

trump. I ask pardon. Turn your head just a hair-breadth this way. Ah!—thank, that will do. Well, now, Olga, I was out rather late; but I met some—some fellows, and we played a game or two, and so—

“Were you up to the village?”

“Yes, up to the village. You see Blightbrook is such a deadly-lively sort of place at the best, and a fellow must amuse himself a little in some way. And that reminds me—I have an engagement at five. What’s the time, Oly—just look at my watch, will you?”

She obeys after a moment—a moment in which wistful longing and precocious pride struggle for mastery. Then she stoops and looks.

“A quarter of five. But you said—”

A pause.

“Well, I said—”

“You said—you promised Leo Abbott yesterday that you would drive me over there this afternoon, and we would have croquet and tea.”

“Oh, did I?” carefully. “Well you must let me off, Oly, and make my excuses to little Leo. Upon my honor, I cannot manage it—awfully sorry all the same. But it need not keep you, you know; your papa will drive you, or Peters will.”

Peters is head coachman, the safest of chauffeurs. Papa is always willing to drive his darling anywhere. But Olga Ventnor turns hastily away, and the childish eyes that look at the setting sun are full of tears she is too proud to let fall.

“There!” Frank says after five minutes more devoted to the sketch; “there you are, as large as life, but not half so handsome. Here it is for a keepsake, Olga. When you are a tall, fascinating young lady—a brilliant belle, and all that—it will help to remind you of how you looked when acrobaticity of eleven.”

He tears out the leaf, scrawls under it, “Princess Olga, with the love of the most loyal of her lieges,” and hands it to her. She takes it, her lips compressed, pique, pain in her eyes, plainly enough in spite of her pride, if he cares to look. But Frank has a happy knack of never looking, nor wishing to look, below the surface of things, and he has something to think of besides his little cousin’s whims just at present.

“I am off,” he says, jumping up. “And—look here, Oly—go to sleep like a good little thing, when you go to bed, and don’t lie awake ‘o’ nights in this wicked way counting the clock. It will bring gray hairs and wrinkles before you reach your twelfth birthday. You will wake up some morning and find, like Marie Antoinette, all these long curls turned from gold to silver in a single night.”

He pulls out one of the long tresses, fine as floss silk, to an absurd length as he speaks.

“And besides—I am going to reform, to turn over a new leaf, numbers of new leaves, to become a good boy, and go to bed at ten. So say nothing to nobody, Oly, and, above all, above everything, shut those big peepers the moment your head is on the pillow, and never open them, nor the dear little pink ears, until six the next morning.”

He gives the pink ear an affectionate and half anxious tweak, smiles at the grave face of the child, flings his hat on, and departs.

The little girl stands watching him until he is out of sight, then, with a deep sigh that would have infinitely amused Master Frank could he have heard, turns for consolation to the drawing. Is she really so pretty as this? How clever cousin Frank must be to sketch so—dash off things as he calls it—all in a moment. She has it yet, yellow, faded, away among the souvenirs treasured moor.

“Madame votre mere says will mademoiselle not come for one little walk before supper?” says the high Norman sing-anv-song voice of Jeannette, appearing from the house; “it will give madame an appetite for her tartine and strawberries.”

“Very well, Jeannette. Yes, I will go. Here, take this up to my room. I will go on this way. You can follow me.”

So, with a slow and lingering step, the little heiress of many Ventnors sets off. She is a somewhat precocious little girl, old-fashioned, as it is phrased, a trifle prim in speech and manner, except now and then when the wild child nature bursts its trammels, and she runs and stags, and romps as wildly as the equitres she chases. Just at this moment she is under a cloud. Cousin Frank has wounded and disappointed her. He will not tell her where he goes or what he does all these long hours of absence.

“Up the village” is vague and unsatisfactory to a degree; he has broken his promise about taking her to Abbott Wood, and she likes to play croquet with Geoff and Leo Abbott. Frank’s promise she is beginning to discover is very pie-crusty indeed; he makes them without a shadow of scruple. All these things are preying on Miss Ventnor’s eleven-year-old mind for the first few minutes, and make her step legging and her manner listless. Then a brilliant butterfly swings past her, and she starts in pursuit—then a squirrel darts out of a woodland path and challenges her to a race. Then a tempting cluster of flame-colored marsh flowers catches her eye and she makes a detour to get them; then she finds herself in a thicket of raspberry bushes, and begins to pluck and eat. Overhead there is a hot, hot sun, sinking in a blazing western sky like a lake of molten gold.

