

THE SEMI-WEEKLY TELEGRAPH
is published every Wednesday and Saturday at 11.00 a year, PAYABLE IN ADVANCE, by The Telegraph Publishing Company, of St. John, a company incorporated by Act of the Legislature of New Brunswick.
R. W. McCREADY, Editor.
S. J. McGOWAN, Bus. Mgr.

ADVERTISING RATES.
Ordinary commercial advertisements taking the run of the paper, each insertion, \$1.00 per inch.
Advertisements of Wares, For Sale, etc., one cent a word for each insertion.
Notices of Births, Marriages and Deaths 25 cents for each insertion.

IMPORTANT NOTICE.
All remittances must be sent by post office order or registered letter, and addressed to The Telegraph Publishing Company, 207 Union Street, St. John, N. B.
Correspondence must be addressed to the Editor of The Telegraph, St. John.
All subscriptions must, without exception, be PAID FOR IN ADVANCE.

AUTHORIZED AGENT.
The following agent is authorized to canvass and collect for The Semi-Weekly Telegraph, viz.:
Wm. Somerville

Semi-Weekly Telegraph
ST. JOHN, N. B., JUNE 16, 1906

THE VOYAGE OF THE "ARCTIC"
The investigators at Ottawa are getting considerable fun out of the "Arctic" inquiry. No one appears to regard the matter as really serious, though some of the committee seem to do so. To dwellers in the ice-bound north the coming of the ship laden with hardy explorers, wines, liquors, cigars, cigarettes and a fine line of food must have been a delightful surprise. The log of the "Arctic," if we are to judge by the later testimony at Ottawa, was remarkable rather for what it omitted than for what it contained. True, cold scientific and hard matter-of-fact information was recorded, but the warm coloring, the humorous incidents, the real life of human interest, were left out. There are now being drawn out slowly in these examinations.

It will be urged in extenuation of some of the proceedings, we may guess, that the ship is a deadly dull place at best, the discipline is difficult of enforcement when the sun is hid and the spirit thermometer is retired from service by excessive frost, that the ship's company would have suffered from the blues had not some relaxation been permitted to thaw out the frozen voyagers. In a mixed company such as the "Arctic" carried jealousy and friction were inevitable, and these feelings no doubt color the testimony in some measure.

It is remarkable that among the explorers there seems to have been no man capable or willing to spin a connected yarn embracing all the livelier happenings of a voyage which appears to have been unique in the history of such ventures. The testimony, it is true, is not finished. The committee may yet hit upon some one who had the memory and the appreciation necessary to make him the happy and accurate historian of the trip. If they find him some enterprising publisher will do the rest.

APPRECIATING CANADA

The cable brought to us some ten days ago a brief summary of an editorial in the London Daily Telegraph discussing Canada's invitation to King Edward to visit the Dominion. The full text of the article, which is now at hand, indicates that the London Journal had some reason to believe His Majesty might accept. The Telegraph dwells impressively upon the value and importance of Canada's progress and possibilities. Some of the language employed is unusual in a British newspaper in that the patronizing tone so frequently adopted is replaced by an approach to what would be inclined to regard as the other extreme. The Telegraph says in part:

"Unity of the Empire is the ideal of their dream—the aspiration upon which, as their situation, their resources, their racial fibre, and monarchical tradition, entitle them to think, depends as high a hope as ever opened before a people. The desire of Canadians is to seal the word of their history, the promise of their future, and the whole meaning of their expansion as an Imperial State under the British flag, by a visit from the King. For their allegiance is not, as it were, sub-contracted and transmitted through ours. It is direct and parallel with ours. Canada is no longer a Colony; she is a nation, a territory which is well-nigh as large as Europe, forms the true centre of the land-masses of the globe, and offers the shortest route between the Far East and Western civilization—between her and our ally, Japan, on the one hand, and the partners to the entire cordiality, on the other, who have been the almost equal parents of Canadian nationality."

