

GLADSTONE IN SCOTLAND

Address to a Vast Gathering of Midlothian Electors.

THE GOVERNMENT'S FUTURE POLICY

The House of Lords Question—They are Open to Consideration—Reply With the Commons—When They Etc.

London, Sept. 27.—Right Hon. Mr. Gladstone, today brought his visit to George Armstrong at Black Craig castle, near Blairgowrie, Scotland, to a close, and proceeded to Edinburgh. The prime minister, accompanied by his wife and son, Mr. Gladstone, and Sir George Murray, left Black Craig castle at noon. The party were driven to Carlisle, where they took train for Edinburgh at half-past two. People from all the country side gathered to bid Mr. Gladstone farewell. Then the party arrived at the station. Mr. Gladstone was heartily cheered, and as the train drew out of the station the cheering was renewed. Though Mr. Gladstone transacted much state business while at Black Craig, his appearance, which is hearty and vigorous, shows that his stay in the country has done him good.

The party arrived in Edinburgh at 6 o'clock this evening. The admirers of Mr. Gladstone were out in great force to welcome him. The station was besieged, and as he descended the train Mr. Gladstone was cheered again and again. Mr. Gladstone's object in visiting Edinburgh was to address the Midlothian Liberal committee, which met this evening in Albert hall. As soon as possible after greeting personal friends and the committee entered their carriages and were driven to the hall through streets that were lined with enthusiasts. Hats, handkerchiefs and canes were waved as the prime minister passed along, and cheer after cheer was raised as he lifted his hat and smilingly bowed in acknowledgment of the salutes given him. It had been announced that Mr. Gladstone would, in his address to the committee, declare his policy for the government to follow until the next general election. Great interest was everywhere displayed in political circles as to what he would say in regard to the government's programme, and the hall was in consequence crowded to the doors long before he arrived.

Mr. Gladstone, when he rose to speak, was greeted with an outburst of enthusiastic cheers. He began by admitting that Scotland fretted justly over the slow progress of measures in which she was interested, but he held out the hope that before the end of the year some results would be achieved, especially in regard to local government and parish councils.

With reference to the disestablishment of the Church of Scotland, he believed the bill prepared by Mr. Cameron was a desirable one as a practical settlement of the question, and would open the doors for the union of the Presbyterian communions. He hoped the friends of the Established Church would accept this change for a moderate settlement of the question, and he urged the friends of the Established Church to be fair to the home rule bill, and spoke substantially as follows:

In spite of all that has been said, the last session of the house will not have to be recorded as a barren one. The many days spent on the home rule bill were not fruitless. On the contrary, that the people's chamber deliberately and advisedly passed after a long and searching discussion a bill of such vast importance, is the most significant step in connection with the whole subject of the contentment, happiness and peace of the British people. The fact that the present parliamentary institutions are to be weak for their purpose. They overlook and do not meet the demands of the country. In spite of the sacrifices of the house of commons during the past session there was a legislative famine. There is something wrong and defective in the present institutions. The condition is intolerable, and demands the concentrated attention of the nation with a view to the removal of the defects. The next was the rejection of the home rule bill, and the expression of the hand of the nation expressing just demands, on the other hand are the necessary measures to satisfy those demands. But between the two there is a great barrier, namely, the Irish question, which has taxed the energy and mortgaged the time of parliament generation after generation. Why has this question existed so long, and who is answerable for its remaining before us? There is one remedy. The responsibility rests with the house of lords (cheers), who have no remedy in dealing with the great evil. Mr. Gladstone then proceeded to review the relations that have existed with the house of lords since the passage of the home rule bill in 1882.

Since 1841, he said, the legislation of the house of commons has been a perpetual challenge to the house of lords. Sometimes the latter has declined to accept the challenge and has passed the measure proposed, because unless they had done so there would have been no house of lords at this date. As instances he cited the repeal of the corn laws in 1846, the repeal of the soap duties in 1853, Irish disestablishment in 1869, the passage of the land act in 1870. He also noticed three cases in which the house of lords had taken a different course. The first of these was when in 1841 the house of lords rejected the bill of reform from the house of commons, which they regarded as a great triumph. The next was the rejection of the home rule bill, and within six months they were unanimously compelled to pass the measure under threat that unless they did so a sufficient number of peers would be created to carry it over their heads.

