

Large quantities of hay continue to be shipped from Ottawa to New York.

Sixteen Canadian artillerymen will leave Montreal in June for Shoeburyness.

Epidemic is prevailing to a serious extent at San Francisco, greatly increasing the street car companies.

The Starr Manufacturing Company of Halifax has declared a dividend of 15 per cent—the largest for many years.

It is stated that Nally, one of the travellers in the recent State trials at Dublin, and one of the prisoners under the Coercion Act, has become insane.

On Mr. Gladstone's resolution of urgency on supply in the House of Commons on the 18th inst., the Government were defeated by a vote of 295 against 212.

Charles C. Gregory has entered an action in the Superior Court of Quebec for \$100,000 damages against the Canada Improvement Co., and Sir Hugh Allan.

An able and ambitious, whose ambition in this life is to outstrip Dr. Tanner, will begin operations at Chicago shortly under the auspices of a local medical school.

Courtney says the coming sculler is Wallace Ross, and furthermore, that if Ross had one half the chances Hanlan has had, he would be handled as well, he could beat the champion.

The oldest member of the Ontario Legislature is Mr. D. D. Galvin, M. P. P. for Frontenac, since Confederation. The hon. gentleman, who is a Baptist by religion, is 85 years of age.

There is talk of the Nova Scotia Government proposing extensive constitutional changes, such as abolition of the Legislative Council, curtailment of the House of Assembly and of the Executive Council, etc.

Mark Twain admits having made \$125,000 out of his lecture, but makes no promise of restitution. This shows what a callous moral condition persistence in lecturing may bring a man to.

SUGAR FOR THE HALIFAX REFINERY.—The bark "Terentia," of Glasgow, Capt. Caw, arrived the other day, 70 days from Bahia, with the first cargo of sugar, consisting of 525 tons, for the Nova Scotia Sugar Refinery.

The Boers have committed another act which is likely to alienate sympathy from them. Lambert has sent a number of his men to Utrecht, who, by his orders, are clearing that district of the legal Boers and burning their homesteads.

The Marquis of Hartington stated in the House of Commons yesterday that the order of the withdrawal of the British troops from Candahar had already been given. It is understood that the whole force at present in occupation will not be withdrawn at once.

Mr. W. H. Vanderbilt has been preaching on the blessings of a contented spirit. He says it is a glorious thing to be satisfied with what you have. Most people would be in that happy frame of mind with something less than a hundred million dollars.

The county of Grey, Ont., has a veritable Sampson. Wm. Brown, of Bennington, says the Durham Review, shouldered and carried one barrel of salt one quarter of a mile, then putting the barrel on the ground took it by the chin, and threw it fourteen and a quarter feet.

KILLED AT SEA.—The *Sickville Post* says the melancholy news has been received of the death of Avision Knowlton, a sailor on board the "Fred Semmel." He fell from the topsail yard, striking two yards in his descent, and then the fall, from which he fell to the water. He was to have been married early next summer.

Arrangements have been made whereby telegraphic communication between Europe and the west coast of South America will be had by way of the United States, Mexico, Central America, and Panama, instead of via Portugal and Brazil, as at present. This will save about 8,000 miles in distance, and \$5 a word in cost.

Lord Baconfield, says the London correspondent of "The Publisher's Weekly," has another novel, which it is possible, may see the light ere many months have elapsed. It was, I am given to understand, planned and partly written some years ago, and is so near completion that it might be prepared for publication almost immediately. The story deals with political affairs, but with circumstances more recent, and perhaps, therefore, more universally interesting than those touched upon in "Eadyonia."

Dr. Orton, M. P., has stated in Parliament that in consequence of the National Policy the farmers in Canada had been afforded an enlarged home market for the following quantities of grain, so much less have been imported since the tariff was imposed.—Oats, 500,000 bushels; barley, 115,000 bus.; Indian corn and coarse grays, 2,500,000 bushels; rye, 60,000 bushels; wheat, 2,000,000 bushels—the whole amounting to about 6,000,000 bushels. On the quantities imported of grain and flour a revenue of some \$30,000 had been raised, which has been paid by the American farmers, and the Canadian was saved so much in taxation.

