politics seem to have cropped out quite vigorously, was very favorable to the construction of the road. A committee of five was appointed to wait upon the Government and take such other steps as might be necessary to secure the construction of the road. A similar committee was appointed at Johnston Parish on the 25th. The two committees consist of Hugh McLean, John Ferris, W. C. King, J. C. Burpee, Robert Ward, Sr., Thomas Hetherington, C. F. Cody, T. W. Perry, Dr. Armstrong and Dr. Hetherington. Mr. King, M. P., took an active part in promoting these meetings, and was one of the principal speakers at them. At that first-named Mr. Perley, M. P. P., was present. Judging from the report of his remarks in the *St. John papers* he seems to have thrown cold water upon the agitation, although speaking very favorably of the prospects of the road being built and of the intentions of the Government, but he was careful to say that he did not speak for the Executive, but only for himself as a representative of Sunbury. When driven into a tight corner by Mr. King he said that he was willing to go out of the Government on the question of this railway. There was a time when he had an excellent opportunity to do this, and when he might, by standing up manfully for the rights of his constituents, have secured them this road, and saved the province several hundred thousand dollars; but he did not do so, and so we are justified in rating his feebly protestations as to what he would do, at something about the value he put upon Mr. King's efforts, that is "the snap of his finger."

That we may not be charged with misrepresenting the honorable gentleman, we will give the facts and let them speak for themselves. In 1874 the Railway Facility Bill was passed, and shortly after Mr. Alex. Gibson, President of the Central Railway Company, Mr. King and some others, waited upon the Government and made an application for a subsidy for that road. They represented to the Government that a Company had been organized, the stock subscribed, and that they were prepared to enter into a contract immediately. Of their ability to carry out what they were willing to undertake there was not the slightest doubt, as the line could be built and laid with steel rails for about \$7,000,000, or only \$2,000 per mile above the subsidy, and this amount the President of the road could himself have contributed, if it were necessary. There was some discussion at the Council Board, and an unwillingness to close the matter evinced, unless some further information was given the Government concerning the prospect which the Company had of getting old rails from the Dominion Government. At the close of the interview, Mr. Gibson asked if the application of his company was not the first which had been made under the Act, to which Attorney General (now Judge) King replied that it was. Mr. Gibson then said they were willing to let the matter rest there, and would, at a later day, communicate with the Government again. He afterwards went to Ottawa and secured a sufficient number of rails to lay the first portion of the line, and on his return secured an interview with the Government, informed them of the fact, and urged the claims of his company to receive the subsidy, but the application was denied. Mr. Perley, who posed in the role of omnipotence at Briggs' Corner, was a member of the Government at this time, and he was as dumb as a statue then on the question of going out of the Government. Perhaps we do him an injustice here. He may have threatened to go out, but all the same he stayed in, is there now, and voted for the subsidy for the Kent Northern and the Grand Southern, while his own constituents called in vain for the aid which alone could place them on an equal footing with their fellow citizens in other parts of the Province. We think in view of all these facts, that the less the honorable member for Sunbury has to say about what he will do and what others can't do, the better.

Referring to the question of the railway we shall be glad to assist its promoters in any way in our power. The people of New Brunswick are not so miserably sectional as to refuse simple justice to so large and important a district; but at the same time they will require that any Government, which shall propose an addition to the permanent indebtedness of the Province, shall be prepared with a thorough scheme of retrenchment by which the interest on the loan can be saved. In spite of the clamor of a timeserving contemporary, the *HERALD* is not

afraid to labor for the abolition of useless trappings of legislation, and the expenditure of the money they cost in public works for the benefit of remote districts, and the sensible people of Fredericton will stand by us in so doing; for they know that the welfare of this city does not depend upon whether there be three or five clerks in any department, but upon the general prosperity of that portion of the Province of which its merchants can make it the business centre.

THE ENFORCEMENT OF THE CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT.