The next was the rejection of the bill for the abolition of the paper duty in 1850, which resulted in the peers losing an interest in the country's finances. The third was the refusal of the lords to pass the home rule bill in 1885. That measure having been rejected by the upper house, the question was discussed incessantly until 1892, when the entire country returned a majority in its favor. That verdict, continued Mr. Gladstone, the lords have not reversed. What are their plans for its reversal? A majority of the lords give an opinion hostile to the bill, a majority of the commons an opinion in its favor, yet it is only a case in which one opinion is superior to another. The peers form their opinions for themselves. They are responsible to nobody, and if it is wrong

they will neither be abused nor suffer in any way. Our opinion is not our own, but was formed from discussion with the nation and was given with all the authority that a national verdict can confer. I think, therefore, that the peers do not stand well on their own showing. They certainly stand worse on the showing of their friends in the house of commons. The latter set up the fantastic idea that the people know nothing of the bill. Necessarily it involves a multitude of important details; but with the single exception of the retention in parliament of the Irish members, in which we to the utmost conform to the will of the people, the country displayed no disposition to enter into details, but was content to leave it to the discretion of parliament. There could not possibly be a more frivolous pretence than that the people do not know the bill.

Mr. Gladstone instanced the case of Sir Robert Peel refusing at the general election to explain the details of the new Corn law until he was put into office. The country's ignorance of the clauses of the Irish Disestablishment bill in 1868 was instanced as a similar case. The peers are the things to be entrusted to deliberative assemblies. If not, such assemblies are useless. The business of a self-governing country is clearly to take in great ideas, and when they are comprehended to stick to them, contented with the result. It is not the idea of legislative effect. The plea that the home rule bill was insufficiently discussed is equally flimsy, and the house of lords did well to avoid these fallacious pretences, the adoption of which would have shown egregious folly and want of tact, for they disposed in four days of a bill that occupied the house of commons eighty-two.

Then there is the third plea, that the lords are entitled—indeed I think they are bound by duty—to require a referendum to the country. That is not constitutional. The doctrine of the constitution shows that if a responsible ministry advises the dissolution of parliament there ought to be a dissolution at the risk of the ministry, and the house of commons has the power which it may exercise to force a dissolution by vote. But no such thing has been recorded at any period of our history as a dissolution by a vote of the house of lords. Such a contention is a monstrous innovation, an odious doctrine, and no man is fonder of these doctrines than the modern Tories, except it be the modern Unionists. But in addition to being a new-fangled doctrine, I hold that it is nothing less than high treason. If this is the case, let me put myself in the place of the house of lords. I say you have a representative government. You, as representatives of the people, are returned to parliament to do the business of the country. It so happens that you are not a moribund parliament, but one of the youngest and most vigorous of parliaments, measured by a willingness to encounter labor and to make personal sacrifices. You are sent to do the business of the country for seven years. You have done that business for nearly a year. You have consulted the electors on all the business and have acted on the opinion of the country on the question of Irish government. Our claim is to step in between you and the country to nullify the verdict of the country, and send you back to your constituents instead of allowing you to prosecute the public business.

Now, let me humbly presume to speak for the house of commons. I should say admit the majority misrepresent the voice and judgment of the country; though we do misrepresent them, we ought to be called to account by those entitled to do so, namely, the people of the country. Invited by the crown and ministers in whose hand is invested the prerogative of dissolution, what will happen if we have misinterpreted the judgment of the country? We will be sent to the right-about, and with perfect justice every Liberal will say. Great as the evil is, I infinitely prefer it to the other evil, namely, interpreting the opinions of the country and attempting to contrive by the use of some extraneous machinery. But we make this plea—we say if we are punished why should not also the majority in the house of lords be punished when it misinterprets the judgment of the country? Let us have fair play and no favors. Why should the house of lords be allowed to pass off with impunity, an impunity which only encourages them to repeat the same offence—a similar practice to that which they have just committed.