THE WRECK OF THE ATLANTIC.—Wreckers from Provincetown, Mass., will soon resume work on the wreck of the Atlantic, of the White Star Line, which was sunk off Halifax, N. S., some years ago, when 530 lives were lost. The wreck's stern lies in twelve fathoms of water. The average time that the wreckers worked last year per month was six days. The first wreck days will be to open a string of state rooms. The Atlantic's safe, which is supposed to be located about midnight, contains \$80,000 and a large quantity of jewelry. Eight thousand dollars will be expended in the forthcoming search. Most of the cargo was taken from the wreck soon after she sank.—*New York Evening Telegram.*

THE ELEVATOR WHARF BEGUN.—The timber for the elevator wharf at Richmond began to arrive yesterday. The wharf will be 600 feet long by 80 feet wide, and will be erected to the south of the last one built at Richmond, leaving a dock of 100 feet wide between them. It will accommodate three large steamers. It is considered necessary by the growing business of the road, even though it had not been determined to build an elevator. The delivery of materials must begin at once, and every stone must be on the spot by the 20th of May. About 200,000 feet of deals and 300,000 feet of square timber are required. The cost of the wharf is estimated at \$35,000. The wharf was all full last evening, and a steamer was lying in the stream waiting for a berth.—*Ms. Herald.*

Correspondence.

We do not hold ourselves responsible for the statements or opinions of our correspondents.

Union Bank—No. 6.

To the Editor of the Examiner.

Sir,—I am glad to find the Union Bank has assumed courage to reply to my last letter. True to their cowardly nature, they dared not answer one of my questions, but raised a question respecting the report of the proceedings at the annual meeting—were quibbles—occupying half the letter; and then commenced to daub me with foul abuse and dirty names. Had Palmer and Dawson faced the music it would not have been so bad, but to get a postscripted man to be disabled both mentally and physically—to father their offspring, is mean and contemptible to the uttermost. I do not thus write for fear of a contest with Geo. Macleod. If necessary I would have had no hesitation in trying a lance with him at his prime, for I consider his coat of mail vulnerable all over; but his recent affliction demands sympathy and protection. It would, therefore, be unmanly in the extreme, to hold him responsible for the contents of the letter. There can be no doubt that the true author is Charles Palmer, assisted by Dawson. I shall, therefore, regard the answer as theirs, and treat it accordingly.

I have no objection to their description of the proceedings of the meeting, except for the allusion to the position of the shareholders who remained to fight the explanation of the Directors. I have seen some of them since the publication of the letter, and they persist, that after the ballots were handed in, they waited long enough to ascertain, that the Directors had no intention of going into the matter, and that when their patience was utterly exhausted, they also left the Bank. Some, I have been informed, when they saw how skillfully the Directors had arranged the affair, and that there was no chance of fair play, left the bank—before the balloting commenced—in disgust with the proceedings.

It is self evident, that if the President really had an answer written fit to read to the Shareholders, it ought to be fit for the public gaze. Why then did he not publish his fourteen page manuscript? I did the publication of his cross-examination render it worthless? Or, if revised and condensed, is it his duty to withhold it from the public? I presented to us in the latter half of this letter. Let us glance at its contents.

My last letter is characterized thus:—marked by abusive language—a reckless disregard of truth—a deception in the use of long words and phrases—a want of candour and veracity. From this decision I appeal to the public. They are the best judges of the fitness of the language employed, and the truthfulness of the facts. In my describing certain transactions of Palmer and Dawson, as being in violation of their duty as Directors, in permitting Mr. Palmer to use his own language to explain his own transactions, is to be properly denominated as abusive, untruthful and deceptive, the public will decide.

We are next favored with a description of my incompetence as Cashier. It is useless to go again over the particulars of the manner in which I was cajoled by the President into a consent to accept the position of Cashier, for you have already had every useful assistance, and when Lawson was appointed, making me pay half his salary—of his repeated promises to provide a proper accountant, and up to the last moment refusing to provide a man fit to take charge of the books—their palming off upon me as assistant the brother Rowan Fitzgerald, whom I begged the President to take away, being more hindrance than use in the Bank. Nor is it worth while to refer to Dawson's assurance that the same mistakes would not be committed by me subsequently, or to the fact that over \$30,000 was paid to his protection of the interests of Wellner, and his strenuous exertions to fasten upon me the results of this man's villainy. These things have been before the public for some time, and have been read by me. But I will merely refer to Mr. Palmer's declaration to me a few days before George Macleod arrived, viz., "I want you to understand, that you are under no obligation whatever to the Bank, but we are under the deepest obligation to you, for if you had not taken charge of the Bank when you did, we had no alternative but to close our doors." Not many months elapsed before the same lips gave utterance to the following:—"Yes, sir, and I promise you that if you had not done so, our business would have been made to pay every penny of them." What a contrast! How truly St. James describes this phenomenon—"Out of the same month proceedeth blessing and cursing."