In these woody dells there are coolness and shadow, sweet forest smells, the chirp of birds, the myriad sounds of sylvan silence. A breeze is rising too. She goes on and on, eating, singing, chasing birds and butterflies, rabbits and field mice—all live things that cross her path.

All at once she pauses. Where is Jeannette? She has been rambling more than an hour, she is far from home, the sun has set, she is tired, the place is strange, she has never been here before. Her dress is soiled, her boots are muddy; woods, trees, marshes are around her—no houses, no people. Oh! where is she—where is her bonnet?

“Jeannette! Jeannette!” She stops and cries aloud; “Jeannette! where are you?”

Her shrill, childish voice echoes down the dim woodland aisle. Only that, and the gathering stillness of the lonesome evening in the wood.

“Jeannette! Jeannette! Jeannette!”

In wild fright the young voice peals forth its piteous cry. But only the faint ringing of the twilight wind, only the mournful sighing of the leaves, only the faint call of the little mother birds in their nests, answer her. Then she knows the truth—she is lost!

Lost in the woods, far from any habitation, and night close at hand. Jeannette has lingered behind to gossip; she, Olga, has gone heedlessly on; now it is coming night; she is alone, and lies in the black, whispering awful, lonely woods!

She stands still and looks around her. Overhead there is a gray and pearl-tinted sky, very bright still in the west, but with a star or two gleaming over the tree-tops. In the forest it is already pitch dark. In the open, where she now stands, it will be light for half an hour yet. To the right spread the pine woods whispering, whispering mysteriously in the solemn darkening hush; to the left is a waste of dry and dreary marsh land, intermediate and blankly gray in the very gloaming. “No house, no living thing to be seen far or near!”

CHAPTER IV.
A WILD GIRL OF THE WOODS.

“What shall she do? The child is not a coward—she has been so sheltered, so loved, so encompassed by care all her short life, that fear is a sensation almost unknown. If it were noonday she would not fear now; she would wander on and on, calling for Jeannette until some one came to her aid, some one who would be sure to take care of her and bring her home. But the gathering darkness is about her, the tall black trees stand up like threatening giants, the deep recesses of the wood are as so many gaping dragons’ jaws, ready to swallow her up. Perhaps there are ghosts in that grim forest—Jeannette has a wholesome horror of revenants, and her little mistress shivers. Oh! what shall she do? Where is papa? where is Frank, mamma, Jeannette, any one, any one she knows, to come to the rescue? She stands there in that breathless, awesome solitude, a panic-stricken, lonely little figure, in her soiled dress, and muddy, blue kid boots.

“Jeannette! JEANNETTE! JEANNETTE!” The terrified voice pierces wildly the stillness, its desolate echo comes back to her, and frightens her more and more. Oh! what shall she do? Must she stay here in this awful, awful place until morning? What will become of her? Are there bears, or lions, or robbers in that spectral forest? She has on a necklace of gold beads—will they kill her for that?

“Jeannette! Jeannette!” she cries in answering despair, but no Jeannette answers. She is indeed lost, hopelessly lost, and the dark, dreadful night is already here.

All this time she has been standing still, now a sudden panic seizes her. Her eyes glare at her out of the vast depths of the wood, strange weird moans, and voices in pain, come to her from its gloomy vastness. She turns wild with fright, and flies, flies for life from the haunted spot.

She runs knowing—how long or how far she never knows. Panting, gasping, slipping, falling, flying on! She does not cry out, she cannot, she is all spent and breathless. Something terrific is behind her, in hot pursuit, ghost, goblin, fiery dragon—who knew what?—stretching forth skeleton hand to catch her—a phantom of horror and despair! And still the silvery twilight deepens, the stars shine out, and still she rushes on, a wildly flying, small white figure in the lovely summer dusk.

(To be continued.)