The writer well appreciates the welcome which King Edward would receive in the Dominion, and truly measures the far-reaching effect his visit would have:

"The moment, in many respects, never can be more auspicious. The visit of the then Emperor, nearly half a century ago, has always been affectionately remembered; but King Edward's appearance in full sovereignty among his subjects in the greatest self-governing state of his Empire overseas would be the first demonstration to all the world of the unifying spirit and power living and inherent in the influence of the Imperial Crown, and would have an incalculable effect upon the development of Imperial sentiment. At Washington, the meeting of the President and the King would be one of the dramatic moments in the history of the English-speaking peoples, instinct with a meaning not soon to be forgotten, throwing a receding light upon all that has passed, and moving and almost mysterious promise for the future of the world. King Edward's efforts have not only transformed the position of this country, re-

storing its power and security upon every side, by the most complete system of guarantees we have ever possessed, but have harmonized international relations with a success unprecedented in pacific diplomacy. The alliance with Japan, the entente with France, the better understanding with Russia, followed by a visit to Washington, sealing the reconciliation of the Anglo-Saxon races for all the ages to come, would make the accomplished years of His Majesty's influence more memorable and beneficent than an equal period of any reign that history records."

HEARST AND BRYAN

Hearst is warned by the Brooklyn Eagle (Ind. Dem.) that he will only waste his money if he and his paid agents attempt to prevent the nomination of Bryan in 1908. The Eagle describes the call for Bryan as irresistible. It is curious to find Roosevelt criticized as unsafe and Bryan praised by their respective attitudes toward the business interests of the country. Bryan recently wrote an article denouncing Socialism. By some his boom is ascribed to that. But the Eagle asserts that the real explanation of it is to be found in Roosevelt's attempt to have passed a sweeping railway rate law. It says:

"In the domains of the Little Father, they are getting rid of the bureaukrat. Perhaps the time will soon come when even in Russia the caprice of a grand duke will not necessarily require confirmation with it. To bring about this desirable state of affairs is also a fact that many lives have been sacrificed in this country to bring about conditions now obtaining here. And after lives were sacrificed John Marshall had much to do, his partiality for constitutional government being pronounced. He believed that a free people should have the right of appeal, and for that right he stood against all comers with courage and persistence. Of Theodore Roosevelt this cannot be said."

"Bryan enjoys the advantages of comparison. That some time ago he caught the drift of things there can be no doubt. He governed himself accordingly. He stopped permitting his tongue to run amuck. A navigator would say that he took in a reef, but it would be more descriptive to observe that he took in several. Indeed, so thorough is his reformation, or, rather, so thorough does it seem to be, that he is calling a halt to Socialism of the more rampant species, though in 1896 one of the platforms upon which he stood was Populism. The Roosevelt policy is regardless of consequences, regardless of anything and everything but the immediate end in view. It makes Bryan conservative by comparison."

Coming to Hearst, the Eagle notices him that the states will tumble over each other to get in line for Bryan: "It is equally clear that no matter how active and liberal the agents of Mr. Hearst, they will have their labors for their pains. For the recrudescence of Bryan there are many causes, but the fact is that he is coming. Nor is his nomination resistible. The Roosevelt agents might as well husband the resources of their principal. The investment is unound. It will be, to quote a popular song, a case of all going out and nothing coming in. Momentum will accelerate rather than diminish. If they must be futile, let them try to stop an Empire State express with the aid of nothing but a wisp of straw."

THE OPEN DOOR

The Presbyterian General Assembly has not only voted down the anti-union wing by a significantly large majority, but has now so enlarged the scope of the work entrusted to the union committee, that the Anglicans and the Baptists are definitely invited to co-operate in finding some common ground upon which they may stand with the Presbyterians, the Methodists and the Congregationalists. This action alone would suffice to stamp the meeting at London as an event of an unusually momentous character. Most laymen at least will hope that before many years have elapsed the organic union of the five denominations will be brought about. The spirit of the time favors union. Careful building of the new edifice is necessary that it may be at once commodious and enduring, but unless some are deceptive the great work is now in a fair way to be done.

