The Colonist.

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 13TH, 1889.

THE ONTARIO FRENCH SCHOOLS.

The report of the commissioners appointed by the Government of Ontario to inquire into the teaching of English in the schools of the French districts of Russell, Essex, Kent and Simcoe, has been published in the Toronto papers. It is a faithful, even up and evidently fair and full account of the instruction imparted in these schools. The picture drawn by the Commissioners is not nearly so dark as we were led to expect from the language of the telegrams received from the east. The French schools of Ontario are evidently improving and more attention is now paid to teaching English in them than in years gone by. The Commissioners speak of them hopefully. It will, perhaps, be best to quote some of the general conclusions at which they arrived. They say:

There can be no question as to the fact that in all the French schools in the several counties visited, notwithstanding particular cases of backwardness or inefficiency, an effort is being made to impart a knowledge of the English language; and not only so, but this work is receiving a larger amount of attention at present than in former years, so that they are practically English schools. There are also some, as will be seen from the statistical statement forming part of this report, in which the English language is largely used in the work of the school. This is the case more particularly in the counties of Essex and Kent.

There are some schools in which the time given to English and the use of that language in the school are too limited; but, even in these, more attention is paid to English than formerly, and the use made of it in the work of instruction is greater than it was a few years ago.

In dealing with these schools, in order to raise them to a higher standard, and to secure a satisfactory teaching of the English language in them, time must be allowed, and patience must be exercised. For many years, the French people were allowed to conduct their schools in their own way, no exception being taken either by the Education Department or by the public. Special provision was made to secure French teachers for them and French text-books were authorized for their schools. They have lived for a long period in the localities where they are found, enjoying the use of their native language. They are strongly attached to it. It is the language of their fathers, and the language used in their homes and spoken by their children. It is natural that they should cherish it with affection and desire their children to acquire a knowledge of it. If the schools are dealt with justly, and with due consideration for the feelings of the people, and if the recommendations made in this report are adopted, we believe these schools, within a reasonable time, will be raised to a degree of efficiency that will be satisfactory to both the English and the French people.

The Commissioners believe that the French people themselves will welcome any changes that may be made to render their schools more efficient and to advance them rapidly and intelligently in the knowledge of English. The French in Ontario are very far from being fools. They are sharp enough to know that if their children—the boys particularly—are to get on in the world they must learn English. They see that English is the language of business not only in the Dominion of Canada, but in the United States, and that to send a boy into the world without a knowledge of any other language than French is doing him a very great injustice. We are not surprised, therefore, to learn that the Commissioners found both school trustees and parents ready to listen to their advice.

The comments of the Toronto Mail upon the report are remarkably mild. It does not say one word calculated to irritate the most sensitive French Nationalist. It says:

"On the whole, the commissioners appear to have done their work thoroughly and conscientiously. It now remains for the Minister of Education to carry out their recommendations. The task may be a difficult one, but the country is prepared to give ample time, provided, of course, that he goes about the job in an earnest and determined manner. No one desires to see the French ill-treated. They have been allowed by various Governments to conduct their schools in their own language and in the old Quebec way for two generations and more; and should be dealt with in a kind and conciliatory spirit. Nevertheless the evil is a grave one, and it is the duty of the Government to uproot it wholly regardless of party considerations."

A SUCCESSFUL OPERATION.

One of the best uses which the United States can make of its surplus—since it is bound to have a surplus—is to pay off the national debt. This is better than pensioning every old soldier who can show the ghost of a claim, or squandering the people's money in public works that are not needed, and holding out to unscrupulous contractors tempting opportunities to cheat the nation. But the United States Government has paid all its bonds that have matured, and it can only lessen the debt by going into the money market and buying its own stocks at a premium. This is a rather delicate operation, for it would be very easy for the Government to disturb the business of the country, and to do more harm than good by trading in stocks. But there are times when it can make things easy for the mercantile community by permitting a few millions of its hoarded cash to go into the general circulation. In the opinion of the Secretary of the Treasury, the state of the money market a few weeks ago made it advisable for him to go into the stock market with his money bags. He offered to buy four per cent. bonds which are to mature on July 1, 1907. He found that he could purchase $5,395,000 of them at 128, and he purchased. The transaction was a profitable one for the government. These bonds have nearly eighteen years yet to run. The Republic would have to pay $72 interest on every hundred dollars of these bonds if they were allowed to mature, but by buying them now from holders that needed the ready cash he paid only $28, thus saving $44 on every hundred of the bonds purchased. This amounted in all to $2,373,800. This to an individual would be a very pretty sum to save, but to a very rich nation like the United States which finds it difficult not how to save but how to spend, it does not seem like a very great deal. But it must be satisfactory to the citizens of the Republic to know that their government can pay its debts readily even before they are due. Of course there are economists and politicians who say that it is bad policy and bad financing to take from the people more money than is needed for the requirements of government, and that locking up money is no more the business of the Government than dealing in sugar; but every one does not understand how this is, but the ordinary American citizen may be excused if he feels proud when he knows that his Government has more money in the treasury than is required to meet every demand upon it.

