POOR COPY

an equivalent for their concession of this point alone.

Letter after letter details the various stages in the negotiations both in France and Spain, and ultimately failure is admitted. In Spain it was desired to arrange for a commercial treaty, not only to apply to the Spanish West Indies, but to the Iberian peninsula. In both cases utter failure is admitted, but Sir Alexander retains hope that success will eventually crown his efforts in that direction.

Mispah.

Yes brief our parting words shall be,
And few our parting tears,
The Lord shall watch twixt thee and me
Through all the coming years ;
His eyes shall be our guiding light
Wherever we may roam,
Like beacon fires that burn at night
To lure the wanderer home.

We will not fear that time or change
Our perfect trust can dim,
Or shadow of a wrong, estrange
The hearts that rest in Him.
But should they for one hour forget,
For one faint hour be cold
The Lord shall watch between us yet,
His love our love shall hold.

Beloved when we reach apart
The valley lone and dread,
Which side by side and heart to heart
We once had thought to tread,
His faithful rod thy staff and mine
Through all the ways shall be,
The comfort of His grace a sign
Still between me and thee.

General Business.

Farm to Let.

The Subscriber desires to let the farm at present leased to William Sullivan, located on the Wellington Road, about half a mile from the town of Chatham If not let before the 15th of April, it will then be leased by Public Auction.
For further particulars apply to
MRS. ROBT. JOHNSTON, Jn.

To Let.

The well known business stand owned by the Subscriber, including store, shed and fishing privileges. Any one wishing to do country business, together with summer and winter fishing will find it the most suitable place.
Terms liberal.
For further particulars apply to.
V. ALLAN.
Neguac, N. B., 26th Feb. '80. 4m4*

For Sale.

The farm situated on Bartibogue River, in the Parish of Alnwick, the property of James Kerr, containing 140 acres, fronting on the Bartibogue River 33 rods. There are 30 acres cleared which cut about 25 tons of hay. There is a dwelling house with a frost proof stone cellar, and 2 barns, one 30x40 ft. and the other 18x30 ft. The premises are supplied with both well and spring water. For terms apply to the Subscriber.
JAMES KERR.
Chatham, Feb. 19.

Farm for Sale.

The Subscriber offers for sale that valuable property with dwelling, barn and outbuildings, sittuate in Moorfield, opposite Chatham, containing about 70 acres, 20 acres of which are in good cultivation, the balance woodland. Possession given 15th April, next.
For further information apply to
JOHN McDERMAID, Moorfield
A. D. SHIRREFF, Chatham.
Moorfield, March. 5 '80. tf

To Let.

The dwelling house situate on the corner of Henderson and Duke Street in Chatham.
Possession given on the 6 of May next. For further particulars apply to
JOHN HAVILAND, or A. H. JOHNSON.
Chatham, 9, of March, '80.

To Let.

The house and store on South side of Water Street, opposite the Golden Ball, lately occupied by W. H. Frecker.
Apply to
MARTIN LYONS,
Mill Cove.
Chatham, 28th Feb 1880.

To Let or Sell.

The house at present occupied by Mr. A. Leishman, situate on St John street, has a good Stone Wall cellar, wood-house attached and well of water on the premises.
ALSO:—
The House at present occupied by Mr. T F. Keary, on same street, on the north side of the above, with similar conveniences.
Possession of the above given 1st May.
F. J. LETSON.
Chatham, 17th March, 1880.

ST. JOHN

BUSINESS COLLEGE.

"This institution is now in its thirteenth year. "During this time we have had frequent proofs of "its efficiency and usefulness, and have often di "rected the attention of our readers to the good "work done in preparing young men for commer "cial life. The opportunites it affords for obtain "ing a thorough drilling in Book Keeping, from "the simplest to the most complicated forms, in "Arithmetic, Penmanship, Business Usages, "Commercial, Law, &c., are very valuable, and "such as, properly availed of, should be a certain "means of success to any honest and industrious "young man. We again congratulate the promoters "on the possession of a school of its character and "standing, and on the fact, that notwithstanding "the hard times it is still maintained in all its former efficiency."—*Daily News*, St. John, Feby. 28th 1880.
Terms:—$25 per qr.—Scholarships $50.
Diplomas granted on passing writen examinations.
Students can enter at any time.
S. KERR, Proprietor.
Successor to Eaton & Kerr.
St. John, March 5 '80.

Wanted.

A Second Class Male Teacher for School District No. 4, Chatham.
WM. MORRISON.
Chatham, 23rd March, 80. Secy.

To Let.

For one year the Farm and Business Stand at Portage River, Tracadie, for particulars apply to either of the undersigned.
JOHN McDERMAID, } Executors.
tf. WM. MURRAY, }

FLOUR ! FLOUR !