Holloway’s Ointment and Pills—Rheumatism and Gout—These purifying and soothing remedies demand the earnest attention of all persons liable to gout, sciatica, or other painful affections of the muscles, nerves, or joints. The Ointment should be applied after the affected parts have been patiently fomented with warm water, when the unguent should be diligently rubbed upon the adjacent skin, unless the friction should cause pain. Holloway’s Pills should be simultaneously taken to reduce inflammation and to purify the blood. This treatment abates the violence, and lessens the frequency of gout, rheumatism, and all spasmodic diseases, which spring from hereditary predisposition, or from any accidental weakness of constitution. This Ointment checks the local remedy. The Pills restore the vital powers.

RELEASE OF MICHAEL DAVITT.
GREAT REJOICING IN THE IRISH METROPOLIS—THE LIBERATED “SUICIDE”—DEPARTURE OF HIS VICEROY FROM DUBLIN—THE IRISH CHIEF SECRETARYSHIP, &c., &c.

DUBLIN, May 4.—Great rejoicings here to-night over the release of Davitt. Torch-bearers paraded the streets, and effigies of Forster and Gladstone were burned.

The Corporation presented Earl Cowper with a farewell address expressing regret that his Viceroyalty had been coincident with government by repression, and congratulating him upon the fact that the system of repression had not produced civil war. Earl Cowper said, although he regretted coercion, he considered it indispensable. He was convinced that in time of trouble and difficulty the position of Viceroy with Chief Secretary in the Cabinet and virtually entrusted with the government of the country is a thoroughly false one. Earl Cowper departed for England to-day. The streets were crowded. He was frequently cheered.

LONDON, May 4.—Lord Frederick Cavendish has accepted the Chief Secretaryship of Ireland. It is freely asserted that the appointment of Lord Cavendish is an endeavor to conciliate the Whig members of the Cabinet. The Home Rulers are much disappointed at the selection of Cavendish.

LONDON, May 4.—Correspondence between Great Britain and the United States on the subject of incitement to outrage in Ireland, is printed. A despatch from Earl Granville to Sir Edward Thornton, dated June 24, 1881, makes reference to *United Ireland*. A despatch from Sir Edward Thornton to Earl Granville, June 27th, details a conversation with Blaine. A despatch from Earl Granville to Mr. Drummond, July 27th, expresses satisfaction at the views expressed by Mr. Blaine. In a despatch from Earl Granville to Mr. West, April 27th, Earl Granville says:—“I think it well to state that Sir Edward Thornton reported to me last summer that he had been confidently informed through a trustworthy source that the Government of the United States was not disposed to take up too warmly the cause of American citizens, native or naturalized, who went to England and Ireland with the express object of agitating, and then appealing to the United States for protection.” It considered there was no reason why such Americans should be entitled to better treatment than Irishmen for the same offense.

KEAR NOT.
All kidney and urinary complaints, especially Bright’s Disease, Diabetes and liver troubles Hop Bitters will surely and lastingly cure. Causes exactly like your own have been cured in your own neighborhood, and you can find reliable proof at home of what Hop Bitters has and can do.

WIT AND HUMOR.
Columbus, Ohio, has evolved a verbi-builder who subscribes himself—W. Farrand Felch.

Let’s see! Wasn’t there a native scientist named Edison? Who can throw any light on his present whereabouts?

Leigh Hunt wasn’t noted as a chemist; but he tells us that gentleness and patience compounded are as powerful as dynamite.

“Never send a present hoping for one in return.” Never. Get your present first, always, and send yours when you have time.

Two Nevada boys mistook a grizzly bear for a calf and chased him half a mile. It happened to be the bear’s day for having fun with the boys.

Niagara Falls buried a hackman the other day worth \$38,000. Glory! let the good work go on; the more Niagara hackmen buried the better.

THE IRISH RESOLUTIONS
GREAT SPEECH
Hon. EDWARD BLAKE
ON THE
RESOLUTIONS!