NEW CONSTITUTIONS.

The constitutions of the new States, South Dakota, and Washington, are a sort of anticipatory condemnation of their future governments. The spirit of suspicion rather than of prudence pervades them. They restrict the legislature in almost every direction, and make the enactment of laws on many subjects almost unnecessary. Instead of defining a few general principles on which the legislation of the State is to be based and its government carried on, it goes into details which are ordinarily arranged by statute law. The constitution of the State of Washington, for instance, directs what shall be the salaries of its Governor, Lieut.-Governor, Secretary of State, Treasurer, Auditor, Attorney-General and Superintendent of Public Instruction. The salaries which are thus fixed by the constitution appear, for large and young States in which compensation for labor of all kinds is on a liberal scale, to be very small. The Governor is to get only four thousand dollars a year, and it can be increased to six thousand, but no further. The Lieut.-Governor's is fixed at one thousand dollars a year, and the Legislature has no power to increase it beyond three thousand dollars. The Secretary of State is to receive at first twenty-five hundred dollars a year, but the Legislature can raise it to three thousand, and there it must stop. The Attorney-General of the new State is allowed no more than two thousand a year, and power is given the Legislature to raise it to thirty-five hundred; the Auditor gets two thousand, and the constitution declares it "shall never exceed three thousand dollars per annum;" the Treasurer is not quite so badly off, he is allowed two thousand to begin with, with a limit of four thousand. The Superintendent of Public Instruction is to get twenty-five hundred dollars a year at the start, and an uncommonly generous Legislature is invested with the power to raise it to four thousand dollars, but it is "never" to exceed that sum. It does seem singular that it will require an amendment of the Constitution of the State of Washington to raise the Secretary of State's salary from three thousand dollars to five thousand, which does not seem to be a very princely salary for a man capable of properly performing the duties of the office. It appears to us that it is hardly worth while having a Legislature at all if it cannot be trusted with fixing the remuneration which the state officials are to receive. The excessive caution of the framers of the constitution shows that they have not only no faith in the men whom the people elect as their representatives, but that they believe that the people have not sense enough to elect honest men and men who are capable of adapting the legislation of the State to its circumstances. Their distrust goes so far as to leave it out of the power of the representatives to say what pay they are themselves to receive. The Constitution settles that matter for them. It ordains that each member of the Legislature shall not receive more than "five dollars for each day's attendance during session, and ten cents for every mile he shall travel in going to and returning from the place of the meeting of the Legislature, on the most usual route."

There is a provision of the Constitution which may be necessary, but it shows that the men who drew it up have not a very high opinion of the material out of which public officials are to be made in the Sateo of Washington. It is this:

"It shall not be lawful for any person holding public office in this State to use a pass or to purchase transportation from any railroad or other corporation other than as the same may be purchased by the general public, and the Legislature shall pass laws to enforce this provision."

In order that legislation may not be too expensive to the State and that the representatives of the people will have the least possible chance to do mischief the Legislature is only to meet once in two years, and then the session must not last more than sixty days. The Governor, however, has authority to convene the legisature on special occasions, and the Legislature has the power to decide in what month of the year its biennial sessions are to be held.

The constitution contains provisions for what we in Canada would call the "independence of Parliament," and the safeguards against the bribery and corruption of members of the Legislature are numerous and stringent.

It is just possible that these precautions will effect the purpose intended, but it would have looked better and perhaps the Constitution would have been quite as sound and quite as workable if its framers had left more at the discretion of the Legislature, and had shown that they had some faith in the intelligence and integrity of the electors of the future. There is a difference between the constitution of a country and its statute law. Each, we presume, has its own sphere, but the framers of the constitutions of Washington and North Dakota have made one overlap the other in a way that will make it difficult hereafter to discover where one begins and the other ends.

These new constitutions contain some excellent features, but it will, we think, be found that there is a great deal too much of them.

There are two matters upon which the members of the constitutional convention of Washington State did not take upon themselves to decide. These are, prohibition and woman suffrage. They have arranged to take a vote on these two subjects separately when the constitution is submitted to the people. If the electors approve, articles affirming either or both of these principles, will be embodied in the Constitution.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The electors of South Dakota and Washington Territory will be asked to decide whether they will allow women to vote when their Territories become States. The conventions were unwilling to enfranchise the ladies and they were too gallant—or perhaps afraid—to give the advocates of woman suffrage a direct refusal. They therefore shifted the responsibility on to the shoulders of the people. The electors, protected by the ballot, will perhaps feel freer than the members of the conventions did to vote according to their convictions or their prejudices. The electors of those two territories are not the only people who have been required to give a decision on this momentous question at the polls. Thirteen years ago the electors of Colorado were required to vote aye or nay on the question of woman suffrage. The decision was adverse to the ladies, the ayes being 6,612 and the nays 14,055. A constitutional amendment was passed by the Legislature of Oregon granting the suffrage to women. It was submitted to the people in 1884 and was rejected by a vote of 28,176 to 11,223. A similar vote was taken in the State of Nebraska in November, 1882, with the same result. The women were denied the privilege of the franchise by a vote of 50,693 against, to 25,796 for. In Indiana, as at present in Washington, prohibition and woman suffrage were linked together by the Legislature, but the amendment was declared invalid, so the electors did not get the chance of voting upon it.