Teas, Sugars, Molasses, &c

IN STORE AND ON THE WAY:

500 BBLS. FLOUR, Haxal (Buda)
300 " " Supelative.
900 " " Crown.
200 " " Snowflake.
200 " " White Pigeon.
200 " " Gilt Edge.
400 " " Bank sp'g Ex.
300 " " Strong Bakers'.
100 " Corn Meal, Mason Co.
50 " White Beans ; 50 bbls. Oatmeal.
250 Half Chests & Boxes Choice Congou Teas
30 Hhds Choice Antigua Molasses
20 " Molasses, Porto Rico & Barbados.
10 " Scotch Refined Sugar.
100 Boxes, Butts and Caddies TOBACCO, Popular Brands.

ALSO IN STORE ; A FULL STOCK OF

Rice, Soda, Starch, Pickles, Pails, Brooms, Canned Goods, Raisins Soap, Candles, Oils, Codfish, Pollock, Herring, Salt, &c., &c.
☞ For sale at lowest Market Rates by
HARDING & HATHEWAY.
17 & 18 South Wharf.
Agent for 'Mayflower' Soap, "Drury Cove" Lime 'D. W. Hoegg & Co's." Lobsters, and Portlan Packing Co.'s Canned Goods.
St. John N. B., March 15, 1880.

For Sale.

For sale by the subscribers, their valuable property situate in the centre of the town of Chatham, being the stand and premises where they formerly conducted their business, it is large and commodious, has a large wharf frontage on the river, is a desirable site for a steam mill, deal-yard, warehouses or erections of any description. There is a store and small warehouse on the premises also a small boom connected with it, and is altogether an excellent property for commercial or other purposes. For particulars apply to
D. & J. RITCHIE, & Co.
Newcastle, N. B.
Newcastle, March 25, '80. 3.E.25

Carriages.

To be sold at the Subscriber's Auction Room on

FRIDAY, 23RD APRIL,

at 11 o'clock a. m.

2 New Single Waggons.
1 " Double Waggon.
1 Single Horse-Power, for Threshing Machine.
Terms—One fourth down, Balance, approved joint notes, payable 1st August next.
A. D. SHIRREFF,
Chatham, April '80. Auctioneer.

Miramichi Advance.

CHATHAM, ... APRIL 8, 1880.

The Miramichi Valley Railway.

It will, perhaps not be forgotten by some of our readers, that four or five thousand dollars were expended a few years ago by gentlemen of Northumberland in securing a survey of the route, or routes, for the proposed Miramichi Valley Railway. That being done and a first-rate trial location made, profiles and other data of survey were laid before the Provincial Government, who declined to make a contract with the provisional Company who appeared as promoters of the scheme. At that time it was well known to us that the Province was not in a position to subsidize any Railway, and the ADVANCE published the facts and figures which justified us in taking the ground that it was the duty of the Government to step in and refund the moneys expended by the Grand Southern and Miramichi Valley Companies in their surveys, allow the Subsidies Act to become a dead letter by the lapse of time, and affirm the policy that each of the railways projected in different parts of the Province, should be, thereafter, dealt with alone, on its merits, when the Provincial finances were in an improved condition. The facts presented by the ADVANCE were admitted, as we know, by leading members of the Government of that time—1876—yet, through questionable influences, which should not have been permitted to prevail, the contract for the construction of the Grand Southern was, unexpectedly to the public, made in that year by the Government.

For some reason which has not transpired, the Miramichi Company was differently treated. Its delegation was given the cold shoulder and no hope was held out to Northumberland that the road would be undertaken until the present session of the Legislature, when members of the Government suddenly announced it as a part of the policy of that body to make a contract for the construction of this important work. Some members of the Government who thus declared themselves were also members of the Government of 1876 and 1877 which refused to go on with the Valley Road. The Provincial finances are now in worse condition than they ever were before and many plain-going, common-sense residents of Northumberland are wondering how it happens that these gentlemen could refuse to do in 1876, when the Province was, comparatively, well off, what they are willing to do in 1880 when there is a deficit in the Provincial exchequer. If they are sincere now, the logical conclusion is that they were unwilling to do the Miramichi justice in 1876. If they were sincere in 1876 they are playing us false now. Our representatives at Fredericton who are supporting the Government had better, therefore, aid the Miramichi Valley Company in testing the Government's sincerity. Let them not miss the opportunity, of striking the iron while it is hot. We observe that Hon. Mr. Hanington is one of the new members of the Government who are ready to give us the Valley Road. It would be well to take him while he is in the humour, for he is an "onrelifable cuss," like Artemus Ward's bear, especially in railway matters. We remember that in 1878 he declared to the electors of Westmorland that the Grand Southern was a swindle, but he is now very much in favor of giving it every facility for being as costly as possible to the Province. Other new members of the Government have experienced a similar change of heart and sent ment respecting that most questionable work, and it may be that the Government, as a whole, is ready to do the right thing by the Miramichi Valley Railway. If so, now is the time for our representatives to put the matter into practical shape and ascertain whether these gentlemen have the courage of their expressed convictions. In any case our members must play the game commenced by the Government—viz., that of constructing the Fredericton Legislative buildings and the Miramichi Valley Railway together.