Depend upon it, it is an extremely serious matter. On the supposition that you could subject a majority of the lords to the same penal consequences as those which would befall a majority of the house of commons, there would be something like a prima facie case of justice and equality—some small plea for this title of the house of lords to the right to correct the judgment of the house of commons and to send them back to the country. But there is not the thinnest presumption of justification for such a proceeding. That being so, we have arrived at a very serious position, and the grand question is, how are we going to escape from it? A passing reference to the intelligence and incomparable unity of the Liberals, without which the minority would, he said, have broken down and destroyed the bill without sending it to the house of lords, Mr. Gladstone continued: I was not sure when Lord Salisbury threatened a year ago to destroy the home rule bill that the lords recognized that this might involve the question of their own independent and responsible existence. (Cheers.) If it should ever happen in the vicissitudes of political affairs that the house of lords, by some accident or collateral process, should bring about a dissolution of the house of commons, depend upon it, the people will not consider the home rule bill alone, but will mix it up with the question, are the commons must be exercised with the utmost discretion. If these rights are to be permanently preserved on this occasion, he said, the discretion has been entirely and absolutely waived. In regard to the manner of meeting the situation, Mr. Gladstone said there could not be procured a cut and dried solution of the dilemma. This was neither the time nor the place to consider the matter. He counselled neither violence nor vehemence. All that

was necessary was a quiet determination to cling to the hope that better counsels would prevail and induce the house of lords to grant to Ireland some just satisfaction of her aspirations. If the worst comes, the world consolation that could be offered would be to remind them of recent history and of the vast changes of the past sixty years, not one of which originated in the house of lords or was promoted by the lords. To every one of these great changes the opinion of the lords had been adverse, although its manifestation might have been prudently restrained, and might perhaps be prudently restrained again.

For my part, said Mr. Gladstone, I find this retrospect sufficiently encouraging. If the nation is determined, it will not be balked by a phalanx of 500 peers. We have the will of the country to execute, and will not submit to the house of lords, although they bear high-sounding titles and sit in a gilded chamber. The next session will not pass without your seeing this subject again appearing above the waves where it has for the moment appeared to founder. The nation has given us the authority and propelled us on our course, and it is our duty and hope and belief that we shall find with the help of the Almighty the means to reach the goal.

At the close of Mr. Gladstone's speech there was a general cheer, and a vote of thanks was then adopted to Mr. Gladstone and the meeting dispersed. An immense crowd followed Mr. Gladstone's carriage as he drove to his hotel. In response to the cheers of the crowd Mr. and Mrs. Gladstone appeared on the hotel balcony and bowed their acknowledgments.

Prof. Campbell's Case. London Advertiser: What promises to be a famous heresy case has been advanced a stage by the Montreal Presbytery. Rev. Prof. Campbell has been libelled on two charges and found guilty, and he has appealed to the Synod of Montreal and Kingston, which meets at Carleton Place in May next. The deliverance of the higher court, no matter what its effect may be, will not be accepted as final, and the whole subject will be thrashed out on the floor of next year's general assembly. On February 20th last, Professor Campbell delivered, by invitation of the students' committee of Queen's university, Kingston, a lecture entitled, "The Perfect Father, or The Perfect Son." The lecture was reported and published, and it is in the conclusions reached in it that the charge of heresy is founded. The indictment charges that Professor Campbell holds and teaches:

1. A view of the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures which repugns and discredits them as the supreme and infallible source of religious truth; and 2. A view of God which sets him forth as one who does not smite either in the way of punishment or discipline, and who has nothing to do with the judging or punishing of the wicked.