It is easy to find fault, to object, to accuse, to differ, to magnify slight concessions into sacrifices of essentials; but the strong men of the denominations are on another and a broader road. They are emphasizing and exalting the admittedly common ground. In reality it embraces all the essentials. A generation hence men will wonder that union was a work so difficult, so unimportant, yet that it seemed so of the matters now in dispute. Referring to the letters of Rev. W. J. Armitage, of Halifax, which The Telegraph has been publishing, and to other indications of the Anglican attitude toward union, the Toronto News says:

"The address of the Anglican Bishop of Huron at the General Assembly seems to have had a profound effect. Of like spirit are the letters of the Rev. W. J. Armitage, of Halifax, which are now in course of publication. If we are not mistaken the Bishop of Toronto regards the union movement with equal sympathy and interest. We are accustomed to think that there is a great wall of division between the Anglican clergy and the ministers of the evangelical churches, and it must be admitted that Anglicans generally have admitted that Anglicans generally have done a little to create that impression. On the other hand, the Church, both in the Old Country and in Canada, has sought earnestly for a basis of union and in a spirit of great liberality and self-render. It is a significant illustration of the temper of our time that not only are there fair prospects of a union between Presbyterians, Methodists and Congregationalists, but that Anglican bishops should bless the movement and ask if there are

valid reasons for their exclusion from the deliberations."

Of the greater good to be effected by united churches the News says:

"The gain would be enormous, the loss insignificant. It would not be of the genius of such a reunited Church to seek domination within the sphere of the state, or to exercise other than a spiritual authority. The ideal which was agitated by narrowness and ecclesiastical freedom and personal independence, there would be a great increase of power and a great reinforcement of energy for the purification of sin in great cities, for the moral invigoration of public opinion, for the elevation of business standards, for the awakening of all healthy human relationships and the establishment of the Christian faith in all the far and dark places of the earth."

DIRECTOR CUSHING AGAIN

Mr. Cushing, after a brief period of eclipse, returns to power with the added effulgence of a rather substantial increase in salary. The director, before his short-lived retirement, received, together with other heads of departments, an increase of authority. Now that he is in the saddle again he will have a chance to assert himself, and he should do so. The salary is not too large considering the responsibilities of the office, but the office demands firm judgment, prompt decision and hesitating assertion of authority. Mr. Cushing, by suspending a wharf inspector a short time ago drew upon himself some criticism, yet it must now appear that his course was warranted under the circumstances.

He is disappointed by a bare majority of the aldermen, yet those who voted against him will, we doubt not, stand ready to give him ready support in all that makes for good service. The position filled again, the situation demands harmony between the Council and the director. There is much work to be done. The director will not object if he is weighed in the light of results hereafter, which he is given a fair chance to show his ability. The department of which he is the head is now charged with operations of no little importance in relation to the future of the port.

For one thing there must be an end to contradictory statements about the condition of the berth on the West Side. The city government, if it is efficient, can prevent ground for fair criticism of our harbor facilities when next the winter steamers are due. The citizens will expect the Mayor, the aldermen and the officials to work together to this end, and to waste no energy in family quarrels.

THE NEW ALFONSO

There is such a thing as persecuting and striving to injure a man until the very malice of his enemies serves to make him popular. This seems to have been the case with the boy king. Instead of being a weakling, who was thought to be a coward, he has demonstrated to the world that he is most modest and plucky young man, who takes the gride of life with cool fortitude, and who cannot be shaken by the threats or the acts of the cowardly assassins, who have dogged his path since he emerged from the cloisters of the castle, where he was reared in seclusion. —Bangor News.

The anarchists, in other words, have "made" Alfonso. The world was inclined to laugh at him or to think of him with contempt only a year ago. Spain's colonial failures and military retrogression added to the world's carelessness of the boy king. The chances were that the queen mother could give him but a tottering throne at best, and his seemed like anything but the hand to steady it. Then the anarchists threw a bomb which was to kill him and the French president. The aim was bad, and the principal result was to fix the world's attention suddenly upon one unsuspected attribute of Alfonso—a kingly attitude—his high courage. The world had been contemptuous of the scabard. Now it was seen to hold a Toledo.