If we ventured a prediction, we would be inclined to say that the chances appear very much against both the prohibition and the woman suffrage articles of the Washington Constitution. Prohibition has evidently fallen upon evil days. It has gone into disrepute on both sides of the line, and there is among the men of the Anglo-Saxon race—and we suspect among the women, too,—a prejudice against extending political power to women. The men dislike the idea of their womankind mixing up in election contests, and the women themselves do not appear to set a very high value upon the privilege of voting for candidates for legislative honors. The ladies, therefore, do not feel at all hurt when a proposal to extend the franchise to women is rejected, either at the polls or in Parliament. If they were very desirous of the privilege, the result would, no doubt, be different.

BOUND TO BE AHEAD.

The Americans are determined to anticipate the Canadians in the matter of laying a cable to Australia. A committee of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce has recommended uniting the continent of America with Australia by a cable. The estimated cost is $10,000,000. The total distance is 6,371 miles. It is made up in this way: From San Francisco to Honolulu, 2,100 miles; from Honolulu to Tutuilo, 2,271 miles; from Tutuilo to North Cape, New Zealand, 1,700 miles. Three hundred miles are allowed for slack and irregularities of the bottom of the ocean. The bed of part of the Pacific is said to be favorable for cable laying. The cable between San Francisco and Honolulu will lie in a bed of soft mud. The coral reefs in the southern latitudes may be hard on the cable. The greatest depth between these two points is 3,252 fathoms. The reasons for engaging in the enterprise are partly military and partly commercial. The late difficulty in Samoa impressed the citizens of the United States with the importance of having better and more rapid communication with the islands of the Pacific than now obtains. One of our San Francisco contemporaries says that if there had been cable communication with Samoa or some point near that group, the American Government would have saved some $3,000,000 worth of property that was destroyed there. If the United States Government had known exactly what the Germans were doing in Samoa sooner than they did, the trouble would have been all over before the storm came that destroyed their warships, or what is more likely, there would have never been any need of sending war ships there at all.

One of our California contemporaries becomes quite enthusiastic when it contemplates the commercial advantages which will follow uniting California with Australia by cable, it says:

Finally, the wire to Australasia is a commercial necessity. The communities which inhabit the continent of Australia and the island of New Zealand gravitate toward us by a community of origin, institutions and national purpose—it is our joint destiny to cherish the closest reciprocal relations. By a singular accident we supply Australia with the products of the living forest in the shape of lumber, and fruits, while Australia supplies us with the product of the dead forest in the shape of coal. As the years pass this interchange will grow more active. The people of Melbourne are eating bread made from Californian flour, the tables at Auckland are laid with Californian apricots and Californian dried peaches, while the first effect of a revival of the woolen industry would be consignments of Australian wool to San Francisco. All this business is done by cable; the messages go from here to England, thence to Southern Europe, Africa, Southern Asia and so on, eventually to Australia, at a cost of $2 50 to $3 a word. It goes without saying that the increase of the business would be facilitated if we had a line of our own, conveying messages at 50 cents a word and insuring answers to questions on the same day.

THE ELIXIR DISCREDITED

Dr. Brown-Sequard's elixir of life appears to be already pretty well discredited. Whatever good it is supposed to have done is credited to the imagination of sanguine patients. The power of the imagination is known to be very great, and when the elixir was believed to be a powerful life-restorer many to whom it was administered thought that they were rejuvenated, and they became, in consequence, as frisky as young colts. But the delusion does not appear to have lasted long. The infirmities and the disabilities of old age could not be ignored, and the believers in the virtues of the elixir soon began to feel that it was unable to conquer nature. Their old pains and aches and weaknesses came back to them, and when their imagination had cooled and they had settled down to their normal condition they found their last state be, if anything, worse than their first. There were, too, some upon whom the elixir had positively an injurious effect, and at least one death was reported from its use. The consequence is that the believers in the elixir are becoming fewer and fewer every day, and those who hoped by its use to renew their youth have lost their faith in its power and are cruelly disappointed. Dr. Brown-Sequard is yet to be heard from in defence of his nostrum, and Dr. Hammond of New York will be expected to tell the world why he so readily gave the elixir the benefit of his reputation as a physician and a man of science.

"NO TURPITUDE."