Very "Fishy," Indeed.

The *Telegraph* of Wednesday last dealt with the question of "the Maritime Provinces and the Fisheries," in a rather personal manner. The fact is all the more noticeable, because the *Telegraph* usually takes higher ground in discussing matters of general public concern. Its leader on that day, very properly, represented popular feeling in the Maritime Provinces as being strongly in favor of a just apportionment of the Fishery Award to the different Provinces of Canada, on the basis of their respective interests in the fisheries affected by the Washington Treaty. It rightly complained of the comparative neglect of the Maritime Provinces in the matter of Public Works, and protested against the Award, or any part of it, being appropriated for the carrying on of the expensive and extravagant public works that are going on in the Western Provinces, and by which the East can be but little benefited. The *Telegraph's* readers, doubtless, expected that after it had opened up the subject so commendably, it would proceed to support the propositions laid down with argument in keeping with the breadth of the theme. Instead of doing so, however, it made a weak criticism on the comparative number and salaries of Fishery officers in the respective Provinces, and attacked the gentleman in charge of the artificial breeding branch of the Fisheries Department in a manner quite unprovoked by any developments of which the public are aware.

In passing from the sublime to the ridiculous in the article referred to, the *Telegraph* made a wholesale condemnation of the Department, because Fishery officers in Ontario receive more pay per man than they do in the Maritime Provinces. It also made a grievance of the fact that, in proportion to the value of the fisheries of the respective Provinces, Ontario has a larger number of officers than the Maritime Provinces. It is not necessary to say much in reply to the complaint that the pay of Ontario officers is higher than that of officers in the Maritime Provinces, because those who are informed on the subject, know that the fisheries organizations of the several provinces were taken over at Confederation pretty much as they then existed, and the fact that the Maritime Provinces entered the Union could not reasonably be expected to change natural and geographical conditions which make inland fisheries quite different from those of tidal waters and rivers flowing directly into the sea. It ought, therefore, to have occurred to the *Telegraph* that there was much more service required of the average Fishery officer of Ontario, than from the average New Brunswick officer. Besides, it has been a very just complaint against the administration of Fisheries affairs under Confederation—both at the first and under the present Government—that in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, Wardens and Overseers have been appointed, not because they were necessary, but for the purpose of providing offices for hungry political partizans. These men receive little pay, because, in far too many cases, but little service is required of them. In Ontario the Fishery officers belong to a different class of men. They are not only clothed with magisterial functions and powers, as our Overseers are, but they have the education, experience and sound judgment which warrant the exercise of such powers on their part. They are men who devote their time to their official duties, and, unlike the greater number of our officers, they have not reduced to a science the problem of rendering the minimum amount of public service for the maximum amount of public money. Truth obliges us to state, while admitting that the salaries paid in the Province of New Brunswick are too small for the duties expected to be performed, that two thirds of the officers are entirely unfit, by both nature and association, for the honest discharge of the responsibilities that are laid upon them.

The *Telegraph*, very superficially, assumes that because the New Brunswick fisheries are six times the value of those of Ontario, the latter province should have only one officer for every six that we have. To show how erroneous this kind of argument is, it is only necessary to quote the fact that more than one-half of the fish which go to make the officially-valued catch in New Brunswick, are deep sea, and other species, which are taken where officers never think of venturing in their official capacity. In Nova Scotia four-fifths of the fish taken, are of the kinds not subject to the protection of the Department, so far as its ordinary officers are concerned. It is, therefore, unfair for a paper usually so well-informed and well-balanced as is the *Telegraph*, to attempt to mislead the public by assuming, that the numerical ratio of Fisheries Officers should be based on the value of the catch credited in the blue books to the respective provinces of the Dominion.

The most questionable portion of the article under notice, however, is that in which it makes a very pointed and, we think, undeserved attack upon the Chief of the Fish Culture Branch of the Department, Samuel Wilmot, Esq. It belittles the work done at the Newcastle and Sandwich hatcheries, which are more especially under Mr. Wilmot's personal supervision, characterising them as "costly shams, which yield no return whatever for the enormous sums expended in maintaining them." It contrasts these large establishments with "those" in New Brunswick—ignoring the expenditure on the new St. John River breeding house, and says: "it is remarkable that with so energetic and efficient an officer as Inspector Venning, the claims of New Brunswick have not been better attended to in this particular."

This is followed by complaints against the salary and travelling expenses of Mr. Wilmot, a similar allusion to his nephew, who has charge of the Bedford establishment, Nova Scotia, and, in fact, the whole article seems to have been diverted from its original purpose, as disclosed in its title, which should have been changed to "the Maritime dog bays the Ontario moon." It is, evidently, not an article written by a well-informed journalist on a great public interest—in a fair and dignified spirit, but an attack, pure and simple, on Mr. Samuel Wilmot. As such it can neither do the person in whose interest it is written much good, nor will it work much harm to Mr. Wilmot. How it found its way into the *Telegraph* we cannot imagine, unless it be that some designing person took advantage of the absence of the editor and proprietor from St. John to impose upon the sub-editor temporarily in charge.