That was six months ago. The anarchists, undeniably, had unwittingly done the king a good turn. The Madrid tragedy of the other day had two principal results: one being to encourage civilization anew against anarchists and anarchy, and the other to exhibit for all the world to see the admirable and thoughtful courage of Alfonso the newly married man. The anarchists had butchered a score of innocent folk, and definitely made a man of the boy king. The world wishes him luck. And it is prepared to hear with pleasure of any rigorous punishment, in any country, of the gentlemen who plot murder in cellars and turn the murderous work over to some fanatic whose cracked head does not grasp the meaning of the crime entrusted to him.

CENSURED

The House of Commons by a formal vote Thursday censured the French Canadian correspondent who was brought before the bar of the House at the instance of Mr. Foster. From the applause which greeted the journalist, and from the nature of the proceedings throughout, it does not appear that the judges—if we except Mr. Foster—regarded the offence of Mr. Cingmars as especially grave. Sir Wilfrid Laurier moved the vote of censure, desiring, apparently, to save the House from the position of undignified helplessness in which it would seemingly have been placed had the proceedings ended like a farce. The Madrid tragedy was of opinion from the first that Mr. Foster's judgment was at fault in insisting upon having the journalist summoned before the House, and after reviewing the proceedings Mr. Foster may now be inclined to agree with Sir Wilfrid.

The power of Parliament in such matters is supreme and unquestioned. The highest court of the country cannot be offended with impunity. But—suppose the newspapers should say they must be without sin who cast the first stone? The men who make the laws are bound to set an example in temperance of

speech, in chastity of assertion, in dignity of discussion, in fairness of argument. The fact that what they say is privileged makes this all the more binding.

Comment by the newspapers is not privileged. Persons to whom harm is done by newspaper publication have a remedy at law. Therefore, as Mr. Dun could say what he liked in the House with impunity, was asking the protection of the House against the correspondent of a newspaper which is responsible and which may be held accountable for his words. The country might curtail some of the liberties of members of the Commons without harm to the best interests of the people; but that is not true of the newspapers. Their liberty of speech with in reasonable limits—remembering the fact that they govern them—is wholly essential to the well-being of the people in a free country.

SALARIES AND HONESTY

A St. John (N. B.), pastor advances the theory that young men are driven to crime because they are not sufficiently paid, and he cited the case as an illustration of a young man who handled large sums of money, and who was paid \$35 per month. If the reverend gentleman would investigate, he would be surprised to learn that in the great majority of the defalcations of young men, the fault arises from indulgence in things which any young man can only indulge in at his own risk. It is a question of morals, not of money, and no amount of the latter can ever make the former what they should be. A single man of good morals could live with comfort in St. John on \$35 per month; a young man of defective morals would not be likely to do any better on \$350 than on \$35.—Montreal Gazette.

Speaking generally, small pay has little to do with honesty after all. It is a short step from this sort of discussion of small salaries to the broader statement that "the world owes every man a living" which is so often in the mouths of criminals seeking to excuse themselves. All men are not subjected to the same temptations in money matters; and the thing that tempts one may not tempt another in the same degree, if at all. But the man who is dishonest on a small salary is likely to be dishonest when receiving five times as much. It is legitimate to argue that certain services are worth more, and should receive more, than they now command; but it is perilous to preach that any man is made a thief by the employer who pays him a small salary. It is unwise to make excuses in advance for dishonesty. Men are apt to seize upon such excuses. Those who are tempted may deceive themselves by deciding that stealing is only sinning under some circumstances, just as there are dishonest and worthless employees; but most employees are honest and reasonable, and most employers also. "Thou shalt not steal" covers a lot of ground in short meter. It is as binding and as necessary today as at any time since it was first written.

NOTE AND COMMENT

Chamney M. Deper is to the fore again. He is seeking to regain his shattered health. He may do it. But his reputation is beyond repair.

