

successor. They did not think it possible that they could be successfully opposed. But Mr. Temple, knowing full well how large a number of Mr. Pickard's following was personal rather than political, accepted a nomination from the friends of the Government and boldly entered the lists with what looked like desperate odds against him. His opponent was an abler man than he, but not so well known or so personally popular. The local Government was against him, its power in the county being wielded by the partner of the Liberal candidate, but he had the influence of the Dominion Government in his favour. Mr. Gibson, the king of the Nashwaak, marshalled his hosts against him, but the Burpees, who control all the railways in the county, are understood to have held themselves aloof from the struggle.

The result is the election of Mr. Temple by 167 majority—a result which shows that nearly six hundred electors changed sides—that six hundred who voted for Mr. Pickard, the follower of Mr. Blake, voted for Mr. Temple, the follower of Sir John Macdonald. My reference to pecuniary considerations does not refer to bribery, but to favours that are looked for from a friendly Government. One of the Temple papers published its platform, and almost every plank of the structure consisted of subsidy-money for railways, money for bridges and money for public buildings. The Attorney-General, appealing to the same spirit of selfishness, asked for tenders for a bridge across the St. John, at Fredericton, and made lavish promises of great road improvements. The Liberals are lamenting the relapse of York into the bosom of Tory barbarism, and the Liberal Conservatives are singing hosannas over its redemption, but the mourners going about the streets and the makers of music are alike perfectly conscious of the fact that personal considerations decided the contest.

We are disposed to marvel much, here in New Brunswick, at the "Bystander's" assertion that "the Ontario tax-payer bears the chief burden" of the expenditures of the Federal Government. Our politicians have frequently figured on the subject of relative contributions to the revenue, and have always shown to their own satisfaction that the New Brunswick tax-payer bears a heavier burden than he of Ontario. Without going into the arithmetical mazes and conjectural assumptions which are employed by those who discuss so unprofitable a theme, it is safe to say that it has never been demonstrated that the Ontario tax-payer bears a larger share of the public burden than the New Brunswick or Nova Scotia tax-payer. "Bystander's" statement as it stands is simply incorrect, and there can be few readers, even among the chronic grumblers of Ontario, who do not recognize its falsity at a glance. If "Bystander" intended to personify Ontario, the statement is unphilosophical and absurd. Ontario pays no tax to the Dominion Treasury. The individual consumers of native whiskey and imported goods, no matter where they reside, have the whole burden of Federal taxation, and it is mischievous and misleading to talk about the share any Province bears. We look for something sounder than this sort of shoddy from your distinguished contributor.

St. John, N. B., Feb. 1, 1884.

JAY.

CORRESPONDENCE.

LIMITED FARM HOLDINGS.

To the Editor of The Week:

SIR,—In the last number of THE WEEK "A Bystander" again refers to the proposal to limit holdings of land to 320 acres, or any other arbitrary quantity. Permit me to ask "A Bystander" if he would favour selling in unlimited quantities to individual holders? or would he fix a limit? and if so, about where? In either case he would be liable to be objected to. In the first, as favouring an aristocratic monopoly detrimental to the best interests of the people; and in the second as fixing on a limited arbitrary quantity, and therefore a nationalist aiming to slay the monster of iniquity.

I quite agree with "A Bystander" as to the effect a tenancy at the will of the state, would have. But a fixed lease of say ten, fifteen, or twenty years would have a very different effect. The tenant would have the advantage of using all his capital in plant and stock, which would enable him to cultivate the land better and raise more bread. If his object was cultivation and bread raising for his remuneration, and not speculation, the amount of rent and value of improvements could be settled in fairness, so as to admit of the experiment of ever so large a farm without cause of opposition.

Having had some experience in farming, and having read, talked and thought a good deal about it, I have no hesitation in saying that a township settled with families on every 320 acres or less, with a mixed system of farming, whose surplus of produce will not be grain entirely, but largely of butter, cheese, beef, pork, etc., the freight on which would be so much less felt than on grain, will be better cultivated, better settled for the public good, will raise more bread-stuffs, make more trade and commerce,

and in every way better for the country, than if occupied by one or two wealthy holders farming on a large scale. I am pleased "A Bystander" has referred to this matter again, as it may help to get it the consideration it is entitled to. Yours truly,

WM. OSBORNE.