And it charges that this teaching is "contrary to the Word of God and the standards of the Presbyterian Church in Canada." The apparent intention of the lecture was to show that Campbell's accusers, was to cast discredit on the inspiration of the Old Testament Scriptures, to hold that the men who wrote them were very fallible, and that they misunderstood the character of the Almighty. In the assembly, the professor taught that God has nothing to do with the punishing of men, and that if they suffer here and hereafter it is simply because of their misdeeds, and not because of divine retribution. The House of Bishops came to Saturday last when a resolution moved by Dr. Langtry came up, aiming at the abolition of the distinction between the Upper and Lower House, and the Metropolitan of Rupert's Land, on behalf of the Lower House, declared that the Bishops insisted on the retention of the distinction. Seeing their determination, the Lower House yielded, a compromise being effected by which full provision was made for the rights of the Lower House, and the Upper House was to be retained, but not one intemperate speech was made.

As now established, the constitution opens with solemn declaration of allegiance to the doctrines of the Church of England, and passes on to two declarations, the basis of the constitution, one concerning the powers and rights of Diocesan Synods, the other leaving the system of diocesan synods entirely to the control of these bodies. The constitution then goes on to determine the system and proportion of representation, stipulating that dioceses having fewer than 25 licensed clergymen shall have two delegates, one from each order; dioceses having between 25 and 50 clergymen, four delegates, two clerical and two lay; dioceses having from 50 to 100 clergymen, six delegates, and dioceses having over 100 clergy, eight delegates. It is agreed that there are to be two houses, the one composed of the Archbishops and bishops, the other of the clerical and lay delegates, the clergy and laity to vote by orders, if necessary. The election of a primate and Archbishop is provided for. The scope of the jurisdiction of the General Synod is declared to be "matters affecting the general interests and well-being of the church, and the care being taken of the diocesan rights. Doctrine, worship and discipline, together with the general missionary and educational work of the church, and the establishment of an appeal tribunal, are among the subjects mentioned." Being more particularly under the General Synod's control. All rights possessed at present by Provincial Diocesan Synods are declared to be reserved, and a check to rash legislation is imposed in a clause declaring that no canon shall be binding upon the church until passed by two successive General Synods, and, as that body does not intend to cheapen itself, but will meet only once in three or four years, a special general synod must intervene between the pro-

ANGLICAN CONVENTION.

Review of the Work Done by the General Synod at Toronto.

Toronto Globe: The Church of England in Canada has now attained to the rank of full membership. Such is the meaning of the proceedings of the first General Synod of the body, which has just closed in Toronto. The Synod has been in session a week, and has completed its labors of union, and the result is a united Anglican Church in Canada. A primate for all Canada appointed, the high title of Archbishop boldly adopted, a general synod constituted and established, such are the steps taken that have made one organized and solidified church out of 19 dioceses, 16 of which had a form of provincial organization, and three of which were outside all provincial boundaries. The step is one that cannot but awake the deepest admiration in the heart of every churchman throughout the country, and that must, besides, be of interest to the whole community, the small portion of which looks to the Anglican Church for the satisfaction of its spiritual wants. It is an assertion of strength, a manifestation of increased self-confidence, that will scarcely fail to command respect in a world that is prone to take into account the opinions of its own valuation. The title of Archbishop is certain to affect men's imaginations as a visible and outward sign of the new self-estimation, and the improved machinery and accompanying increase of unity of feeling, which will permeate the effects of the steady propaganda, which, in common with all other denominations, the Church of England is engaged.

It has been no easy task to arrive at so satisfactory a result. With a week's meeting, the Bishops met with the delegates who came instructed to endeavor to form a General Synod, problems and difficulties were numerous and formidable. The extreme east and the far west were represented, and sectional feeling could not fail in some degree to be present. The western dioceses are largely missionary, and consequently poor; the eastern dioceses are richer, and feeling of jealousy very prevalent. Some dioceses pledged to a plan that looks towards the abolition of Provincial Synods; others were firm in desiring their retention. There was hardly a point in the constitution which was not the subject of meeting upon which widely varying opinions, and in some cases, determinations were not entertained. At the very outset an inclination on the part of the delegates was strongly manifested to call for one house instead of two. Some of the assemblies, the House of Bishops and the Lower House. There was a clash at the very moment of opening, and for a time there was every prospect of a deadlock. But the House of Bishops, with a commendable spirit of conciliation, yielded for the moment, and agreed that while the actual constitution was under consideration the two houses should sit as one. The wisdom of this concession was proved, not only by the spirit of co-operation that was evoked, but by the value of their contributions to the debates upon the constitution. By another concession, graciously made, they allowed that those who suspected that their rights of dealing with certain provincial subjects might be curtailed, and a still further act of grace was shown when the Bishop of New Westminster, at the request of the delegates, from the Montreal, withdrew an amendment which the vote was at the moment apparently being taken, which was apparently carried, but which would, in all probability, have resulted in the withdrawal of the House of Bishops from the Saturday last when a resolution moved by Dr. Langtry came up, aiming at the abolition of the distinction between the Upper and Lower House, and the Metropolitan of Rupert's Land, on behalf of the Lower House, declared that the Bishops insisted on the retention of the distinction. Seeing their determination, the Lower House yielded, a compromise being effected by which full provision was made for the rights of the Lower House, and the Upper House was to be retained, but not one intemperate speech was made.