It is announced at Ottawa that the New Brunswick route of the G. T. P. will be selected in July. This section, it is now said, will be completed as soon as that between Quebec and Winnipeg. Meanwhile there is a rumor that Mackenzie and Mann will offer to build from Quebec to Moncton and give the Grand Trunk Pacific running rights over the road. We should like to hear more about St. John and the shortest way to tidewater.

There will be a return to the old-fashioned principle that guilt is always personal, and that the boot way to discourage crime, whether of high financiers or pickpockets, is by a relentless enforcement of law.—New York World.

"Sanity, precision and thoroughness distinguish that sentence," says the Brooklyn Eagle. "The method stated is better than the one which would make the government the master, instead of the servant, of the people and which, the first time lunatics or rascals got possession of the government, would make the people serfs, first, and revolutionaries afterwards."

Mr. Richard Cunfield, the most notorious of American gamblers, has been taking the public into his confidence. Says Richard:

"There is no gambling game that man can win at. Any one who gambles with the idea of making money is either a very unsophisticated youth or a fool. Smart youths who think they can 'beat the game,' or rich old fools who with money to burn, would lose the world if they had sense; but men of sense do not gamble. When the winnings of some players were noted, Cunfield replied: 'Players have quite frequently within my knowledge and experience lost the house many thousands of dollars ahead of the game, but they always come back and play it in again,' and without edging against the player more than five per cent the proprietor is certain to win in the end; 'the player has no chance whatever.'"

Knowing the public the gambler does not hesitate to tell the truth. It will not prevent men from gambling. Strange fact.

Tuttle's Elixir

Well known remedy for all ailments. It is a family medicine, and is sold in all drug stores. It is a family medicine, and is sold in all drug stores. It is a family medicine, and is sold in all drug stores.

100 Reward
Tuttle's Elixir, the great family medicine, is sold in all drug stores. It is a family medicine, and is sold in all drug stores. It is a family medicine, and is sold in all drug stores.

TUTTLE'S ELIXIR CO., 74 Beatty St., Boston, Mass.
C. H. Crocker, Sole Agent, St. John, N. B.
Pudington & Merrill, 48 St. John St., St. John, N. B.

CINGMARS GETS CENSURE AND APPLAUSE IN HOUSE

(Continued from page 1.)

sufficient or not sufficient. But I cannot conceive that the house will say. You shall give an answer, but you shall limit it to certain things and not go beyond these."

Mr. MacPherson (Vancouver), rose to a point of order and asked that the accused be given ten minutes to answer the charge. Mr. Speaker decided that it was not a point of order.

Duncan Ross later on pointed out that it was the British practice for the gentleman at the bar to be discharged while his case was being discussed.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier suggested that a seat be given to Mr. Cingmars.

Borden and Aylesworth Tilt.
R. L. Borden said somewhat sarcastically that the minister of justice had approached the subject in an eminently judicial manner. The question did not appear to him in the same way as it did to Mr. Aylesworth. He did not give the same meaning to it. Even with the word "inexactly" used. The minister of justice would not say so on second consideration.

Mr. Aylesworth—I would.
Mr. Borden—I did not think that political partisanship would be shown.

Hon. Wm. Patterson read from Mr. Foster's speech where he said that there was nothing in his conduct, in the house or out of it, that called for such statements as Cingmars had used. That being so it was in the interests of Mr. Foster that there should be a full enquiry.

Mr. Aylesworth thought that other questions could be put after Mr. Foster had put his, and Mr. Gallieher held a somewhat similar view.

Mr. McCarthy (Simcoe) thought they should treat the accused fairly.

The vote was then taken and Mr. Aylesworth's amendment was carried by eighty-two for to forty-eight against. It was a straight party vote with the exception that Mr. Gallieher (Liberal) voted with the Conservatives.

Cingmars Pleads Justification.