[Concluded from last week.]

of dealing with that demand. In my opinion, the wise and the just method is to require that before any such plan can be dealt with, or can be examined with the view of being dealt with on its merits, we must ask those who propose it—“What are the provisions which you propose to make for the supremacy of Parliament?” That has been my course, and that is the course I intend to pursue. I am bound to say I have not received an answer to that question. I have never heard, in the time of Mr. Butt or from the mouth of any other gentleman, any adequate or satisfactory explanation upon that subject. To this declaration I have only one limitation more to add, and that is, I am not prepared to give Ireland anything which in point of principle it would be wrong to give to Scotland, even if Scotland ask for it. (Home Rule cheers.) That is, I apprehend, what Irish members—those members of the most popular classes will be ready to accept. (Cheers.) The right hon. gentleman was determined to make out that these declarations on my part were a formidable novelty, and he said he believed that I had in Midlothian, the scenes of so many misdeeds (laughter), and likewise at the Guildhall, which might have been considered a more consecrated precinct, delivered opinions of this kind. Well, I cannot recall all the speeches I have delivered on the subject, but I have taken the pains to recall six of them (laughter), which seems to me a very tolerable allowance. One was made in 1872, at Aberdeen when I was Prime Minister, the next was made in 1879 in Midlothian, and another was made in the Guildhall in 1881. But the three speeches made out of Parliament were balanced by three made in Parliament; for in 1872, as Prime Minister, I made a reply to Mr. Butt, precisely in the same spirit as the declarations I have now made, and in the spirit of the sentences I uttered last week. I did the same in 1874, when I was not Prime Minister, but leader of the Opposition; and I did the same thing in 1880, when I sat on these benches as an independent member. Perhaps I may be allowed to read a few words of that speech. My hon. friend the member for Cork (Mr. Shaw) in the beginning of 1880, on the 27th of February, made a remarkable speech upon this question. He made a proposition which I could not accept any more than I could accept the proposition of my hon. friend the member for Tipperary (Mr. P. J. Smythe) the other night; and professing himself an advocate of what I think he termed Home Rule, argued for it and pleaded for it in a spirit I own won my sympathy and regard. I did not hesitate then as I do now to use these words, (The hon. gentleman then quoted the words in which he said that from the tone of the hon. member’s remarks, if the relations between England and Ireland were to become satisfactory, the most important contribution to that essential end would have been made by Mr. Shaw.) That was the spirit in which I received the declaration made by the hon. member as leader; for he then was the leader of the party from Ireland, and every one of the speeches to which I have referred is, I believe, in complete and exact conformity with the brief outlines of my opinion upon this question. Now, sir, I have read that speech for three reasons. First, because you will observe that the Prime Minister, after an interval of reflection, comment, and criticism, reiterates the demand as an essential condition preliminary to action on this subject, that a satisfactory solution of these difficulties shall be propounded by those who ask for it on the Home Rule benches. Therefore, we find the suggestion that it stand until a day which may never come. Secondly, there is a declaration which he says he has made for ten years, and therefore we find no advance in his views upon this question. Lastly and most importantly, we find him using these same fatal words with which Irish questions, as I have proved, have been always postponed until the day of grace and utility was passed:—“This is not a practical question. I do not expect to be called upon to deal with it. I care nothing for these speculators.” I say it is a practical, a burning question. It is the most practical and burning question we can conceive, and when the Minister has stated that the results are not satisfactory as they stand, that there ought to be a change, that there ought to be a grant of local rights and privileges, that justice demands it, and that it cannot be expected that they will be satisfied if the Parliament of the United Kingdom does not discharge the duty that ought to be remitted to the local bodies, justice demands that those who have the power and the responsibility should propound that legislation which will meet the emergency.

OUR INTEREST.

Now, sir, I come to the consideration of another branch of this question, and that is, whether we have any interest in this question calling upon us to interfere in it, and I deal with that branch of the question now greatly because the hon. gentleman has alluded to it, and greatly because it is not the first occasion on which a great Irish question has come under the consideration of this House, and has been treated by this House in one way or another. I alluded awhile ago to the question of the disestablishment of the Irish Church as one of vast importance both in its direct and indirect relations to the conditions of Ireland; and it happened that while that question was under debate a late respected member of this House, the Hon. Mr. Holton, seconded by Mr. Mackenzie, moved on the 31st May, 1869:—

“That this House will immediately resolve itself into a committee to consider the following proposed resolutions:—

“1. That in the opinion of the House the measure now pending before the Imperial Parliament for the disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish Church will, if it becomes law, by the removal of one of the chief causes of the deeply-rooted discontents which have long existed among a numerous body of Her Majesty’s subjects, promote the tranquillity, increase the prosperity, and add immeasurably to the strength as well as to the just renown of the great empire of which this Dominion forms no inconsiderable part.”