Hamilton, Feb. 6, 1884.

THE IRISH QUESTION.

To the Editor of The Week:

SIR,—What does Mr. Edgar mean by Home Rule for Ireland? Does he mean a separate Parliament? If he does, he seems to forget that the experiment has been already tried, and that it ended in a war between the two races and the two religions, which plunged the island into sanguinary anarchy in '98. It is difficult to imagine how any man of sense can fancy there is any analogy between the case of a distant dependency like Canada and that of Ireland, which is an integral portion of the United Kingdom, or imagine that it is possible, without dismemberment of the United Kingdom, to give Ireland self-government on the Canadian plan. The Parnellites do not want Home Rule. They want, and avow that they want, separation. On the other hand, there is evidently a large party in Ireland opposed to anything of the kind. Why are we bound to withhold our sympathy from the Irish Protestants and Unionists? They have among them almost all the intelligence of the country. Why is their opinion less deserving of attention than that of the masses of which we have specimens in Conway street? Mr. Edgar says that we did not deprive the Irish in Canada of their rights on account of the Fenian invasion. But suppose the Irish in Canada had joined the Fenians, murdered our citizens, maimed our cattle, and blown up our public buildings with dynamite, what should we have done? However, nobody has proposed to deprive the Irish of any rights. Parliament was legislating for them in the most liberal spirit when the standard of rebellion was raised, and Mr. Gladstone, whose life they are daily threatening, had given them a Land Act, and was proposing to give them an extension of local self-government. It is quite clear that this question of sympathy with rebellion in Ireland has become mixed with party questions here, and that we shall have to be on our guard accordingly. I am yours, etc.,

CANADIAN LIBERAL.

Toronto, February 11, 1884.

ENGLISH WOMEN IN PUBLIC LIFE.

To the Editor of The Week:

SIR,—As the question of Female Suffrage seems likely to be brought before the Legislature, it may be worth while to call attention to the testimony of "A Good Liberal" given in the *Pall Mall Gazette*, itself a very liberal journal, respecting the ladies who take part in public life in England—

The advocates of women's suffrage and of women in public work are fond of taking it for granted that their opinions are gaining ground in the Liberal party. For myself, with fair opportunities of judging, I doubt it. The experience of the election of guardians is not favourable to them, and with regard to women on school boards and other public bodies, where are the cases in which they have been of service? Unfortunately in public business as in private life it is found that women are apt to form their opinions by their likes and dislikes, and to be moved by personal reasons rather than by the merits of the questions at issue; and this has made them often the cause of ill-feeling and discomfort on the boards on which they have sat. There has been nothing in the work which they have contributed to counterbalance this. They have done nothing which could not have been as well or better done by men.

To experience of this kind is probably due the decided retrogression of Female Suffrage in the British House of Commons, where from a regular Bill, which once passed a second reading, it has shrunk to a mere resolution, the rejection of which is so much a foregone conclusion that members hardly think it worth while to attend. At the Radical Conference at Leeds the other day, a resolution in favour of Female Suffrage was carried as it was announced by a great majority. But it seems that of the 540 delegates only about 200 thought it worth while to be present on that occasion. Among the mass of the wives and mothers of England the movement evidently finds no support. Yours, etc.,

SEX.

Feb. 9.

To the Editor of The Week:

SIR,—I see reported another hideous case of premature burial, the victim being Miss Hockwall, of Dayton, Ohio. It is surely time that some medical man who has a regard for the reputation of his profession should explain these cases and tell us why such horrors are ever permitted to occur when the use of very simple tests might prevent them. PHILO.

THIS story is told in illustration of the elder Dumas' unthinking generosity. A friend came in with a thousand francs for him, in gold and silver, and piled them up on his mantel-piece. "Not there, not there," cried Alexander Dumas, "for whatever money is put there is common property for my friends. A score of needy men would come in—there are so many needy people in Paris just before dinner—who might be hungry, and seeing the money there would help themselves, and I couldn't deny them. By eight o'clock there would not be a sou left. I wouldn't have the heart to say no. Somehow charity has no definite object. It must be universal, but in this case I must be prudence itself," and saying this he took up the money and locked it in a drawer in his writing desk.