Mr. Cingmars then presented his case. He read it first in French and afterwards in English, and at times received applause. Summarized, his defence is as follows:

Mr. Cingmars expressed his respect for its membership and claimed the privileges of the press, which he did not think he had gone beyond in this matter. In his opinion, the press is a necessary part of a free government, and it is the duty of the press to expose the wrongs of the government.

Mr. Cingmars expressed his respect for its membership and claimed the privileges of the press, which he did not think he had gone beyond in this matter. In his opinion, the press is a necessary part of a free government, and it is the duty of the press to expose the wrongs of the government.

Mr. Cingmars expressed his respect for its membership and claimed the privileges of the press, which he did not think he had gone beyond in this matter. In his opinion, the press is a necessary part of a free government, and it is the duty of the press to expose the wrongs of the government.

Mr. Cingmars expressed his respect for its membership and claimed the privileges of the press, which he did not think he had gone beyond in this matter. In his opinion, the press is a necessary part of a free government, and it is the duty of the press to expose the wrongs of the government.

Mr. Cingmars expressed his respect for its membership and claimed the privileges of the press, which he did not think he had gone beyond in this matter. In his opinion, the press is a necessary part of a free government, and it is the duty of the press to expose the wrongs of the government.

Mr. Cingmars expressed his respect for its membership and claimed the privileges of the press, which he did not think he had gone beyond in this matter. In his opinion, the press is a necessary part of a free government, and it is the duty of the press to expose the wrongs of the government.

Mr. Cingmars expressed his respect for its membership and claimed the privileges of the press, which he did not think he had gone beyond in this matter. In his opinion, the press is a necessary part of a free government, and it is the duty of the press to expose the wrongs of the government.

Mr. Cingmars expressed his respect for its membership and claimed the privileges of the press, which he did not think he had gone beyond in this matter. In his opinion, the press is a necessary part of a free government, and it is the duty of the press to expose the wrongs of the government.

Mr. Cingmars expressed his respect for its membership and claimed the privileges of the press, which he did not think he had gone beyond in this matter. In his opinion, the press is a necessary part of a free government, and it is the duty of the press to expose the wrongs of the government.

Mr. Cingmars expressed his respect for its membership and claimed the privileges of the press, which he did not think he had gone beyond in this matter. In his opinion, the press is a necessary part of a free government, and it is the duty of the press to expose the wrongs of the government.

Mr. Cingmars expressed his respect for its membership and claimed the privileges of the press, which he did not think he had gone beyond in this matter. In his opinion, the press is a necessary part of a free government, and it is the duty of the press to expose the wrongs of the government.

Mr. Cingmars expressed his respect for its membership and claimed the privileges of the press, which he did not think he had gone beyond in this matter. In his opinion, the press is a necessary part of a free government, and it is the duty of the press to expose the wrongs of the government.

Mr. Cingmars expressed his respect for its membership and claimed the privileges of the press, which he did not think he had gone beyond in this matter. In his opinion, the press is a necessary part of a free government, and it is the duty of the press to expose the wrongs of the government.

Mr. Cingmars expressed his respect for its membership and claimed the privileges of the press, which he did not think he had gone beyond in this matter. In his opinion, the press is a necessary part of a free government, and it is the duty of the press to expose the wrongs of the government.

Mr. Cingmars expressed his respect for its membership and claimed the privileges of the press, which he did not think he had gone beyond in this matter. In his opinion, the press is a necessary part of a free government, and it is the duty of the press to expose the wrongs of the government.

Store open evenings till 8 o'clock
St. John, N. B., June 16, 1906

BOYS' SUITS

THAT ARE MADE TO STAND THE WEAR
We have used very great care in the selection of the cloths from which our Boys' Suits are made this year, and we have suits that will stand the rough and tumble wear and yet keep their appearance. Neat patterns in strong, serviceable cloths. Stylish, neat, strongly made, and prices very low.