Since the above was written our attention has been called to a letter in the *Telegraph* of 2nd inst. It is on the fourth page—a not very prominent place—and, therefore, escaped our unchallenged observation. It is as follows:—

SIR: Your issue of this morning contains an editorial article on the Fisheries, the statistics of which are compiled from the Departmental Reports, and, therefore, no exception can be taken to their correctness, nor to the deductions drawn from them. In the course of that article is the following sentence: "It is remarkable that with so energetic and efficient an officer as Inspector Venning, the claims of New Brunswick have not been better attended to in this particular." This sentence contains both a compliment and a covert condemnation. While thanking you for bearing witness to the energy and efficiency with which I have endeavored to perform the duties of my office, I beg permission to say that, the state of things described in your editorial was, year after year, pointed out to the Department in numerous reports and letters now on file at Ottawa; but I have never received even an acknowledgment of their receipt, and no notice was ever taken of them. Of course I have no means of knowing whether they ever came under the Minister's notice, or whether they were carefully kept from his knowledge by those whose interests are opposed to their duties; but the fact is undeniable that the state of things you describe was allowed to continue. Though I repeatedly begged for such an investigation of facts, as would show the true cause of the failure, for three years, of the Miramichi Hatching House, the "Ontario officers" managed to have my request refused, and the blame was adroitly shifted from the man whose neglect was the cause of the failure, to those who faithfully carried out the instructions they received from a superintendent utterly ignorant of our salt water salmon, who resides over a thousand miles from the scene of his most important duties.

The present head of the department has not yet had time to fully understand the manner in which the details of his bureau have been managed by the "Ontario officers" who have heretofore been allowed to manipulate things to suit their own views and interests. But I believe that as soon as he does fully understand the anomalies and injustice you have pointed out, he will take immediate steps to have them rectified; for I regret to say, the Blue Books of the last six years contain still stranger things than your article discloses. I am, sir, yours,
W. H. VENNING.
St. John, March 31. Insp. Fisheries.

Our readers have a pretty fair knowledge of the impertinent and over-bearing character of the author of the above letter, but they were hardly prepared to find him lashing, not only his fellow-officers, but the Minister of Fisheries as he does in his epistle. The officers aimed at are, however, gentlemen; they have often, both personally and officially, been obliged to snub the ignorance and presumption of Inspector Venning, and can well afford the smile at his attempt to have a little revenge. As for the Minister, it *was* once believed of him that he was hardly the man to be told through the public press, by an employee of his Department, that he did not understand his position and duties. When he is found so tamed as to put up with such lectures as the above, from such a source, should it excite surprise that fishery affairs are in such a wretched condition in portions of this Province as they are at the present time?

A significant feature of the Inspector's letter is its absolute agreement with every statement made by the *Telegraph* against the Department, and especially its expressions of approval of the attack on Mr. Wilmot.—Our readers will remember that it was this same Mr. Wilmot who was sent by the Department a few years ago to investigate certain charges made in connection with the Miramichi Hatching House, then under control of Inspector Venning. Mr. Wilmot as an officer of integrity reported truthfully. He showed that Venning had neglected his duty, and grossly deceived the public and Department. In consequence of this, Venning was relieved of his duties as a fish-culturist, which, in his ignorance and presumption, he had assumed. It is evident that the *Telegraph* has been led to assist Mr. Venning indirectly, in getting revenge on Mr. Wilmot, but as the inspiration of that paper's attack is as apparent as it is irregular and censurable; it will therefore fail, as it deserves to do.

The Tariff Debate.

Having waited in order to get Mr. Snowball's speech on the Tariff from the Hansard copy, we did not receive it in time, and then only a portion of it came to hand. We publish, in this issue, what we have received from the official report, and will give the speech in full in next week's issue. So far as it has come to hand, it shows that our representative has handled the subject very ably. It is to his credit also, that his statements reflect the experience and knowledge of a practical business man, who gives evidence that he understands commercial questions, both by his career as a successful leading merchant and manufacturer in his own Province, and by his speeches in Parliament. Facts and figures from such a source have much more weight than the sophistries of professional politicians and theoretical financiers. Northumberland has reason to feel grateful to her representative for the stand he takes against the unjust tariff, and proud of the fact that he ranks among the foremost speakers in Parliament who deal with the great questions of the day.

Our Ottawa Letter.

The House resumed business on Tuesday, with an evident determination to go on with the work of Legislation. The Budget debate was the order of the day. It was understood that several members from New Brunswick, with others from various provinces, were yet to speak. The *Citizen*, the Government organ, had announced that the discussion would close with a general reply from the Minister of Finance, which would be his parliamentary right, though if it were to be no more effectual than his reply to the New Brunswick members last year he had better, for his own sake, omit it altogether. However, there is no predicting what may occur in the House of Commons, and the Knight of St John did not, on this occasion, air his eloquence at all, of which more anon.