Our opposition contemporary is very unwilling to admit that there is really nothing in the ancient election story which has done duty so long, and as it sees, with such little effect. It has been reproduced at every election for the last eighteen years, and has evidently been regarded by the electors for what it is—a slander dressed up for election purposes. In spite of it, and perhaps on account of it, Mr. Robson has held his own in the country and in the Legislature, until to-day he stands higher than ever he did before. Common sense should convince our contemporary that "ammunition" which has proved so ineffective for so many years is good for nothing, and should be relegated to the receptacle of the worn-out political lumber of the Liberal party. Besides, our contemporary forgets that the story, as told by it, is lacking in the essential element—truth. There is no political turpitude in a politician entertaining the proposition of his chief, or in rejecting it, if it does not meet his views of what is proper.

We have corrected the organ in one very important particular, but it carefully refrains from noticing the correction. It did not suit its purpose to acknowledge that it was wrong in representing that the negotiations to which it alludes were not as it represented them, between Mr. Robson and an opponent, but between him and a leading member of his own party, a party which he, at the time, was supporting. This makes all the difference in the world. There is no place for "turpitude" to come in in such negotiations. There was no "political barter." In fact the whole slander has been worn out and our contemporary's ammunition must be completely exhausted when it revives it now to do duty against the Leader of the Government.

The organ "commends our ethics to the disinterested analysis of the electors. We are glad it does. Our ethics are sound. We believe that slander is an unlawful weapon. It is seldom an effective weapon even when it is fresh, and its falsity and malignity has not been exposed. But it is utterly useless when it is eighteen years old, and has been fired off numberless times during that period without once doing any perceptible execution. Most of the electors, will we are sure, conclude that it is neither good morals nor good policy to attempt to injure an opponent by repeating a stale, exploded slander, that did little or no harm even when it was first invented. If the organ must deal in slander why does it not invent something new?

"TRANQUIL NEGOTIATIONS."

The Washington correspondent of the New York Herald writes as if he had received his information with respect to the understanding that exists between Great Britain and the United States regarding the Behring's Sea difficulty from an authoritative source. From the tone of his letter he would have the readers of that paper believe that he knows all about it. He says in effect that there is really no dispute between the two nations with regard to the jurisdiction over the waters of Behring's Sea. They have, as it were, agreed to disagree about the matter. The United States claims sovereignty over the sea by virtue of its deed of purchase from Russia. England does not admit the validity of the claim, but it is willing to permit the United States under its "colorable" claim to exercise exclusive jurisdiction until such times as an amicable settlement is arrived at. But it does not seem in any violent hurry to press for such a settlement, and in the meantime British Columbia sealers are exposed to outrage and loss. A knowledge of this fact does not appear to affect the easy-going diplomats very seriously. What are the sufferings and anxieties of a few British Columbia sealers to them? They appear bound to take their own time. The Herald correspondent speculates on the prospects of a settlement, and gives his opinion of the chances of the British Columbian sealers and ship owners being indemnified for the losses they have sustained. He says;

"The burden of pressing that contention and those claims properly falls upon the British Government, since our own Government is in possession of Behring's Sea with a good color of title and has nothing to do but to stand on its possession and colorable title till the adverse party makes out its case. The relative positions of the respective parties are fully understood and virtually admitted on the British side, and hence there is not the slightest heat nor fear of ill-feeling between the two governments.

"I am advised that the probable result of an entirely tranquil negotiation will be a reference of the question of dominion to the arbitration of a friendly Power and an international convention for the protection of seal life in Behring Sea. I am also informed that the Department of State expects to lose its case upon an arbitration, but also looks for such a justification or exculpation of what has been done in good faith and upon a fair color of right that any moderate payment which may be made upon account of the intercepted Canadian sealers will take on the character of a compassionate allowance rather than an award of damages. The nature of my information and the source of it warrant the assertion that there is next to nothing, in an official and diplomatic sense, in the much-exploited Behring Sea question."

"Tranquil negotiation" is good, or rather, from a British Columbian point of view, is exasperating. There was a time when the negotiations respecting an insult offered the British flag and outrages perpetrated on British subjects could not be characterized by the party offering the insult and committing the outrages as "tranquil." Will that time ever return?

Children Cry for Pitcher's Castoria

A GOOD EXAMPLE.

The American Government is exploring the waters of its territory on the Pacific coast to discover where food fish are to be found. Lieut. Commander Tanner is doing the work in the steamer Albatross. He is reported to have made many interesting discoveries. He has found the haunts of some very valuable fish, and his trawls have brought to the surface denizens of the deep whose existence has been hitherto unsuspected. He has discovered rich oyster beds, from which a plentiful harvest may yet be gathered. It is to be hoped that the Dominion Government will do for the waters of British Columbia what the Government of the United States is doing for California and Alaska. The sea near the coasts of the mainland and islands should be prospected. It should not be left to private enterprise to find where the best fishing grounds are situated and what fish inhabit the waters of the province. Such an expedition as that which Lieut. Tanner is conducting would not cost much and it might be productive of very great advantage to the province and also to the whole Dominion. Such explorations are necessary to the proper development of the fisheries of the coast. They are valuable, too, from a scientific point of view. We trust that one will be set on foot on the Pacific Coast by the Dominion Government before this time next year.