Boys' School Suits, 2 Pieces, - - -	\$1.35 to \$3.50
Boys' Normal Suits, - - - - -	2.50 to 3.50
Boys' 3-Piece Suits, - - - - -	2.50 to 7.00
Boys' Long Pant Suits, - - - - -	5.00 to 12.00

J. N. HARVEY, Clothing and Furnishings
199 and 207 Union Street

Home Decorations
Everybody intending to tint or decorate his walls this spring certainly ought to know about



CHURCH'S ALABASTINE
the modern sanitary wall covering. It won't rub off like kalsomine, contains no arsenical poisoning like wall-paper, and being porous, lets the walls breathe, which is essential to pure air in a room. It costs little—does much. Sold in packages only. Comes in white and twenty tints. Simply add cold water and it's ready for use.

If your decorator is too busy to do your work, do it yourself. Our free booklet will tell you how. Get ALABASTINE by the hardware or paint dealers. The "little church" on the label of every package.

W. H. HORNÉ & CO. Ltd., Market Sq., St. John, N. B.

the people of Quebec, especially in regard to educational matters. Later on he was carrying on an election campaign in London any appealing to the electorate by asserting that a vote given to Hyman was a vote for Laurier, Sharrett and the hierarchy.

Quotes a Queens County Speech.
Mr. Cingmars then quoted from a declaration by Samuel E. McDonald, of Queens County (N. B.), stating the Conservatives conducted their campaign with Mr. Foster as their candidate with crime against the French-Canadians. Mr. Cingmars went on: "I am informed that during the election campaign of 1896, at a public meeting held in Renfrew, Ontario, Mr. Foster pronounced the following: 'Would it not be a disgrace and a shame for this fair dominion of ours to have at the head of the government a French Canadian and a Catholic at that?'"

From these quotations and the irony contained in Mr. Foster's speech, the speaker concluded that the people of Quebec were very much deceived by that gentleman. So far as the charge of Mr. Foster being guilty of hypocritical conduct, he could not refrain from a lively feeling of indignation at Mr. Foster's unjust attacks.

"As a member of the Liberal party," he added, "I thought it my duty to sharply take up such utterances on the part of a public personage. Not having attacked either in irony or in sarcasm, or by insinuation the personal honor of Mr. Foster, I beg of the house to believe that I had no intention of being lacking in respect towards one of its members and that I did not overstep the limits of journalistic privileges, nor the latitude assigned to the liberty of the press. Moreover, and in fine, I repeat that I did not make any false report of Hon. Mr. Foster's utterances. I was merely penning an appreciation of a public man. My article was not a misrepresentation since it was not a review, it was a criticism of a general character and the exactness of its coloring might be a proper subject for debate, but elsewhere than here. Under the present circumstances I assert that I in no way abused the privileges of parliament."

Duncan Ross Defends Press.
Duncan Ross (Yale and Cariboo) discussed the question not only as a member of parliament, but as a member of the profession to which the young man, before the bar belonged.

"I wish to take," he said, "the position at the outset recognizing my full responsibility as a member of parliament and that I did not overstep the limits of journalistic privileges, nor the latitude assigned to the liberty of the press. Moreover, and in fine, I repeat that I did not make any false report of Hon. Mr. Foster's utterances. I was merely penning an appreciation of a public man. My article was not a misrepresentation since it was not a review, it was a criticism of a general character and the exactness of its coloring might be a proper subject for debate, but elsewhere than here. Under the present circumstances I assert that I in no way abused the privileges of parliament."

In support of his contention Sir Wilfrid quoted one of the standard authorities on parliamentary government. The cases that Sir Wilfrid quoted from for breach of parliamentary usage extended from 1539 down till 1831. But neither Sir Wilfrid nor any other speaker was able to quote a case in the British parliament similar to the one under discussion since 1819.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier referred to the case of Sir Gorman, of Ottawa, who was censured by parliament in 1802 or 1803 for certain remarks regarding Speaker White. While it was true, probably, that parliament did not call a member of the press to account for anything unless a charge of corruption, that did not mean, anything which is publicly said or publicly written derogatory to the honor of the house, as a body or to some of its members, was an invasion of the privileges of the house.