As now established, the constitution opens with solemn declaration of allegiance to the doctrines of the Church of England, and passes on to two declarations, the basis of the constitution, one concerning the powers and rights of Diocesan Synods, the other leaving the system of diocesan synods entirely to the control of these bodies. The constitution then goes on to determine the system and proportion of representation, stipulating that dioceses having fewer than 25 licensed clergymen shall have two delegates, one from each order; dioceses having between 25 and 50 clergymen, four delegates, two clerical and two lay; dioceses having from 50 to 100 clergymen, six delegates, and dioceses having over 100 clergy, eight delegates. It is agreed that there are to be two houses, the one composed of the Archbishops and bishops, the other of the clerical and lay delegates, the clergy and laity to vote by orders, if necessary. The election of a primate and Archbishop is provided for. The scope of the jurisdiction of the General Synod is declared to be "matters affecting the general interests and well-being of the church, and the care being taken of the diocesan rights. Doctrine, worship and discipline, together with the general missionary and educational work of the church, and the establishment of an appeal tribunal, are among the subjects mentioned." Being more particularly under the General Synod's control. All rights possessed at present by Provincial Diocesan Synods are declared to be reserved, and a check to rash legislation is imposed in a clause declaring that no canon shall be binding upon the church until passed by two successive General Synods, and, as that body does not intend to cheapen itself, but will meet only once in three or four years, a special general synod must intervene between the pro-

posals and the ultimate passing of any important legislation. Carefully constructed as is the machinery of union, undoubtedly the most picturesque of the changes has been the election of two Metropolitans to the dignity of Archbishop. Technically, the titles of Primate and Metropolitan are higher than Archbishop, but, as Bishop Courtney graphically remarked, the ordinary man does not care a snuff for a Primate or a Metropolitan, while he has a very vivid idea of the power and dignity of an Archbishop, and will be impressed accordingly when he hears that the ecclesiastical provinces of Canada have each an Archbishop. The title is jealously guarded in England, where there are only two, so that strictly the Canadian branch of the church equals the mother-church in point of the number of its Archbishops. Indeed, should British Columbia be constituted into an ecclesiastical province, and this may happen very soon, there will be three Archbishops in Canada. In some respects the usage differs from that of England, there being in the province of Canada, at the events of a provincial synod, the one diocese after another may give its name to the Archbishop's title. The change is a striking one, and seems likely to do the church some good, in so far as it impresses the imaginations of men, and gives a new impetus to the work in Canada, now an accomplished fact, is thus complete, both in picturesque detail and in solid machinery, and bids fair to start the church in a new period of prosperity.

Bleeding the Country.