The arbitration is then referred to as a point in favor of the Bank. Not so fast, Mr. Palmer. They decided against me on the ground of strict liability. Could they but have heard, before their award, the decision of Judge Peters on this point—viz, "if the Award had come before this court I do not see that the Bank could have recovered a cent of it," think you that they would have rendered such a verdict? But the subsequent conduct of two of the gentlemen is in striking contrast with that of Palmer and Dawson, and their confessions. When the Merchants Bank Directors found a heavy loss had been made, in their transactions with two or three leading firms, they did not shirk their responsibility in the least, but met their stockholders manfully. Nor did they keep back any information, that was required to explain fully the whole case. And who that investigated fully the agency upon the hands of those Directors with more vim than Charles Palmer? Yet when he is charged with a deficit of \$44,000, and with assisting a clerk to rob the Bank, does he come forward and give the Stockholders one word of information on the subject? Not one! The Merchants Bank Directors acknowledged their responsibility, by paying down \$40,000 out of their own pockets, but all the satisfaction which the Union Bank shareholders have yet been able to get is, that they think that they Directors are rich men amply responsible, particularly—that the charges refer to transactions which occurred over six years ago, (is the statute of limitations hinted at?) that concerns only the Stockholders, and their legal advisers. The former is answered, and that as they have in the past, so they will in the future, ignore all outside enquiries. Where in the civilized world shall we go to find a nest of Bank Directors, possessed of more daring audacity and moral impudence, than is displayed in this extract?

To show his security on legal grounds, Mr. Palmer says "if a title of his charges were true, it would be a simple matter for the Stockholders to obtain redress in a Court of law." Is he perfectly aware of this, and am not quite sure that his method will not be adopted. But is not Mr. Palmer also aware, that if a title of his words have had redress to the help of the law?

I can only now stay to notice one choice phrase, just suited to Mr. Palmer's forensic abilities. The Directors "have no intention of allowing themselves to be blackmailed by Mr. William Heard."

What I do not wish to imply is charge I in the name of everything that is honest and good, let me bring forward the proof. I ask them not to spare me in the slightest degree? Let the public know at once the full extent of my infamous conduct, and I will submit to any punishment that may be imposed. The former is answered. Will Palmer and Dawson accept this challenge?

It is rather unfortunate that Mr. Palmer should have used this term of reproach. Has he forgotten that it is more justly applicable to himself and his comrade? What about their determined efforts to fasten upon me a deficiency of \$25,000, which was justly belonging to their own shareholders? What about their making me pay \$25 for an error, and afterwards receiving the amount from the right party—thus relieving me of any responsibility for the same, and virtually robbing me? What about assisting a clerk to rob the Bank continuously for many months of \$15,000—then giving him up his bonds and presenting

him with a bonus of \$4,000! What about the deficiency in this man's department of over \$16,000 on the 4th March, 1873, and refusing to enquire if it could be traced to him direct? What about the \$44,000, of which the Shareholders have been blackmailed for this to the mind of the young man? No wonder that at the Bible Society meeting, on Monday night, Col. Gray gave utterance to the following:—"There is an utter faithlessness in many who call themselves the followers of our blessed Lord and Saviour. The great remedy for this is to be the mind of the young man at the great principles of our holy religion. It is incumbent upon the Pastors of our various congregations, and upon every head of a family, to see that the minds of the young men of the rising generation that we may have established in our midst that which is now seriously wanting—PURITY OF PRINCIPLES. (Applause.) If this prevailing our countrymen, men would look to their heads in shame for acts and conduct which are at present painful to contemplate. Instead of meeting with censure, it is too much the fashion for the public to approve of, and encourage an example so invidious to the morals of the young people around us, without considering the obligations which we, as Christians, are under to set a better example. (Applause.)"

On the 15th of January last the Boer Triumvirate issued a manifesto in which, amongst other matters, they declare that they had never violated the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of the Sand River Convention imposed upon them, and state that the British Government had liberated no slave in the Transvaal, because they were none. To this the committee of the Aborigines Protection Society have replied by an elaborate statement, sent on the 14th Feb. to Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Committee state that they will not enter upon the question of the justice or expediency of the annexation of the Transvaal to the British possessions, their object being to show that a system of slavery which the British Government had established in the Transvaal, was a gross violation of the obligations which Article IV. of