The *HERALD* has not been backward in expressing its opinion as to the manner in which the working of the Canada Temperance Act has been hampered in the Supreme Court. There is another side of the question which requires some consideration, especially in view of the dismissal of the complaint against James Tennant in the Police Court yesterday. Tennant was charged with a third violation of the Act, on the complaint of one of the policemen. The complaint was not made by the officer from his personal observation, but from information furnished the Police Magistrate by a gentleman connected with a Temperance organization in this city, who, however, acted simply in the capacity of a committee, and gave information which had been received from another person. Certain witnesses were subpoenaed, and when the matter came up for hearing on Saturday Mr. Lugin appeared for the prosecution, and Mr. Rainsford for the defence. Two witnesses were examined, who could give no evidence of importance, but none of the others who had been served with a summons to appear attended. Whereupon the cause was adjourned until Tuesday, in order to give the counsel for the prosecution an opportunity to compel the attendance of the witnesses. When the matter was called on yesterday, he stated he was unable to procure an affidavit that the parties subpoenaed and not attending were necessary and material witnesses, and, in consequence, had no further evidence to offer, whereupon the Police Magistrate did as by law commanded and dismissed the case. We do not think it wrong to say that this result will do more to prevent the enforcement of the Act than anything which has occurred for some time; and the fault lies with those who prefer complaints and yet who do not openly avow their connection with the proceedings.

The *Raccoon* in Tennant's case is due to the application of no new rule of law; but the wonder is that the well known provision of the Summary Convictions Act, requiring an affidavit that a witness is necessary and material, before a subpoena can be issued, has so long remained a dead letter. Prosecutors under the Canada Temperance Act have been exceedingly fortunate in that they were not two years ago brought face to face with such a state of facts as meets them now. An impression seems to have prevailed in many quarters that the proceedings for offences against this Act were governed by a different rule from other matters punishable summarily. This is not the case. Precisely the same procedure applies to all cases. In every case of summary conviction under any Dominion Act the Magistrate is required by law to take an affidavit that witnesses are likely to give material testimony, before he can subpoena them, and then in case of their non-appearance their attendance may be compelled by warrant. In many cases the Magistrate has issued the subpoena without affidavit and if the parties choose to attend well and good; if they do not they cannot be brought on a warrant, except an affidavit be first made. When a person prefers a complaint in his own name, from facts which have come under his own observation or in respect to which he has reliable information, it is an easy matter for him to swear that the witnesses upon whom he relies are "likely to give material evidence"; but it is not to be expected that a policeman who prefers a complaint because he is directed to do so, and who knows nothing more about it, will make any such affidavit, and it is only fair to say that in the case in question he was not asked to. The lesson of the Tennant case is that the Temperance organizations must either leave the work of prosecuting offenders against the Canada Temperance Act entirely in the hands of the police, or they must come forward and take the responsibility of complaints. Public opinion will sustain them if they take the latter course, and its moral effects upon the community would be excellent. If these organizations would co-operate fully with the police, and take the same position in regard to illegal rum-selling as they would in respect to any other violation of law, the sale of liquor here would soon be reduced to a minimum. As it is, although the law is by no means a dead letter, it is not nearly as well enforced as it might be.

THE ANNUAL PILGRIMAGE.

Almost every year before the session of the Local Legislature a delegation finds its way from Fredericton to Ottawa. They go empty handed and they come back empty handed, and if it were not for the charges for their expenses in the public accounts, and for the paragraphs in the newspapers announcing their departure and return, the country would never imagine that there had been any

pilgrimage performed. It generally takes three to make up the delegation, notwithstanding the old adage that two is company, three is none. This time only two have gone which is something saved. Most people would think that one man going once could accomplish as much as those several men have accomplished by a half a dozen visits; that is, nothing. But then only very few persons are able to appreciate the dark and mysterious rules in which men who live by politics govern their ways. We are reminded by these repeated fruitless excursions of the children's game of "What will you give me to put in my soup?" "Only one word is changed, and the question is, "What will you give me to put in my speech?" and the invariable answer is, "Say the claims will be settled soon."