“2. That this opinion is strengthened and supported by the recent experience of the late Province of Canada, for the controversy,

which had during many years disturbed that Province and retarded its progress were finally and happily terminated in 1864 by an Act of the Provincial Legislature bearing a close resemblance in its essential features to the measure now before the Imperial Parliament.

“3. That a loyal and dutiful address founded on the foregoing resolutions be presented to Her Majesty the Queen, and that a Special Committee of members be appointed to prepare the address and report the same.

To this the Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald moved, seconded by Sir George Cartier, the previous question, and the previous question was upon that occasion carried by the hon. gentleman, with the assistance of his supporters, against the vote of the Liberal party. The hon. gentleman supported his motion for the previous question by a speech. He said:—

“Sir John A. Macdonald replied that he did not doubt that the hon. gentleman was influenced by patriotic motives; but it was quite certain that his object was just as mischievous as his mode of bringing it up. The hon. member appeared to give up the whole case when he admitted that as a matter of legislation he had no right to deal with it. The Parliament of the Dominion, he acknowledged, was only authorized to pass laws for the good, order, and peace of Canada. Therefore, the hon. member said that all we could do was to give a simple expression of opinion. Now, more, that we should not do so ordinarily, except on important occasions or in respect to matters of supreme necessity. Now, the question immediately suggested itself, where was the necessity for the present motion? The measure has been approved by the public opinion of Great Britain; it has been sanctioned by an overwhelming majority of the House of Commons; and the hon. gentleman himself has been uncertain that the House of Lords, in due submission to the popular sentiment, would agree to its passage. Now, surely it was an extraordinary course on the part of the hon. member to ask the House to deal with a matter with which it had no concern, and render itself amenable to the answer that it should mind its own business. The hon. member acknowledged that our Parliament should not deal with such a matter, except in a case of supreme necessity.

“Hon. Mr. Holton—I said on a question of supreme importance to the empire.

“Sir John Macdonald—There was no supreme necessity for the motion. It was not of supreme importance to the Empire what our opinions on such a question might be—whether we were favorable or opposed to the disestablishment of the Church in Ireland. The hon. member had asserted that we were in the habit of passing addresses to the Sovereign on matters of interest affecting herself or family. Now the Queen of England was the Sovereign of Canada; every one had an interest in herself and family. In the very Act of Confederation the first clause sanctioned by the British Parliament declared that the Sovereign of Great Britain and Ireland shall be our own Sovereign for all time to come, and therefore it was quite within the limits of our jurisdiction and propriety to refer to matters connected with the prosperity and happiness of her family. The hon. member had also said that we had expressed an opinion respecting peace and war. But every one would see that the moment such a state of things arose every section of the Empire was vitally affected; therefore, as loyal and devoted subjects it was our duty and interest to sympathize with the heart of the Empire. But in the case of the present question, neither our loyalty nor our interest was at stake. He for one would not go into the discussion of the merits of the measure; he would not say whether it was good or not, for it was not the place to debate it. The hon. member had no right to force an expression of opinion in the Canadian Parliament, and he must have known that there was a very considerable and respectable minority in the country immediately affected who received the bill with heart-burning and the deepest dissatisfaction. The people of Canada lived in harmony and peace, and had no religious or other antipathies to excite them; yet the hon. gentleman wished to transfer to the Dominion the heart-burnings and animosities of the Old World. If the policy of the hon. member were sanctioned, then we should see the sad spectacle of different sects in this country coming forward, embodying their respective feelings on this vexed question. The hon. member had not assumed to discuss even the merits of the question, to go into details and show that it was worthy of the support of the House. Yet he was calling upon the House to express a decided opinion on a question respecting which it had only a general idea. There could only be one object in such a motion, and that was to create an ill-feeling between the Protestants and Catholics, to bring discord into this now happy country. It was quite obvious that if the cause of the course of the hon. gentleman was legitimate then it would be within the province of the Legislature to deal with the Home Bill and other questions of equal importance affecting Great Britain. On the same principle the House would be found interfering in the affairs of Spain, and referring to her ecclesiastical establishments. Nay, more; the Parliament of the Dominion with equal justice might be called upon to give a strong expression of sentiment respecting Separate Schools, or church endowing, or other matters of interest to the people of Lower Canada. In whatsoever light he viewed the question he could not avoid seeing the unpopularity of the motion brought forward by the hon. member for Chateaugay, and was convinced that the House would deal with it promptly and effectually, so as to prevent the introduction of similar resolutions in the future. In conclusion he would move the previous question in amendment to the motion before the House.”