St. John Globe: Notwithstanding the fact that the government got out of the people of Canada from all sources for the public revenue over thirty-eight millions of dollars last year they have still further plunged the country into debt. There is no limit seemingly to their extravagance. The revelation of the past two or three years in regard to the doings of certain public men in France leave the impression that that country was largely in the hands of a set of extravagant, corrupt and dishonest men, who sought to enrich themselves out of the public treasury. Let us turn our attention upon our own land, where money is being steadily accumulated by the sleek, rapacious and self-seeking men who largely control the destiny of Canada. Wealth, luxuries, titles, roll in upon these people; they travel with the magnificence of eastern potentates; costly palace cars carry them from ocean to ocean; they live in charmed circles; they are heaping up riches, knowing very well that they will be able to keep them. Probably in no land such as ours is there more at any time so much extravagance as to be prevalent in Canada. Taxed to the very utmost, and yet unable to pay its way, vast numbers of the people, despite its great natural resources, flee from the land; but the ministers and the majority of the legislators never let up on their grip and the task of providing for them hourly grows more severe. The expenditure of the country has gone up from twenty-four and a half millions of dollars in 1850 to some six or seven millions in 1893. In the same period the debt of the country has increased from one hundred and fifty-two millions of dollars to two hundred and forty-one millions, while the gross debt is over three hundred million dollars. The labor of the people is taxed for the benefit of the monopolist, and the waiting tax-gatherer ceases not to gather in the earnings of the husbandman. In one year only since 1850 some ten million dollars have been expended in every other year, no matter how much it raised for the government, the government has spent it all and borrowed more. Deficit has followed deficit each year, adding to the burden of interest and charges upon the debt; and to-day in this young land, despite its fertility and its natural advantages, despite its toiling laborers and the struggles of its workingmen, it is going deeper, deeper, deeper into conditions which are fatal to all men who love freedom and who desire to be independent of the usurer.

THE MONTREAL BRIDGES.

A Conservative Paper's Review of the (From the Hamilton Spectator.) The Montreal correspondence of the Toronto Empire leads us to think that the Dominion government will attempt to justify the expenditures on the bridge over the Lachine canal, to deny that there has been extravagance or misconduct, and to assert that all the work done was necessary and that it was economically performed. While the correspondence points to this conclusion it does not establish it with certainty; for the correspondent may have been deceived by the statements of the government at Montreal, but not those of ministers at Ottawa. For the present we must hope that such is the case, for there is grave reason to fear that the transaction which are at hand will be the result of discussion of the doings at the bridge on the ground that they were still under investigation, though it has felt at liberty to consider some points incident to the main inquiry. As the Montreal gentlemen have entered upon the formal and public defense of their doings, it appears that further reticence is unnecessary. In order that we may be perfectly fair, we copy the letter referred to, which will be found in another column.

The first argument of the correspondent is that it is unfair and unjust to say that a work estimated to cost \$175,000 has in reality cost \$400,000. To that point, we ask the reader to look at the letter. Now, the answer to all this is that the \$175,000 voted was not only to build these bridges and to secure a depth of 15 feet, but it was to purchase land for dumping and do a great deal of work besides. When the money was voted in parliament the Hon. Mr. Haggart said:

which will communicate with the St. Lawrence. The River St. Pierre will require to be deepened to the St. Lawrence. The cost of the drain has to be purchased. For the purpose of constructing the canal entrance, the town of Lachine has been cut off and the adjacent lands have been subjected to flooding from the river. To carry off the water and afford a regular discharge, a covered sewer 6,000 feet long is to be built from Lachine to the proposed canal, the land being furnished at the cost of the town. Wellington street at Montreal is crossed by two bridges, one a highway bridge, and the other a railway bridge. The opening for the passage of vessels is only 46 feet wide, while the navigable depth is 15 feet. It is proposed to replace those bridges and build a highway bridge with four carriage tracks and two sidewalks, and increase the width to 60 feet for the passage of vessels, and make it navigable to a depth of 18 feet. The sum of \$175,000 is necessary for the purpose of carrying out these works.

Now, it may be said that Mr. Haggart had no sufficient estimate at that time on which to base his application for money. It would hardly be to the minister's credit to say that, and we do not think it will be said. We do not think it can be truthfully said, "If the honorable gentleman then, had reasonable estimates before him, he believed that 'those bridges' could be built for so much less than \$175,000, that there would be \$98,000 out of the amount to spend for land and to pay for ditching and other work besides.