Mr. Snowball had the floor, having on Friday night, moved the adjournment of the debate, and he entered upon his work in vigorous style. This was the best thing to do, as the debate had before pretty well tired the patience of the House, and members were in rather a listless mood when he began. But Mr. Snowball soon awakened interest enough, eliciting cheers from his friends and cries of dissent from the other side. He made a capital speech, as I think all who read the full report from *Hansard* will agree. In opening he dealt with the speech of Mr. White, member for Cardwell and editor of the *Montreal Gazette*. This gentleman had made one of the best delivered speeches on the Ministerial side;—indeed the only one of any note after Sir Charles Tupper's. Mr. White had boasted, too, of his accurate knowledge of public affairs from his long connexion with the newspaper press, boards of trade, &c., before becoming a member of Parliament. But he had mistaken matters sadly on several points which Mr. Snowball keenly, but in a gentlemanly way, exposed. He showed that the Tory champion, in his eagerness to represent the expenditure under Mr. Mackenzie's Government as very large, had added *thirteen millions* expended on capital account to the sums voted to be expended on account of Consolidated Fund. No one had, yet, made this point clear, and Mr. Snowball threw the light upon it in a way that made even the ministerial side conscious that their orator and oracle had blundered terribly. Mr. Snowball dealt with the larger questions in a forcible way, and in a manner that could be understood by all. His defence of the Financial policy of the late administration was very effective, as he placed in a light that every one could see the fact that while paying year after year large additional interest and contributions to the sinking funds. Mr. Mackenzie's Government had so curtailed other expenses as to scarcely at all allow the annual expenditure to increase. His exposition of the balance of trade was the best and clearest I have yet heard in Parliament. Not less effective was the way in which he turned the tables upon the Finance Minister and Sir Charles Tupper, whose fallacious reasoning, and misleading statements he cleverly exposed. I don't think Sir Charles Tupper will again, as he did in this debate, claim that Lord Derby had approved of the Canadian protective tariff. Sir Charles, with his usual recklessness, had made this statement, believing that no one could prove the contrary. But Mr. Snowball, who had been in England when the speech was made, produced the report of it and read extracts, proving that Lord Derby was not only a sound free trader himself, but had predicted that the Protectionist bubble in Canada would inevitably burst. Mr. Snowball threw new interest into the debate and was warmly cheered when he sat down.

After another speech or two, the House began to be impatient, and at the close of each there were cries of "question" "carried" etc. Mr. Farrow, an agricultural member from Huron and a ministerialist, had the floor, and many members had gone out when he began. He ended sooner than was expected. Mr. Anglin, who intended to speak was out of the chamber. Sir Albert Smith was in the Library, Mr. Mills had left his copious notes at home, believing that the debate would go over to another day. There was a long pause. The cries of "question" grew louder. The Speaker looked from side to side and hesitated, but at length declared the motion "carried." Sir Samuel, troubled with Mr. Snowball's speech, was bound to have his reply and rose. Mr. Mackenzie said the motion was carried, and the Minister could not have the right of closing a debate already closed. Sir Samuel turned pale, and said he would speak to the first item, (The first item was the duty on demijohns!) and struck off on a general reply such as he intended to have made. He was called to order. The Opposition were willing for him to proceed if only the Government would allow others who wished to discuss the general question to do so. To this Sir Samuel would not consent. There was great ministerial embarrassment, and Sir John was sent for. He came in looking anxious. But Government would not consent to the Opposition member making more speeches after the motion was carried. The Opposition, therefore, was bound not to let the Finance Minister speak, and called for the Speaker's ruling. And the Speaker would not allow the Minister to speak beyond the subject of "demijohns." Sir Sir Samuel angrily said he would take another occasion to make his speech Sir John went out again. Sir Samuel, who was, therefore, again leading the House, was asked whether the subject would come up again on Thursday, the next Government day, but replied that the Fishery Award debate would be then resumed. In this he was wrong again.

On Thursday the order for resuming the adjourned debate on the Fishery Award was called, and Mr. Richey of Halifax had risen to speak, beginning in his usual grandiloquent style, when he was stopped by a point of order. This was a "Government day," and as the Fishery Award debate arose on the motion of a private member, it must be considered on a "private day." Sir John was again sent for and came, but all the Ministerial Knights together could not be permitted to override the rules of the House, and so they had to take up Government business, which Mr. Mackenzie, truly and forcibly, reminded them was "terribly in arrears."

Thus the Ministry were not only out-argued in the debate, but every time out-manœuvred in parliamentary tactics. It is clear that without Sir John the Ministerial party, numerous as it is, has no one in its ranks fit for leader.

On the third reading of the Bill to provide salaries for two more Judges in British Columbia, Blake moved an amendment setting out that the additional outlay of $8,000 for that purpose was altogether unnecessary. It was voted down by a vote of 95 to 43, though I am sure many of the majority are ashamed of the vote they gave, and one staunch ministerialist—Mr. Longley of Annapolis, N. S., whose conscience is becoming awakened—voted for the amendment.