Now, sir, I maintain that the hon. gentleman was on that occasion mistaken as to the real feelings and sentiments of the great majority of the Canadian people. I believe that so far from the motion being, as the hon. gentleman said, calculated to excite discord, heart-burnings, and religious difficulties, we would have all agreed and he but seen the question in another light in favor of that solution of the question, just as we had in the old Province of Canada, lively though were the feelings of religious difference in that old Province, settled a somewhat similar question. I refer, sir, to this statement because I wish to express the hope that in the interval between 1869 and 1882 the hon. gentleman has advanced in his views, has observed the current of events, and will be disposed to take a different line, and instead of arguing on the precedent which he himself created by moving the previous question on that occasion as he stated there would be an effectual barrier to similar resolutions in the future, he may be disposed to admit our right to tender some advice on this occasion and give his support to the motion before the House.

OUR INTEREST IN THE QUESTION.

I say we have an interest as a part of the great Empire, as sharers in its prosperity, as sharers in this shame—we have an interest in everything which will tend to develop the strength and the unity of that Empire; we have an interest in every great and impor-

tant question affecting the general constitution and organization of the Empire at large. Nobody can doubt that through chaos, and without any formal system, the gradual tendency of the constitution of the Empire has been more and more, perhaps through drifting, perhaps otherwise, towards the adoption of

THE FEDERATIVE FORM.

We ourselves are the outcrop of that idea. Our present position is due to its partial, unsymmetrical, unreasoned, but practical development, and I say, sir, we must consider that without power effectually to interfere, without power of legislation, we yet have as rights as members of the Empire to express an opinion upon this subject. As a part of the Empire largely peopled by old countrymen, by Englishmen, Irishmen and Scotchmen, we have a deep interest in a question which must materially affect the prosperity and happiness of our countrymen in the old land.

IRISH EMIGRATION.

As a country wanting immigrants, as the hon. gentleman has said, we have a material interest of a very great degree. We all know where the Irish immigration goes. We all know that those who cross the sea and land upon the shores of America go almost wholly, particularly those of the Roman Catholic faith, to the United States instead of to Canada. We know that our share of the Irish immigration is insignificant, and that our share of Irish Roman Catholic immigration is but a very small proportion in these latter days of even our share of Irish immigration. We know on the other hand that enormous numbers of that people have gone to the United States. When I said two years ago that that was due largely to the difficulties to which I referred, and hoped that a better feeling might be engendered by remedial measures applied to the state of Ireland, hon. gentleman opposite did not seem to sympathize with that remark. I was glad to hear the hon. gentleman repeat it to-day, and I hope it has become to a large extent the accepted sentiment of the people of this country.

HOW IT AFFECTS OUR RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES.

We are interested materially in another sense in this question. We and our neighbors have a common frontier three thousand miles long. That country is, and must always be, a country in our cordial and friendly relations with which must lie a great part of our own prosperity, and no man can doubt that the existence of the Irish question is a main feature of the difficulties between the United Kingdom and the United States, and cannot but react most unfavorably upon us. We recollect what has happened in former days. We recollect when our peace was broken, our territory invaded more than once, expense was incurred, and blood shed. We recollect that such a state of things existed in the United States that redress, whether by expression of regret or by pecuniary compensation, was absolutely denied, on the score, I presume, that the state of feeling in that country rendered it impossible for any such concession to be made. If you look at some of the figures of the recent census, you will see how directly and indirectly—directly as wanting immigrants ourselves, indirectly as those with whom the people of the United States should be on friendly terms—we are interested in this question. Take the State of Massachusetts, in which out of a population of 1,625,000 the foreign-born people, if I remember rightly, number some 420,000 souls, and of these no less than about 240,000 souls were born in Ireland, so that more than one-half of the foreign-born population of the State of Massachusetts is of Irish birth, while if you add to those the number who are the descendants of Irishmen in that State you will see what a formidable factor in the prosperity and the progress of that country is the Irish immigration. Of that immigration we want a share for ourselves, and we want still more earnestly that those who choose the Republic instead of the Dominion shall not choose the Republic with feelings of animosity and disaffection towards the Empire of which we form part, but with those friendly feelings which animate the Englishmen and the Scotchmen who also happen to prefer, for material reasons, the Republic to the Dominion.