THE ORGAN PHILOSOPHIC.

Our Yates-street contemporary has become quite a philosopher. It has, in effect, taken for its text, "Tories and Grits are born, not made," and has treated its readers to an essay the object of which is to prove that they can no more combine than can oil and water. This is all very well, and is, no doubt, to a certain extent true, but it is rather difficult to see what bearing it has upon politics in this province at the present time. Then, again, there are very few people born Tories pure and simple, and fewer still come into this world unmitigated Radicals. Most of us have both elements in our intellectual make-up pretty evenly balanced. Nearly every one is conservative on some points and at some period of his life, and there is no one but likes now and then to see some things changed. Then there are a great many people who are Liberals or Conservatives by accident. Some of the most inveterate Grits that it has ever been our luck to meet were naturally Tories of the strictest sect, and we have met men who prided themselves on being hereditary Conservatives, so to speak, who, if they had been brought up under other influences, would have been out-and-out radicals. There are circumstances, too, which bring out the Conservative element in a man's nature, and it is not hard to imagine situations in which a man must become a radical and even a revolutionist in spite of decided conservative tendencies.

Sir John Macdonald is generally considered a Conservative of the Conservatives, but his Confederation policy and his railway policy have been the very reverse of conservative. It has been the fate of this Conservative statesman to take the leading part in two movements which were almost revolutionary in their character and results. Confederation was a new thing in Canada. The born Tories, whether they were called Conservatives or Grits, were all against it. They believed that British-America was very well as it was. They could see no good in the proposed change. They predicted that all manner of evil to the people of all the colonies would flow from its establishment. They could not see what possessed "John A." and the other leading Conservatives to advocate this radical change in the political condition of the whole country. The Anti-confederate party was the real Tory party of the years immediately preceding '67, and Sir John A. Macdonald, the leader of the Conservative party, did not belong to it. He was on the other side. He was for the nonce not a Liberal merely, but a Radical, and an extreme one at that.

Then when "John A." agreed to build a railway across the continent to the Pacific ocean, the Tories by nature were up in arms. It was an "insane project." It could never be accomplished. Canada would be ruined in attempting to carry out the mad scheme. If the country could not repudiate his agreement with British Columbia a way must be found of evading some of its stipulations. The born Tories made a dreadful row about the construction of the great Canadian railway. The country then saw a very singular political spectacle. The great parties changed places. The nominal Liberals became Conservatives and the Conservatives became the party of change and progress. It was about this time that the title "Liberal-Conservative," which our contemporary dislikes so much, became popular in Canada, and its appropriateness to the party led by Sir John A. Macdonald was acknowledged by all reflecting men. Its policy was liberal, too liberal indeed, to suit the unprogressive Grits, but it still remained the Conservative party of the Dominion of Canada. And since then those who have observed at all closely the movements of parties in this Dominion saw that the policy of the two great parties in Canada has not at all corresponded with the titles they respectively bear. The policy of the Conservative party has not been uniformly conservative, neither has the policy of the Liberals been always liberal.

Our philosophical contemporary, no doubt, sees that in politics there is not, after all, except for convenience sake, very much in a name. It has seen Tories pursuing a liberal policy and Liberals acting in a way that might be justly characterized as hysterically conservative. So that it is not so very anomalous after all for the new association to call itself Liberal-Conservative, and to expect that men who agree with its principles and approve of the acts of the party which it supports, no matter what name they may have gone by heretofore, can consistently join it, and work heartily to effect the objects at which it aims. The men who are loyal to a mere name may pride themselves on their consistency, but they do so at the expense of their reputation for common sense. Sensible men do not make party a superstition. They give their support to the men and the government which they are convinced will best administer the affairs of the province and the Dominion. As we have seen, those who are Conservative by name may be in practice liberal and progressive, and those who pride themselves in being called Liberal may be the very reverse of all that their name implies. The theories of the Opposition organ may amuse its readers, but when it comes to business British Columbians will take a practical view of their duties as electors, and support those who have shown that they know how to make a country go ahead and how to keep it prosperous.

CANADA MISREPRESENTED.

Our neighbors across the line, while they cannot justify the course which their Government is pursuing with respect to the treatment of British sealers in Behring's Sea, try to produce the impression that, bad as it is, it is not worse than the treatment which American fishermen receive in what are claimed as Dominion waters in the east. The Oregonian, which is generally well informed, makes this mistake. It says in its remarks on what it calls "The Victoria Tempest":—

"The members of the Dominion Parliament ought to know that there is no substantial difference between the seizure of British sealers under the law passed by the last Congress and the seizure of our American fishing vessels under a strained and obsolete construction of the treaty of 1818. . . . New England claimed that the three-mile limit should be measured from headland to headland, and that, under the broad doctrine of international comity and commercial humanity proclaimed in 1830 between England and America, the American fishing vessel was as fairly treated to humane treatment as an American coasting vessel."