Last night we entered on the Estimates and an interesting, though chiefly conversational discussion was held on the items of Administration of justice, including Penitentiaries, and on the vote for the House of Commons. The shameful extravagance of last session in employing so many sessional clerks and messengers was again referred to, and counter charges against the late Speaker were made, but it was shown that the late Speaker never employed more than 39 sessional clerks while the present Speaker had last year employed 89! The messengers' staff was proportionally increased. Mr. Speaker Blanchet gave the very frank explanation that he had been "overpowered" by applications from Conservative members. K.

A "Celestial" Armstrong Gun.

A Fredericton man named Armstrong writes to the *Reporter* proposing that Fredericton people shall no longer patronise St. John. His darling proposition is opened up thus:—

"Now sir, I propose to get up a company to build a vessel for the West India trade, so as we can get our sugar and molasses and all other articles in their line that we require, at first cost, without having to call on independent St. John. I propose to have a vessel, say 250 tons, or as large as can come up the river loaded, and come in safety, to be ready in the spring of 1881.

Mr. Armstrong intimates that Mr. Gibson, Mr. Randolph and other enterprising gentlemen would help the scheme along—"just to spite St. John," no doubt. It is quite probable that Messrs. Gibson and Randolph are able to inform Mr. Armstrong that a vessel ought to be coming home from the West Indies in the Spring with sugar and molasses, instead of commencing the outward voyage. We shall next hear of some sapient Armstrong proposing that Mr. Gibson ignore St. John in carrying on his lumber business. To prove that Armstrong is not the only person who has become demented over the capital question, we may mention that the *Reporter* refers in a serious manner to the letter and says:—

"The ideas put forward by Mr Armstrong are *real good*, and we would suggest their consideration to the members of our Board of Trade."

The italics are ours and they are "real good." The Armstrongs of Fredericton will, we hope, all be improved in their mental condition before the new Legislative buildings are erected.

THAT PAMPHLET.—In the Legislature on Saturday last Mr. Barberie asked what steps the Government had taken to prevent the Surveyor General's Immigration pamphlet from falling into the hands of intending settlers or the general public? The Provincial Secretary declined to answer.

CREDITABLE.—Messrs. Hutchison, Davidson and Gillespie recorded their votes in the Assembly last week against the bill to extend the time for completing the Grand Southern Railway. In taking this course they did what they could to prevent the Province from being further burdened on account of that almost useless work.

The Elections in Great Britain.

During the past week the Parliamentary elections have been going on in Great Britain. The result is a foregone conclusion, and in a great Liberal victory the Conservative Government of Lord Beaconsfield will soon be a thing of the past. It is, at least an open question whether the great change will be for the welfare of the Empire It must be remembered that Liberalism in England is not at all identical with Liberalism in Canada, any more than it is with the Liberalism of France and Italy. English Liberals, however, and those of Canada, hold more principles in common than do the former and the Canadian Conservatives, who appear to have taken an interest in Beaconsfield's Government that is warranted only by the fact that it is the fashion of our Tories to fawn upon those who are in power. Regret will be felt among a majority of those who wish to see Great Britain's foreign policy a successful one, over the prospective change of Government, simply because they believe, in the aggressive and prominent part which England has of late taken in asserting her right to protect her great empire of Eastern Asia, as well as interests somewhat nearer home. Among the late despatches on the subject of the elections are the following:

LONDON, April 4th:—The returns that are now coming in from the more Conservative districts show no diminution in the ratio of Liberal gains, and the result of the four days polling places the fact of a great Liberal victory beyond the possibility of reversal. Special attention now turns wholly upon the composition of the Cabinet. On this subject the *Times*, in a leading article, says:—

"After Mr. Gladstone's defeat in 1874, he not only resigned the Leadership of the Liberals, but declared his intention of withdrawing as far as possible from active political life, and the logical consequence of this resolution would be, that he would not take office in the coming administration. But this resolution has already been in spirit very conspicuously infringed, and it cannot be doubted that a very strong pressure will be brought to bear upon him in order to induce him to abandon it. Nobody can doubt that Mr. Gladstone is a most potent force on the Liberal side. But for him, there is no sign that the policy of the late Government would have been so vehemently challenged. It is Mr. Gladstone who has led on the assault, which has now been so conspicuously successful, and he must be regarded as representing the views of that class of voters to whom the Liberal majority is due."

To the same article points to the remark of Mr. Gladstone in a speech at Wexford, yesterday, to the effect that he neither directly nor indirectly insinuated to any one, that he had come there as the chief of the party, or that a return to office at his time of life was his desire. The *Times* continues: "This is a very different thing from refusing to accept the responsibility naturally attaching to the course he has recently pursued, and it is therefore scarcely conceivable that Mr Gladstone, while remaining in public life will not form a member of the new Cabinet."