"There is nothing more certain than that according to the law of parliament, as it has come down to us of olden ages, anything which is publicly said or publicly written derogatory to the honor of the house, as a body or to some of its members, was an invasion of the privileges of the house."

In support of his contention Sir Wilfrid quoted one of the standard authorities on parliamentary government. The cases that Sir Wilfrid quoted from for breach of parliamentary usage extended from 1539 down till 1831. But neither Sir Wilfrid nor any other speaker was able to quote a case in the British parliament similar to the one under discussion since 1819.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier referred to the case of Sir Gorman, of Ottawa, who was censured by parliament in 1802 or 1803 for certain remarks regarding Speaker White. While it was true, probably, that parliament did not call a member of the press to account for anything unless a charge of corruption, that did not mean, anything which is publicly said or publicly written derogatory to the honor of the house, as a body or to some of its members, was an invasion of the privileges of the house.

"There is nothing more certain than that according to the law of parliament, as it has come down to us of olden ages, anything which is publicly said or publicly written derogatory to the honor of the house, as a body or to some of its members, was an invasion of the privileges of the house."

In support of his contention Sir Wilfrid quoted one of the standard authorities on parliamentary government. The cases that Sir Wilfrid quoted from for breach of parliamentary usage extended from 1539 down till 1831. But neither Sir Wilfrid nor any other speaker was able to quote a case in the British parliament similar to the one under discussion since 1819.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier referred to the case of Sir Gorman, of Ottawa, who was censured by parliament in 1802 or 1803 for certain remarks regarding Speaker White. While it was true, probably, that parliament did not call a member of the press to account for anything unless a charge of corruption, that did not mean, anything which is publicly said or publicly written derogatory to the honor of the house, as a body or to some of its members, was an invasion of the privileges of the house.

"There is nothing more certain than that according to the law of parliament, as it has come down to us of olden ages, anything which is publicly said or publicly written derogatory to the honor of the house, as a body or to some of its members, was an invasion of the privileges of the house."

In support of his contention Sir Wilfrid quoted one of the standard authorities on parliamentary government. The cases that Sir Wilfrid quoted from for breach of parliamentary usage extended from 1539 down till 1831. But neither Sir Wilfrid nor any other speaker was able to quote a case in the British parliament similar to the one under discussion since 1819.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier referred to the case of Sir Gorman, of Ottawa, who was censured by parliament in 1802 or 1803 for certain remarks regarding Speaker White. While it was true, probably, that parliament did not call a member of the press to account for anything unless a charge of corruption, that did not mean, anything which is publicly said or publicly written derogatory to the honor of the house, as a body or to some of its members, was an invasion of the privileges of the house.

"There is nothing more certain than that according to the law of parliament, as it has come down to us of olden ages, anything which is publicly said or publicly written derogatory to the honor of the house, as a body or to some of its members, was an invasion of the privileges of the house."

In support of his contention Sir Wilfrid quoted one of the standard authorities on parliamentary government. The cases that Sir Wilfrid quoted from for breach of parliamentary usage extended from 1539 down till 1831. But neither Sir Wilfrid nor any other speaker was able to quote a case in the British parliament similar to the one under discussion since 1819.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier referred to the case of Sir Gorman, of Ottawa, who was censured by parliament in 1802 or 1803 for certain remarks regarding Speaker White. While it was true, probably, that parliament did not call a member of the press to account for anything unless a charge of corruption, that did not mean, anything which is publicly said or publicly written derogatory to the honor of the house, as a body or to some of its members, was an invasion of the privileges of the house.

"There is nothing more certain than that according to the law of parliament, as it has come down to us of olden ages, anything which is publicly said or publicly written derogatory to the honor of the house, as a body or to some of its members, was an invasion of the privileges of the house."

In support of his contention Sir Wilfrid quoted one of the standard authorities on parliamentary government. The cases that Sir Wilfrid quoted from for breach of parliamentary usage extended from 1539 down till 1831. But neither Sir Wilfrid nor any other speaker was able to quote a case in the British parliament similar to the one under discussion since 1819.