Our Portland contemporary does not, we presume, contend that because American fishermen were treated badly by the British on the east coast of America, it is therefore right that the British sealers should be subjected to wrong and outrage by the Americans on the west coast. It is surely too intelligent and too fair-minded to teach the doctrine held by some peculiar people that two wrongs make one right. But it does, whether intentionally or not, leave the impression on the mind of its readers that the Behring's Sea seizures are a kind of reprisals for injuries done to American fishermen in the east.

But its representation of the case, even from that point of view, is altogether erroneous. The British interpretation of the treaty of 1818 is very far indeed from being either strained or obsolete. It is, in fact the very reverse. The language of the treaty is so plain and pointed that it is impossible to misconstrue it. By it the Americans formally renounced all rights which they had, up to that time, claimed and exercised, except some which were specified, and these and more are freely accorded to American fishermen in British American harbors. But the truth is, American fishermen believe that their Government renounced too much in that treaty. They are not satisfied to abide by the bargain that had been made for them, and want to take more than they have any right to. The Americans have been asked, time and again, to settle all disputed matters in the east by a commission or by arbitration, but they have refused to submit their claims to any tribunal, no matter how constituted.

Our contemporary is curiously wrong with respect to the headland question. It says New England desired that the three-mile limit should be measured from headland to headland. That is exactly what New England would not consent to. Old England held that the fair way of measuring the three-mile limit was from a line drawn from headland to headland, but New England would not be satisfied unless the line followed "the sinuosities of the coast." Here again our neighbors were inconsistent, for if their own rule were applied to their own coast, bays which are claimed to be—and very properly so—the territorial waters of the United States would be outside its jurisdiction. Chesapeake Bay would be one of these. But Great Britain did not insist upon its own rule. She gave up her exclusive right to the Bay of Fundy which is a closed sea, it there is such a thing at all, and she made the Americans free of the Straits of Canso. She also restricted her claim with respect to the headlands to those that were six miles apart. This is the arrangement that now exists in the East—Americans can fish anywhere off the coasts of the Dominion of Canada and Newfoundland three marine miles from the shore, but they cannot enter bays, the points enclosing which are six miles apart. Compare this with the claim of the Americans in Behring's Sea and the jurisdiction exercised.

The truth is, the Americans have not even the shadow of a grievance on the eastern side of the continent. The rights of the fishing vessels in the harbors there are strictly defined by treaty in terms which it is simply impossible to misunderstand. They are allowed, as we have already said, more than anything like a strict interpretation of the treaty extends to them, and when their newspapers try to make the American people believe that the outrages in Behring's Sea are in some sort justified by the ill treatment which American fishermen receive at the hands of the Canadian authorities in the east they are either ignorant of the subject about which they write or they try wilfully to mislead their readers. We advise the editor of the Oregonian before he again attempts to excuse the piracies in Behring's Sea to read the Convention of 1818, and to obtain from authentic sources some knowledge of the history of the eastern fishery question.

ADVICE TO MOTHERS.—Are you disturbed at night and broken of your rest by a sick child suffering and crying with pain of Cutting Teeth? If so send at once and get a bottle of "Mrs. Winslow's Soothing Syrup" for Children Teething. Its value is incalculable. It will relieve the poor little sufferer immediately. Depend upon it, mothers; there is no mistake about it. It cures Dysentery and Diarrhœa, regulates the Stomach and Bowels, cure Wind Colic, softens the Gums, reduces Inflammation, and gives tone and energy to the whole system. "Mrs. Winslow's Soothing Syrup" for children teething is pleasant to the taste and is the prescription of one of the oldest and best female physicians and nurses in the United States, and is for sale by all druggists throughout the world. Price twenty-five cents a bottle. Be sure and ask for "Mrs. WINSLOW'S SOOTHING SYRUP," and take no other kind. my31-eod-w

EDITORIAL COMMENTS.

JUDGE FIELD, when urged to carry arms, in order to defend himself against the violence of ex-Judge Terry, made a very wise reply. He said: "No; I do not and will not carry arms, because when it is known that the judges of the courts are compelled to arm themselves from an assault offered in consequence of their judicial action, it will be time to dissolve the courts, consider government a failure and let society lapse into barbarism." This is a weighty saying and worthy the most serious reflection.

AMONG the American newspapers which characterize the claim of the United States to exclusive jurisdiction over Behring's Sea, as altogether groundless, is the Christian Union. It ridicules the notion that the Government of the United States are justified in violating the law of nations in order to preserve the fur seals from destruction. It says:—

"Protection of seals upon the high seas is something over which we have no more authority than any other nation. . . . As to the humorous claim attributed to the Assistant Secretary of State, that we have a right to the seals in open seas because they have been bred in our waters, the same principle would establish a claim of the Northern States to authority over the robins when they go south in the fall."