The cohesion of the Liberal party and the ability shown by its leaders in the arrangement of the campaign have surprised everyone. The *Saturday Review* in its summary of the situation says: "The constituencies could not have given a much more decided answer to Lord Beaconsfield's appeal, but why they have given it nobody can exactly say. Very probably many electors are tired of the Government merely because it had been six years in office, but there are some things the electors have placed beyond contest. They show that the Publicans have not exercised the influence it was expected they would. The Liberals were not divided by crochets that their party organization is much improved, and that the moderates have as a rule neither abstained nor gone over, but have voted with their party."

The *Spectator*, which is strongly Liberal in quite enthusiastic over the "revolution" of England as expressed at the polls. At home and abroad it claims that the effects of the victory will be most beneficial. In an editorial comment it says "nothing surprises people more in the elections than the evidence they give how easy it is to live in England and know nothing about the real opinion of England. Wherever you went you were told whatever Scotchmen or Irishmen might think England would support Lord Beaconsfield's policy with enthusiasm." Speculating still further on the consequence of the Liberal victory, the *Spectator* adds: "It is a severe blow to the Tory democracy; the next man who professes faith in the monarch and the multitude must appeal to the latter on Socialist grounds, or undertake enterprises requiring sacrifices that will speedily restore people to their senses. No other man will ever wave the banner of prestige as Lord Beaconsfield has done without striking a stroke for it. In the second place, we are rid of personal government. It is, however, in its effect abroad that the Liberal victory will be most far reaching. We don't believe that there will be joy at St. Petersburg at all. Russia dreads and distrusts certain views of the Liberal chiefs, especially Mr. Gladstone's far more than she dreads a ministry which can be coerced into secret compacts, but millions of Greeks, Armenians and Bulgarians will rejoice at the prospect of a new career made possible to them, and their rejoicing will be feeble compared with the exultation of our own millions in India, no longer taxed to death in order that a Premier may pose as arbitrator of the destinies of Central Asia. England can bear with equanimity that Prince Bismarck is sorrowful and Baron Haymerle worried, if throughout the world all freemen feel that with the Tory democratic Government of England, a miasmatic cloud has been rolled away."

The correspondent of the *Times* at Berlin says he has good reasons for stating that in the highest official circles, the prospect of a Liberal victory in the Parliamentary elections in England is regarded with no small fear and trembling. The universal belief in Germany is, that the peace of Europe would be more assured under a Tory than a Whig Government.

Returns show the net Liberal gain thus far as fifty-six seats.

RECAPITULATION.

Liberal elected at the elections, 235; at last election from the same constituencies, 179; Conservatives at this election, 137; at the last, 193; Home Rulers at this election, 16; at the last 16. Thus far elected at this election, 388; at last, 388 Net Liberal gain over Conservatives 54; over Home Rulers 2 Total 56 The representation in the last Parliament was Conservatives 345, Liberals 245, and Home Rulers 60. There are still 262 seats to hear from. In 1874 they were represented by 152 Conservatives, 60 Liberals and 44 Home Rulers. Should these districts remain relatively unchanged, the representation in the next parliament will stand conservatives 289, Home Rulers 60.

The Liberal net gain is now 50 seats.

LONDON, April 6.—The *Observer* of this morning says: "We understand there will be no decision whether the Government shall resign at once or wait the adverse report of Parliament. After the result of the polling on Friday, it became known that a special messenger was sent to Baden with a despatch for the Queen. We have reason to believe that Mr. Gladstone disapproves of the arrangements suggested in various quarters, that he accept a subordinate office in the new administration. He still adheres to his intention of not resuming office, but will cordially support the recognized Liberal leaders—Earl Granville and the Marquis of Hartington. Reports about the composition of the new Ministry are obviously premature, as there has been no consultation between the Liberal leaders on the subject. We mention the following rumors possessing a certain amount of probability, although resting, as yet, on no basis of ascertained facts. It is said that Earl Derby will be offered the Foreign office, but if he refuses, as is probable, the office will be assigned to Lord Kimberly. Mr. W. E. Forster will be Minister of the Colonies; Mr. Goschen, Chancellor of the Exchequer; Lord Cartwell Secretary of War; Mr. Childers first Lord of the Admiralty; Sir William Vernon Harcourt, Sir Charles Duke and Mr. Fawcett, as representatives of the advanced section of the party, will occupy seats in the new Cabinet. Lord Rosebery, it may also be taken for granted, will hold a high or important post in the Liberal Administration.

Mr. Snowball's Speech on the Budget.

[From the Hansard Report.]

Mr. Speaker, in resuming the debate on this question, said it seems to me very unfortunate that after a year's experience of this tariff, so many hon. gentlemen on this side of the house feel compelled to come forward and reiterate in the strongest manner the convictions they expressed last year in relation to this subject. I have been struck during the course of this debate by the earnestness which has been displayed by so many hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. I have also thought that the hon. members on the other side of the House, have not in all cases tried to meet the arguments which have been brought forward on this side, as fully as might have been expected of them.