WE CAN SPEAK FROM EXPERIENCE.

Now, sir, there is another reason why we should interfere. We can speak with authority on this subject. We are federalists ourselves. We are experienced in the benefits of home rule. We know what it means. We know that it is our most precious possession. We know that there is nothing that we would part with with greater reluctance or more difficulty than our portion of home rule. We know that there is nothing that we would sacrifice more to retain than our portion of home rule, whether you revert to that portion which the Dominion has in relation to the Empire, or that portion which the Provinces have in relation to the Dominion. In reference to the important federation which exists between Canada and the United Kingdom, or the more perfect form of federation which exists between the Dominion and the Provinces. If any people in the wide world can speak of the difficulties engendered for the want of home rule and the benefits to be secured by the grant of home rule, it is the people in whose name and for whose interests we sit and deliberate in this hall this night.

WHY HIS PRESENT OPINIONS ARE HELD.

Now, sir, the descendant of Irishmen myself—my grandfather, by the father’s side, a rector of the church to which I have referred, and sleeping in his parish church yard, and my ancestor by the mother’s side slain in a conflict with insurgents—while it might have been my fortune had I been born and bred in the old land to adopt from prejudice views very different from those I hold this night, yet it having been my good fortune to have been born and bred in the free air of Canada, and to have leaved those better, those wiser, those more Christian and just notions which here prevail upon the subjects of civil and religious liberty, class legislation, and home rule itself, I have always entertained ever since I have had the opportunity of thinking on this subject the sentiments to which I have given feeble utterance this evening. I believe that these are the sentiments native to our own sentiments of freedom and justice or forbearance and toleration, and a desire to deal with this subject—as the hon. gentleman said, who moved it—in that spirit which says, “Do unto others as you would they should do unto you.” I had been anxious that this discussion should be raised, and had myself prepared a motion on the subject, when private circumstances called me from the desk here. On my return I learned that the same hon. gentleman to whom the member for Victoria has alluded had taken the matter in hand, and it was thought better not to meddle with them or with the course that they under his leadership might propose; but, although I remained silent, I felt that it would be doing but just cast justice to the feelings of Canadians, French, Scotch, English or Irish to suppose that there is any material difference in the intensity of their feelings on this sub-

ject from those whom the hon. gentleman who brought forward the motion more particularly seems to represent. I believe our sentiment is one based on the general principle of political action to which we have been educated, and which has secured our prosperity and our intellectual and moral standing in the world now.

SECRET AT CHANGES IN RESOLUTIONS.