THE Paris Exhibition is proving the most successful of all the World's Fairs. It is worthy of its success. It is a wonderful collection of the works of industry and art. It is the greatest object lesson that was ever presented to mankind, and it is no wonder that millions from all quarters of the world are flocking to learn what it has to teach. The present Paris Exposition is the eighth of the international exhibitions, and the fourth that has been held in Paris. The first Exhibition of the World's industry was held in London thirty-eight years ago. It was looked upon as a wonderful enterprise. But it was only the first of a series of great exhibitions. The following statistics regarding the exhibitions appeared in a late number of the New York Post:

City.	Yr.	Number of Exhibtrs	Number of Visitors.	Days Open
London	1851	13,917	6,039,195	141
Paris	1855	24,854	5,162,330	200
London	1862	28,653	6,211,103	171
Paris	1867	50,226	10,200,000	210
Vienna	1873	42,584	7,254,687	186
Philadelphia	1876	42,000	9,857,935	159
Paris	1878	60,000	16,226,742	194

WHAT right has the Times to dictate to the electors of Lillooet respecting the choice of a representative? It is a non-resident newspaper, and has no business to be putting in its oar. Lillooet for the Lillooetians is the principle which it advocates, and since it is not a Lillooetian, it has no right to say one single word about the election that is to take place in that part of the province. We are surprised at our contemporary's inconsistency. If the electors of that district are not to choose a non-resident for a representative, we are quite sure they will not submit to be lectured by a non-resident as to whom they shall elect. According to the Times, a non-resident has no right to ask the electors of Lillooet for their votes; and if that is the case, it is the merest impertinence for a non-resident to interfere in any way in its elections. To be consistent, the Times after this will let election matters in Lillooet and all other places outside of Victoria severely alone. We are pretty sure that the electors of Lillooet will be able to manage their election very well without the interference of the champion of resident representation.

MISCELLANEOUS.

STARTLING EVIDENCE

Of the Cure of Skin Diseases when all Other Methods Fail.

Psoriasis 5 years, covering face, head, and entire body with white scabs. Skin red, itchy and bleeding. Hair all gone. Spent hundreds of dollars. Pronounced incurable. Cured by Cuticura Remedies.

My disease (psoriasis) first broke out on my left cheek, spreading across my nose, and almost covering my face. It ran into my eyes, and the physician was afraid I would lose my eyesight altogether. It spread all over my head, and my hair all fell out, until I was entirely bald-headed; it then broke out on my arms and shoulders, until my arms were just one sore. It covered my entire body, my face, head and shoulders being the worst. The white scabs fell constantly from my head, shoulders and arms; the skin would thicken and be red and very itchy, and would crack and bleed if scratched. After spending many hundreds of dollars, I was pronounced incurable. I heard of the CUTICURA REMEDIES, and after using two bottles CUTICURA RESOLVENT, I could see a change; and after I had taken four bottles, I was almost cured; and when I had used six bottles of CUTICURA RESOLVENT and one box of CUTICURA, and one cake of CUTICURA SOAP, I was cured of the dreadful disease from which I had suffered for five years. I thought the disease would leave a very deep scar, but the CUTICURA REMEDIES cured it without any scars. I cannot express with a pen what I suffered before using the CUTICURA REMEDIES. They saved my life, and I feel it my duty to recommend them. My hair is restored as good as ever, and so is my eyesight. I know of a number of different persons who have used the CUTICURA REMEDIES, and all have received great benefit from their use.

MRS ROSA KELLY,
Rockwell City, Calhoun Co., Iowa.

Cuticura Remedies

Cure every species of agonizing, humiliating, itching, burning, bleeding, scaly, blotch and pimply diseases of the skin, scalp and blood, with loss of hair, from pimples to scrofula, except possibly ichthyosis.

Sold everywhere. Price, CUTICURA, 75c.; SOAP, 35c.; RESOLVENT, $1.50. Prepared by the POTTER DRUG AND CHEMICAL CORPORATION, Boston.

Send for "How to Cure Skin Diseases," 64 pp., 50 illustrations, and 100 testimonials.

PIMPLES, black-heads, red, rough, chapped and oily skin prevented by CUTICURA SOAP.

IT STOPS THE PAIN.

Back ache, kidney pains, weakness, rheumatism, and muscular pains *relieved in one minute* by the CUTICURA ANTI-PAIN PLASTER, the first and only instantaneous pain-killing plaster.

Mortgagee's Sale

I am instructed by the Mortgagee to sell by Public Auction, at the Saleroom, Store street, on

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 13,

AT TWELVE O'CLOCK, NOON,

The property known as the

150-MILE HOUSE,

CONSISTING OF

The well known Hotel, and Lots 11, 12 and 14, Group 1, Cariboo District, Containing 480 Acres.

50 per cent. of the purchase money must be paid the Auctioneer when the property is knocked down; the balance of money on execution of conveyance to the purchaser. Deeds at purchaser's expense.

