

Messenger and Visitor.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER,
VOLUME LXII.

{ THE CHRISTIAN VISITOR,
VOLUME LI.

Vol. XVI.

ST. JOHN, N. B., WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1900.

No. 7.

Prohibition. An Ottawa despatch states that the members of Parliament have been advised that a Prohibition resolution will be moved during the present session. Who will be the mover and the seconder of the resolution will, it is said, be decided at a meeting soon to be held at Ottawa, of the members of the Dominion Alliance with members of the House and Senate who are favorable to prohibition. The names of Mr. Flint on the Government side and Mr. Craig of the Opposition are mentioned as those likely to be chosen to present the resolution in the House of Commons. The following is said to be a copy of the resolution which it is proposed to move:

"That in view of the declaration of this House made on March 26, 1884, that prohibition is the right and most effectual legislative remedy for the evils of intemperance, and that this House is prepared, so soon as public opinion will sufficiently sustain stringent measures to promote such legislation, and further, in view of the substantial majority in favor of prohibition of all the votes polled throughout the Dominion in the Plebiscite of September 9, 1898, including an overwhelming majority in all the provinces but one, and a large proportion of all the possible votes in the provinces, the House is now of the opinion that it is the duty of the Dominion Parliament to enact, without delay, such legislation as will secure the entire prohibition of the liquor traffic for beverage purposes, in at least those provinces and territories which have voted in favor of prohibition."

On the Verge of War. As a result of circumstances connected with the election of a governor, the State of Kentucky has been confronted with a condition of things which has seriously threatened civil war. In the November elections the Republican candidate for Governor, named Taylor, was declared elected, and that in spite of a system of electoral courts established under Democrat rule and presumably with the purpose of favoring the interests of the Democrat candidate. Mr. Taylor having been declared elected, took the oath of office and entered upon the discharge of his duties. The election was however disputed by Mr. Goebel, the Democrat candidate, and when the Legislature assembled in January, that body, in the exercise of its constitutional powers, proceeded to review the returns, and, the Democrats having a majority in the Legislature, the decision of the election court was about to be reversed and the Democrat candidate declared elected, when a tragedy occurred which seemed likely to result in anarchy. A large number of Kentuckians, from the eastern part of the State where the Republicans are strong, had come, armed with rifles, to Frankfort, the capital, apparently with the purpose of overawing the Legislature then sitting there. Some of these men are said to have taken up positions in the State House, and as Mr. Goebel, the Democrat candidate for governor, was approaching the building he was deliberately shot and mortally wounded, the shots being fired from one of the windows of the State House. Goebel however lived for some days, and having been declared governor elect by the Legislature, took the oath of office. On his death, which occurred on February 3rd, Mr. Buckham, the Lieut. Governor, also a Democrat, was sworn in as Governor of the State. In the mean time Governor Taylor has declared Frankfort to be in a state of insurrection and summons the Legislature to meet at London, a small town in the eastern part of the State and a Republican stronghold. It seems pretty clear that this action was unconstitutional, and if carried into effect, the result would almost certainly be a bloody strife between the rival parties. It now appears that Taylor and his supporters are likely to give way for the present and allow the points in dispute to be settled by the decision of the Courts. But what has occurred, and the present contingencies of the situation, afford a striking com-

mentary on the perils of a political condition in which leadership can be so easily attained by personally ambitious and unscrupulous men. There is somewhat less danger in Canada than in Kentucky that corrupt measures shall lead to anarchy and bloodshed, but there is not less certainty that the result will be evil. It will be well if Canadians shall learn by such instances that the price of liberty and pure government is the maintenance of a firm purpose on the part of its best citizens to bring the full force of their influence to bear upon the politics of their country to secure honesty and integrity both in public men and public measures.