But the plans then formed—the plans upon which those estimates were made and for the carrying out of which Mr. Haggart asked \$175,000—were changed. We regret to say that they were. And we were to be compelled to say that plans for public works are habitually and systematically changed. It is very difficult to name a public work constructed by the public works department or by the railways and canals department in recent years, of which the plans were not changed after the contracts were let or after the work was begun. It is simply marvelous with what facility it can be truthfully said, "If the honorable gentleman then, had reasonable estimates before him, he believed that 'those bridges' could be built for so much less than \$175,000, that there would be \$98,000 out of the amount to spend for land and to pay for ditching and other work besides.

Well, the plans for the bridges in question were changed, and the outlay was increased. It is strange indeed that Mr. Haggart had not thought of this in the first place how disastrous it would be to draw off the water from the canal during winter, stop the mills and throw people out of employment. Again, we do not think it creditable to the minister that the country honestly paid him not to think of it in the first place and provide for it. It would have been no more difficult to convince parliament in the first place of the need for keeping the mills going, and of the expense of coffer dams than it will be now.

But after all is said and done, there will remain the fact that Mr. St. Louis was paid a commission of 20 per cent. The payment of that commission is absolutely indefensible. Men in abundance were to be had. They could have been employed by the superintendent direct, as well as by an intermediary. When the intermediary got his commission, it became his interest to give as many men employed as possible, and the testimony shows the number to have been so great that the men stood in each other's way and impeded the work. It was his interest to have men rated as skilled laborers and paid as skilled laborers who were doing work requiring no skill; and the testimony shows that this was done. It was his interest to have materials hauled to the work by horse, which cost the cost, and the testimony shows that stone was hauled by teams from quarries in the country of Two Mountains. No; it is too late in the day to set up a plea that the work was economically done. We do not think a serious attempt will be made in parliament to prove that it was economically done. The work was approved by the minister and authorized by parliament. Those whose duty it was to have it done economically failed in that duty. Where the responsibility rests it is not so easy to determine.

General Despatches.

London, Sept. 28.—The national laundry exhibition which has been in progress at Agricultural Hall for the past three weeks, closed today. The number of German and American managers shown in operation, and the American exhibits carried off the palm.

London, Sept. 27.—Right Hon. Lord Justice Sir Charles Sygne Christopher Bowen of Her Majesty's court of appeals has been created a peer of the realm under the title of Baron Colwood.

Plymouth, Sept. 27.—The Associated Chambers of Commerce met here yesterday. Sir Albert Kaye Holliot, M. P., the president, said he thought trade was slowly improving, but he feared that England would ever return to the profits of the past, as they would now be more generally shared.

London, Sept. 27.—The Times financial article yesterday says: Several American sterling loans will shortly mature. Although European lenders would ordinarily be glad to renew them, it is feared the United States Senate persists in its present course, several of the loans will have to be repaid by shipments of gold to this side.

Madrid, Sept. 27.—The police are searching for two anarchists who are suspected of having been connected with the attempt on the life of Gen. Martinez Campos. The men fled from Barcelona to this city shortly after the explosion of the bombs on the review grounds. The newspaper press throughout Spain is demanding that the strongest measures possible be taken immediately to suppress anarchism.

NOTES

In The Great

important canal to the city delegates opened world's coming delegates of every and the other of Sunday of the in-p same subject over which, president. The bodies of were found yesterday. A note was found, it were anything to apply together, 15 years. The waley had met wife, and she says later, com-

the railway and opened highland, however, Electric of the old, talk poor, and revived, assistance upon Sept. 28.—The Jap purchased of 74,500 shares, at a rate 2,172,000

—Ex-Superis- returned from the went to the Joust on failed.

Sept. 28.—T-eran shoe man- famous all- importer of- died today. S.—This morn- world, in his address to the committee, declare the policy of the government to follow until the next general election. Great interest was everywhere displayed in political circles as to what he would say in regard to the government's programme, and the hall was in consequence crowded to the doors long before he arrived.

Mr. Gladstone, when he rose to speak, was greeted with an outburst of enthusiastic cheers. He began by admitting that Scotland fretted justly over the slow progress of measures in which she was interested, but he held out the hope that before the end of the year some results would be achieved, especially in regard to local government and parish councils.