For particulars apply to Messrs. Drake, Jackson & Helmcken, at Victoria, B. C., or to the undersigned.

W. R. CLARKE,
Auctioneer.

au23-dw

NEW ADVERTISEMENTS.

The "Colonist"

Offers to New Subscribers to the

WEEKLY,

And to old ones who renew promptly,

A magnificent $400 Rosewood Case

PIANO!

As a premium, during the months of September, October, November and December, of the present year.

EVERY PAID-UP SUBSCRIBER

At the 1st of September, 1889, renewing for one year, will be entitled to a ticket.

EVERY NEW SUBSCRIBER

For One year is entitled to a ticket.

The Piano is now on view at ROBERT JAMIESON'S Bookstore, Government street, and is open for inspection at any time during business hours. The Instrument is from the well-known house of

MASON & RISCH, TORONTO,

and is guaranteed to be first-class in every respect. The following names are given of prominent people, copies of whose letters of appreciation of the Mason & Risch Piano may be seen at R. Jamieson's store:

THE LATE DR. FRANZ LISZT.
HERR MULLER-HARTUNG, Director Royal Orchestral School, Weimer, Germany.
MADAME ALBANI, the renowned Prima Donna, London, England.
C. S. JEKYLL, Esq., St. James' Palace, London, Organist to Her Majesty's Chapels Royal.
DR. A. C. MACKENZIE, London, the eminent Composer of "The Rose of Sharon," etc., etc.
DR. W. C. SELLE, Organist in Ordinary to Her Majesty, Hampton Court Palace.
FRANKLIN TAYLOR, Esq., Premier Prof. of the Pianoforte, Royal College of Music, London.
HERR WILHELM GANZ, the well-known Composer and Pianist, London.
HERR LEIDERITZ, Director of the Wagner Orchestra, London.
JAS. FITZGERALD, Esq., F. S. Sc., Conductor Kidderminster Choral Society.
DR. F. J. BRIDGE, Organist, Westminster Abbey, London.
REV. W. BLOW, M.A., the eminent Amateur Violinist and Musical Critic.
HENRY LESLIE, Esq., Founder of the celebrated Henry Leslie's Choir, London
E. MINSHALL, Esq., Organist and Choir Director of the City Temple Church, London.
H. KILLICK MORLEY, Esq., Organist, Royal Parish Church, Greenwich, Eng.
HERR REMENYI, the renowned Hungarian Violinist.
THE MENDELSSOHN QUINTETTE CLUB, of Boston, Mass.
FREDERIC ARCHER, Esq., the Great English Organist and Critic.
S. P. WARREN, Esq., the talented Organist, Grace Church (Epis.) New York.
OTTO BENDIX, New England Conservatory of Music, Boston, Mass., formerly Pianist to His Majesty the King of Denmark.

The Drawing will take place on

NEW YEAR'S EVE,

And will be under the supervision of a Committee selected by ticket holders.

CASTORIA

for Infants and Children.

"Castoria is so well adapted to children that I recommend it as superior to any prescription known to me."
H. A. ARCHER, M.D.,
111 So. Oxford St., Brooklyn, N.Y.

Castoria cures Colic, Constipation, Sour Stomach, Diarrhœa, Eructation, Kills Worms, gives sleep, and promotes digestion, Without injurious medication.

THE CENTAUR COMPANY, 77 Murray street, N.Y.

BRITISH COLUMBIA

LAND AND INVESTMENT AGENCY, L'd

THOMAS ALLSOP,
HENRY S. MASON,
CUYLER A. HOLLAND } DIRECTORS.

HEAD OFFICE, 15 Serjeant's Inn, Fleet St, LONDON, ENGLAND.

The business of ALLSOP & MASON has been merged in the above Company and will be carried on by the Company from this date as a general Land Investment and Insurance Agency.

MONEY TO LOAN on Mortgage at Low Rates.

Town Lots and Farming Lands for Sale on easy terms.

Victoria, B. C., May 16th, 1887. e24-tf-dw

JUST ARRIVED!!

TWO CARLOADS OF

Buggies, Road Carts, Democrats, &c.

These Rigs are built by the BRANTFORD CARRIAGE CO., Brantford, Ont. (A branch of the Cortland Carriage Co., Cortland, N.Y.), and are undoubtedly the

BEST BUILT AND HANDSOMEST RIGS

EVER IMPORTED INTO BRITISH COLUMBIA.

We guarantee them all to be A 1. Call and examine, or write for Catalogues. Prices very moderate and terms easy.

E. G. PRIOR & CO.,

Cor. Government and Johnson Sts, Victoria, B. C.

feb-1-dwly

SPECIAL.

FOUR CASES

MEN'S FINE SHOES

Just Arrived!

—AT—

ERSKINE'S Boot & Shoe EMPORIUM

132 Government Street, Cor. Johnson.

mar23-d&w-1yr.