I heard the hon. gentleman’s resolution with regret for one reason, that I find it amended. I find it weaker than the resolution which was put on the paper in the first instance. In so many particulars it does not legislatively suit my view. It has fallen into something like the error ascribed to Mr. Gladstone, and, not willing myself to repeat that error—for I would prefer to vote for the best resolution we can get—yet I will vote with reluctance for the measure which hypothetically grants a measure of self-government to Ireland. The hon. gentleman in the altered resolution expresses the hope that, if consistent with the integrity and well being of the Empire, and if the status of the minority be preserved, Home Rule shall be accorded to Ireland. We have no idea that the rights and interests of the minority will be other than fully protected and secured. I believe that the best security is to be found in a united Irish people managing their own affairs. I say that the possession of such a measure is essential to the maintenance of the Empire. There ought to be no ifs or ands in the expression of the views of the Canadian people upon this most important subject. It is only upon the theory, only upon the strong view that the possession of such a law is essential to the integrity of the Empire that we can agitate or act with effect in dealing with this matter. I am not disposed to act hypothetically; I am not disposed to deal with this question, with ifs and ands. I am willing to advise conciliatory measures and ample justice to Ireland. I should like the Canadian people through their representatives in Parliament to say to the Imperial Government politely that in their opinion as 4,000,000 of British subjects, they believe that the integrity of the Empire demands self-government for Ireland. So with reference to the clause that speaks of trials by jury. I do not consider that right of trial by jury. I do not understand them to invite the clemency of the Crown, or to be charged with political offences. I understand them to be imprisoned under a law which does not call on the Government to charge them with any crime whatever. What we ought to have asked for those gentlemen is the restoration of the habeas corpus and a trial by their peers on any charge which the Government of England may think fit to make against them. It is not an application for clemency and mercy that they demand, and that we should express but a hope that the ordinary constitutional right of every British subject may be extended to these particular British subjects, namely, the right of habeas corpus and of trial by their peers for any offence with which they may be charged against the law of the land to which they belong. I hope that the resolution, weak as it is, unsatisfactory as it is, failing, as in my opinion it does in those two points in a manner which I do not myself admire, will yet pass because it is not amendable, and it is infinitely better that it should pass than that it should be rejected, because some may think it too weak and others too strong. In this question I have shown we are interested in many ways. Although we have no direct voice in the legislation of Great Britain, notwithstanding we have a right to venture our counsel and express our views. We have a right respectfully to approach our Sovereign and strengthen the hands of her Prime Minister, whose sentiments we met hostile to reform. We have a right to give the influence of 4,000,000 of British subjects to the redress of grievances too long maintained to the attainment of rights too long denied, and so enlarge the strength and increase the unity of the mighty Empire of which we form part. (Loud and prolonged cheers.)

THE DRESSES AT AN EARL’S WEDDING.

At the wedding of Lady Georgiana Hamilton, daughter of the Duke and Duchess of Abercorn, with the Earl of Winton, which took place last Thursday at St. George’s, Hanover square, the bride wore the usual white satin, with orange blossoms and Brussels lace. The bridesmaids, six in number, two of whom were sisters of the bridegroom and four nieces of the bride, had dresses of ruby nun’s veiling, combined with pink of the same color. Ruby bridesmaids are a decided novelty, and form an effective contrast to the all-prevailing whiteness of the bride. These seem to be a reaction just now against pink, blue or cream-colored bridesmaids. In several recent instances white has been the color taken into favor. The Princess of Wales wore a most becoming dress of violet velvet. The bride’s mother wore a costume made of bronza-colored satin and moire, trimmed with many-colored beads. Lady Glend John Hamilton wore myrtle green satin and small white straw bonnet; Lady Balfour, of Boreleigh, and Lady Middleton wore dark blue velvet, and Lady Alexandrina Murray a great preponderance of dark tints in the dresses and bonnets, offering a very marked contrast to a fashionable wedding fifteen or twenty years ago, when every possible variety of brilliant color would have been represented. The comparison is certainly in favor of the taste to-day.—London Truth.

REFUSING A PRINCE.

It appears that the young lady who refused a prince, and was indignant that he should aspire to her hand is not Mr. Mackay’s own daughter, but a stepdaughter, with a romance clinging to her skirts. Her father was a gold miner, who worked beside Mackay when they were starting to death at Gold Hill, Nevada. His name was Johnson—“Doctor Johnson,” as he was there called, and he and Mackay were warm friends. Johnson died in 1862, and left a wife and one daughter. Mackay “struck it rich” and married the widow of his old friend, and the daughter is the present Miss Mackay. No one ever knew who Johnson was, but his wife was a woman of refinement, and gave the impression of gentle breeding. Mackay has always lived happily with her, and seems to think as much of her daughter as if she was of his own blood.

Patrick O’Donnell, a wealthy contractor of Charleston, S.C., has just died and left his estate to Rev. Tom Burke, of Galway, Ireland, the native town of the testator, in trust for the benefit of the destitute poor of Galway, without distinction of creed.

In the action of the *United Ireland* against Mr. W. E. Forster to recover £28,000 damages on account of the seizure of that paper, the defendant refuses to answer the interrogatories on the ground that they concern matters of State.

Two hundred and fifty suspects have been released since the first of the present month.