The speech of the hon. member for Cardwell, Mr. White, was delivered with the usual force of that hon. gentleman; yet, whatever failings there were in that speech, it presented the advantage of closely following the lines laid down by the leaders of the Government in relation to the subject.

A BIG BLUNDER EXPOSED.

The hon. gentleman in opening his remarks, told us that the first Budget of the late Finance Minister imposed a tax on this country of $26,000,000. Now, I have sought in the public records to find out what the hon. gentleman based his information, and so far have not been able to find any ground for such a statement. I do find that in 1874 the late Finance Minister brought down an estimated expenditure for 1874-5 of $23,713,000. In the face of that fact, where did the hon. gentleman get his information in reference to the $26,168,000 he spoke about? When asked where he got it, he showed us a book stating that that was where his statement could be proved. But the book did not contain the estimates, but only the Supply bill. The hon. gentleman told us that he had studied this question not only while he had been a member of this House, but during the many years he had been in the press gallery, and therefore, he knew fully what he was talking about. Is it possible the hon. gentleman made that statement with the clear intention of deceiving the country? Or did he make it, not knowing that he was quoting from the supplies that had no correct connexion with the estimates, and that those supplies contained an item of $3,107,000, which belonged to capital account? Whether it was in error or not, the statement will not raise the hon. gentleman's character as a financial authority. I find the hon. gentleman's speech is published in the Montreal *Gazette*, but in that paper he is not reported so fully, and as he should have been, for his statement in reference to that point is entirely omitted, but I find that in the first portion of this speech he is reported as saying that "the hon. member for Centre Huron, (Sir Richard Cartwright) in the first budget speech that he delivered in this House, imposed upwards of $3,000,000 additional taxes upon the people." This is the first part of the argument which he adduced to prove the position he had taken in reference to the $26,000,000, the amount he stated was asked for in the first Budget speech of the hon. member for Centre Huron. He asserts that that hon. gentleman added $3,000,000 additional taxation to the burdens of the people of the country. I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite are quite willing to accept the estimates for 1873-4 of $23,823,000 as theirs, and the actual expenditures for that year of $23,316,000, showing an expenditure of $507,000 less than the estimates, as the fair basis on which to estimate their last expenditure previous to going out of office.

ON THE WRONG TRACK

I find the hon. member for Cardwell, after laboring very nearly an hour to prove that the Liberals, after coming into power, had in their first year, that is in 1874-5, imposed $3,000,000 additional taxes on the country, now abandons that statement entirely, and later in his remarks states the expenditure in the year 1874-5 reached the sum of $1,417,000 in excess of the greatest expenditure of the previous administration. By what rule of argument did the hon. gentleman so suddenly drop from the first position he took, and adopt a sum of less than half of the amount that he argued so long to sustain? This statement, however, is equally at variance with the truth. As far as I can find out of the Public accounts, the expenditure for 1874-5 was $23,713,000, and for this I defy contradiction; whereas, for the year previous, for which the previous administration was responsible, the expenditure was $23,316,000, making a difference of only $397,000, and an overstatement of the hon. gentleman of $1,020,000 from his reduced figures. On what grounds can the hon. gentleman justify such gross misstatements?

STILL AFTER WHITE.

Now the hon. gentleman goes through the whole five years of the Mackenzie administration, giving figures for each year's excessive expenditure which are equally at variance with the truth; but let us follow him and analyze his statements. The expenditure for 1875-6 was $24,488,000. Deduct now their expenditure of 1873, which as before stated was $23,316,000, and we have a balance of $1,172,000 which the late administration expended more than the previous one did in 1873-4. But the hon. gentleman is not willing to put the sum at $1,172,000. He puts it at $2,152,000. In 1876-7 the expenditure was $23,513,000. Take from this amount again the highest expenditure authorised by the previous administration, viz: $23,316,000, (and this is what the hon. gentleman asked) and you have a balance of only $203,000, whereas the hon. gentleman stated the balance was $1,223,000. The next year 1876-7, the hon. gentleman stated the extra expenditure was $1,203,000, whereas it was only $186,000. For the year 1878-9 he puts the excessive expenditure at $2,155,000; it was only $1,133,000 and for this excessive expenditure the Mackenzie Government was not wholly responsible, as the hon. gentlemen opposite came into power this year, and over expended the estimates by $786,308. I would, however, be willing to give them the benefit of all this if they wish it, as I will show that the Mackenzie Government actually reduced the expenditure during their administration. To sum the whole matter up, the hon. gentleman says there was an excessive expenditure during those years of $8,152,000, whereas, according to the Public Accounts published by themselves, the excessive expenditure during those five years is only $3,097,000. There is an alarming difference in these figures and some person should be able to account for them But I can go still further and show that in those years, not only does the extra expenditure not exceed $3,097,000 but that

THE LATE ADMINISTRATION PAID MORE INTEREST

on the money borrowed by the Government to carry on the public works of the country, than did the former administration to the extent in—

| | |