The Debate on the Address. The Parliament of Canada—and no less the country—is to be congratulated upon the fact that the debate upon the address in reply to the speech from the Throne has been concluded within a reasonable limit of time, and also that in its progress the amenities of civilized political warfare have been observed to a gratifying degree. The address in reply was moved by Mr. I. J. Gould, the new member for West Ontario, who represents the constituency of the late Sir James Edgar, and was seconded by Mr. Victor Geoffrion, the new member for Chambly-Vercheres, who spoke in French. Both gentlemen are good speakers and acquitted themselves on this occasion in a manner to win the respect of the House. Sir Charles Tupper addressed the House in a speech of three hours in length. Though the leader of the Opposition is now seventy-eight years of age, he is still in possession of remarkable physical vigor, and his political opponents do not at present appear to be charging that he has suffered any loss of intellectual power. Sir Charles Tupper confined himself to a consideration of the Government's policy in reference to the South African war. He took exception to the passage in the speech referring to the profound devotion and entire loyalty of the entire people of Canada to the Sovereign and institutions of the British Empire, and contended that some exceptions must be made. His keenest criticisms were directed against the Minister of Public Works and his attitude toward the sending of a Canadian contingent to South Africa and against Mr. Bourassa, member for Labelle, who had resigned his seat because of his opposition to the Government's policy in the matter, and being re-elected without opposition had received and accepted a welcome back into the ranks of the Government's supporters. While Sir Charles approved the action which had been taken by the Government in connection with the war, he contended that that action had not been so prompt and spontaneous as it should have been, and that it was only the strong pressure of public opinion that had caused the Government to move in the matter. . . . The speech of the leader of the Opposition was considered, at least from the point of view of the Government side of the House, a very effective deliverance. Sir Wilfrid defended the Government from the charge of any apparent unwillingness to proffer military aid to the motherland in the prosecution of the war, on the ground that Parliament had voted no money for such a purpose, and that in the absence of the action of Parliament in the matter, such an offer by the Government could only be justified by unmistakable evidence that the sentiment of the country at large was positively favorable to such action. From the time that the ultimatum of President Kruger had raised a storm of indignation over the whole English-speaking world and it became evident what the attitude of the people of Canada was toward the war, not a moment, the Premier contended, had been lost, and in three weeks time Canada's volunteers were on the ocean. . . . Other leaders who spoke upon the address were Hon. Mr. Foster, who followed the Premier, and Sir Richard Cartwright, who closed the debate. The Opposition had not considered it good policy to move an amendment to the address, and in the House it was accordingly adopted on Tuesday evening without discussion.

The Clayton-Bulwer Treaty Abrogated.

The Clayton-Bulwer treaty, by which the control of any prospective canal across the Isthmus of Panama, was secured jointly to the United States and to Great Britain, has been abrogated. A Convention between the two powers was signed at Washington, on the 5th inst., by Sir Julian Pauncefote, British Ambassador to the United States, and Mr. Hay, Secretary of State for the latter country, annulling the Clayton-Bulwer compact, and vesting in the United States an exclusive right to construct and manage a trans-isthmian canal. The control of the canal by the United States is, however, placed under certain conditions. The Convention guarantees the canal's neutrality. It provides that the canal shall be free and open, in time of war as in peace, to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations, on terms of entire equality, so that there shall be no discrimination against any nation, or its citizens, or subjects, in respect of the conditions or charges of traffic or otherwise. It is further provided that the canal shall never be blockaded, nor shall any right of war be exercised, nor any act of hostility be committed within it. The United States is pledged not to fortify the canal nor the land adjacent thereto, and the international regulations applying to neutral parties are to apply to the canal and its adjacent waters, within three marine miles of either end. The Convention must be ratified by Her Majesty, and by the President of the United States, by the advice and consent of its Senate, and exchanged at London or Washington, within six months of the date of signature, upon which the high contracting parties will immediately bring the Convention to the notice of other powers, and invite them to adhere to it. The abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty had been anticipated for some time. The impression, we believe, has been quite general, that Great Britain was willing to surrender the joint control of the proposed canal, but would expect something in the nature of a *quid pro quo* for such concession. There has also been some hope in Canada that the *quid pro quo* might be of a nature to facilitate the settlement of the Alaska boundary question. But it appears from a statement made on Thursday last, in the British Parliament, by the Parliamentary Secretary of the Foreign Office, in reply to a question on the subject, that there had been no question of compensation, as it was considered that the advantages to Great Britain of the former compact, had been fully maintained by the stipulations which secured the neutrality of the canal and the protection of trade and commerce, under conditions of entire equality.

Opening of the N. S. Legislature.

The Nova Scotia Legislature was opened on Thursday last by Sir Malachy Daly, the Lieut. Governor. The Governor's speech begins with an allusion to the war in South Africa, and the spontaneous loyalty which it has called forth. The Legislature will be asked to vote a substantial contribution towards the patriotic fund for the relief of the wives and families of the volunteers. The Governor is able to assure the Legislature that during the year the Province has enjoyed a measure of prosperity unexampled in its history. The present condition and prospects of the coal mining industry are especially encouraging. Important progress is reported in respect to the iron and steel manufacturing industry at Sydney. In several new railway enterprises in the province substantial progress has been made. These enterprises include the Inverness and Richmond railway of Cape Breton; the N. S. Midland connecting Truro and Windsor; the Coast railway in the western part of the province, and the N. S. Southern railway. In the interests of agriculture the Legislature will be asked to make provision for improving the breed of horses, cattle and sheep. The establishment of an Agriculture and Manual Training School, and of Sanatoria for the cure of tubercular diseases will also engage the attention of the Legislature.