With reference to the disestablishment of the Church of Scotland, he believed the bill prepared by Mr. Cameron was a desirable one as a practical settlement of the question, and would open the doors for the union of the Presbyterian communions. He hoped the friends of the Established Church would accept this change for a moderate settlement of the question, and he urged the friends of the Established Church to be fair to the home rule bill, and spoke substantially as follows:

In spite of all that has been said, the last session of the house will not have to be recorded as a barren one. The many days spent on the home rule bill were not fruitless. On the contrary, that the people's chamber deliberately and advisedly passed after a long and searching discussion a bill of such vast importance, is the most significant step in connection with the whole subject of the contentment, happiness and peace of the British people. The fact that the present parliamentary institutions are to be weak for their purpose. They overlook and do not meet the demands of the country. In spite of the sacrifices of the house of commons during the past session there was a legislative famine. There is something wrong and defective in the present institutions. The condition is intolerable, and demands the concentrated attention of the nation with a view to the removal of the defects. The next was the rejection of the home rule bill, and the expression of the hand of the nation expressing just demands, on the other hand are the necessary measures to satisfy those demands. But between the two there is a great barrier, namely, the Irish question, which has taxed the energy and mortgaged the time of parliament generation after generation. Why has this question existed so long, and who is answerable for its remaining before us? There is one remedy. The responsibility rests with the house of lords (cheers), who have no remedy in dealing with the great evil. Mr. Gladstone then proceeded to review the relations that have existed with the house of lords since the passage of the home rule bill in 1882.

Since 1841, he said, the legislation of the house of commons has been a perpetual challenge to the house of lords. Sometimes the latter has declined to accept the challenge and has passed the measure proposed, because unless they had done so there would have been no house of lords at this date. As instances he cited the repeal of the corn laws in 1846, the repeal of the soap duties in 1853, Irish disestablishment in 1869, the passage of the land act in 1870. He also noticed three cases in which the house of lords had taken a different course. The first of these was when in 1841 the house of lords rejected the bill of reform from the house of commons, which they regarded as a great triumph. The next was the rejection of the home rule bill, and within six months they were unanimously compelled to pass the measure under threat that unless they did so a sufficient number of peers would be created to carry it over their heads.

The next was the rejection of the bill for the abolition of the paper duty in 1850, which resulted in the peers losing an interest in the country's finances. The third was the refusal of the lords to pass the home rule bill in 1885. That measure having been rejected by the upper house, the question was discussed incessantly until 1892, when the entire country returned a majority in its favor. That verdict, continued Mr. Gladstone, the lords have not reversed. What are their plans for its reversal? A majority of the lords give an opinion hostile to the bill, a majority of the commons an opinion in its favor, yet it is only a case in which one opinion is superior to another. The peers form their opinions for themselves. They are responsible to nobody, and if it is wrong

was necessary was a quiet determination to cling to the hope that better counsels would prevail and induce the house of lords to grant to Ireland some just satisfaction of her aspirations. If the worst comes, the world consolation that could be offered would be to remind them of recent history and of the vast changes of the past sixty years, not one of which originated in the house of lords or was promoted by the lords. To every one of these great changes the opinion of the lords had been adverse, although its manifestation might have been prudently restrained, and might perhaps be prudently restrained again.

For my part, said Mr. Gladstone, I find this retrospect sufficiently encouraging. If the nation is determined, it will not be balked by a phalanx of 500 peers. We have the will of the country to execute, and will not submit to the house of lords, although they bear high-sounding titles and sit in a gilded chamber. The next session will not pass without your seeing this subject again appearing above the waves where it has for the moment appeared to founder. The nation has given us the authority and propelled us on our course, and it is our duty and hope and belief that we shall find with the help of the Almighty the means to reach the goal.

At the close of Mr. Gladstone's speech there was a general cheer, and a vote of thanks was then adopted to Mr. Gladstone and the meeting dispersed. An immense crowd followed Mr. Gladstone's carriage as he drove to his hotel. In response to the cheers of the crowd Mr. and Mrs. Gladstone appeared on the hotel balcony and bowed their acknowledgments.