We expect a new answer this winter. At the opening of the session of 1878, Lieut. Governor Tilley said that the Eastern Extension claim of \$150,000 ought to be paid with interest. This would amount now, all told, to about a quarter of a million dollars, a large sum to this Province, but a small one to Sir Leonard, with his millions of unearned revenue. New Brunswick alone paid to Ottawa an unnecessary taxation more than the amount due, in the six months ending December 31st, and if our claims are not met promptly, it will be an outrage upon every principle of justice. We think the claim will be paid for several reasons. First, it will have a tendency to strengthen the Local Government, which is essentially Tory, and has a poor record to face the electors with next summer, and secondly, it will give the partisans of the Minister of Finance something to talk about when that gentleman's party asks to be sustained at the polls in this Province. It is high time the claim was paid, and it is impossible for the supporters of the Tory Government to justify the delay on the part of the Minister of Finance in allowing the matter to remain unsettled for so long a time after he was in position to insure its immediate recognition on the part of the administration.

Notes and Notices.

—They have been enjoying a strike in Milltown, owing to a reduction of wages paid to workmen on the new cotton mill.

—The World Mutual Relief Association of Lebanon, which has done some work in the Province, is threatened with dissolution by the New York Insurance Commissioner.

—One of the points which will be taken in the motion for a new trial in Guitseau's case is that the jury read the newspapers.

—There will be a shortage in the United States cotton crop this year of nearly a million bales.

—Jay Gould, in connection with C. P. Huntington, has bought an independent railway route to the Pacific. He now controls an army of 50,000 employees, from railway presidents to brakemen.

—It looks as though a vigorous effort would be made to suppress polygamy in the United States.

—A single rail elevated railway to carry a train from Boston to Chicago between breakfast and supper time, with compressed air as a motor, is talked of in Boston.

—The New York *Sun* says that "an assault which has no foundation, made in a newspaper or a public speech, produces a different rule from other matters punishable summarily. This is not the case. Precisely the same procedure applies to all cases. In every case of summary conviction under any Dominion Act the Magistrate is required by law to take an affidavit that witnesses are likely to give material testimony, before he can subpoena them, and then in case of their non-appearance their attendance may be compelled by warrant. In many cases the Magistrate has issued the subpoena without affidavit and if the parties choose to attend well and good; if they do not they cannot be brought on a warrant, except an affidavit be first made. When a person prefers a complaint in his own name, from facts which have come under his own observation or in respect to which he has reliable information, it is an easy matter for him to swear that the witnesses upon whom he relies are "likely to give material evidence"; but it is not to be expected that a policeman who prefers a complaint because he is directed to do so, and who knows nothing more about it, will make any such affidavit, and it is only fair to say that in the case in question he was not asked to. The lesson of the Tennant case is that the Temperance organizations must either leave the work of prosecuting offenders against the Canada Temperance Act entirely in the hands of the police, or they must come forward and take the responsibility of complaints. Public opinion will sustain them if they take the latter course, and its moral effects upon the community would be excellent. If these organizations would co-operate fully with the police, and take the same position in regard to illegal rum-selling as they would in respect to any other violation of law, the sale of liquor here would soon be reduced to a minimum. As it is, although the law is by no means a dead letter, it is not nearly as well enforced as it might be."

—Premier Norquay, of Manitoba, says his Legislature would not have passed the Railway Bill if a member of the Government had not promised that it would not be disallowed. So there has been deceit as well as oppression.

—The St. Croix Cotton Mill will be lighted by electricity, and the wheel for generating the power is already in place. The cost of putting in the apparatus for the electric machinery requires a large outlay at first, but the cost of the light is comparatively small, and its use is a great economy.

—Melvin, the Andover bigamist, only had six wives at the same time, so far as is known.

—There were 2,039 shipwrecks throughout the world last year, by which property worth \$1,400,000,000 was destroyed, and of this \$900,000,000 worth was owned by Great Britain and her dependencies. The total loss of life was 4,134. No less than 826 of these wrecks were off the British Coast.

—Sir Leonard Tilley wants the 30th anniversary of the first Total Abstinence Society celebrated in Canada. It will soon be time to celebrate the first anniversary of Acting Premier Tilley's refusal to pay the expense of the Temperance people in the appeal case under the Canada Temperance Act.

—The *Presbyterian Review* attacks the Rev. Phillips Brooks' orthodoxy. What is orthodoxy anyway? Is it a belief in what Christ taught or in what certain bygone worthies said he taught?

—The *Telegraph, Sun* and *News* oppose the Scott Act in St. John. We fear those who have brought the matter up at this particular time have more pluck than discretion.

—No news from the missing crew of the "Jeannette."