MISCELLANEOUS.

e or more Surgeons of
Surgical Institute
NO. 319 BUSHST., SAN FRANCISCO,
WILL BE AT
Oriental Hotel, Victoria,
MAY 14 & 16,
To examine cases for treatment by this Institute, which is devoted to treating
es of Children,
s of the Spine,
d Knee Joints,
ysis, Piles,
la, Catarrh
Chronic
Diseases.
— Governor E. P. Ferry, Olym-
Hoyt. Associate Justice of
602 Fourth st., Seattle; Wm.
tal Hotel, Victoria; Ben. E.
Seattle. my6

OLLIS BROWNE'S
HLORODYNE.
AL and ONLY GENU NE
or Sir W. Page Wood stated
t that Dr. J. Collis Browne
ly the inventor of Chlorodyne,
tory of the defendant Freeman
true, and he regretted to say
n sworn to.—*Times*, July 13,
BROWNE'S CHLORODYNE
EST AND MOST CERTAIN
IN COUGHS, COLDS, ASTH-
NSUMPTION, NEURALGIA,
TISM, &c.
BROWNE'S CHLORODYNE
ht. Hon. Earl Russell com-
to the College of Physicians
Davenport that he had received
n to the effect that the only
any service in Cholera was
e.—*See Lancet*, Dec. 31, 1864.
BROWNE'S CHLORODYNE
ed by scores of orthodox
s. Of course it would not be
larly popular did it not "sup-
and fill a place."—*Medical*
12, 1885.
BROWNE'S CHLORODYNE
cure for Cholera, Dysentery,
olics, &c.
None genuine without the
Collis Browne's Chlorodyne."
Overwhelming medical testi-
es each bottle. Sole manufac-
ENPORT, 33 Great Russell
d at 1s. 1½d., 2s. 9d., 4s. 6d.
au12

E 100 YEARS.
THE
AN'S FRIEND
rts' OINTMENT
ES. This VALUABLE OINT-
MENT (as originally pre-
Ed. pared by G. L. ROBERTS,
M.D. is confidently re-
ES. commended as an unfail-
ing remedy for Wounds
ES. of every description, Chil-
blains, Scorbutic Erup-
ES. tions, Burns, Sore and In-
flamed Eyes, Eczema, &c.
S' ALTERATIVE PILLS
BLOOD and SKIN.
ES. They are useful in Scrofula
Scrobutic Complaints,
ES. Glandular Swellings, par-
ticularly those of the neck;
ES. they are very effectual in
the cure of that form of
ES. skin disease which shows
itself in painful cracks in
ES. the skin of the hands and
in all scaly diseases.
en at all times without con-
t or change of diet.
2s. 9d., 11s. and 22s. each, by
ridport, England. my20

Y GOLD CURE COMPANY*
FOREIGN).
16th Day of December, 1892.
ate of Registration.
y that I have this day regis-
H. Keeley Gold Cure Com-
nder the "Companies' Act,"
ation of Foreign Companies,"
nies' Act Amendment Act,
which the Company is estab-
ablishing and conducting of
ituates for the treatment of
ed to the use of alcholic li-
cco and other narcotics and
r the treatment and cure of
anufacture and sale of the
, and the establishment of
tutions for the sale and use
rying on and conducting of
sary or incidental to the ob-
oned.
he Capital stock of the said
y-five thousand dollars, di-
ered shares of two hundred
ch.
existence of the said Com-
ness of the said Company is
Province of British Col-
hereof I have hereto set
d my seal of office this 16th
92, at the City of Victoria,
British Columbia.
C. J. LEGGATT,
of Joint Stock Companies.
a6-w1mo

If
u Think
a crop will do, then
eeds will do; but for
lls you should plant
'S SEEDS.
they are recognized as
ard everywhere.
d Annual is the most
ok of the kind pub-
s invaluable to the
We send it free.
FERRY & CO.
INDSOR,
Ont.

A CHICKEN.
st in the breeding of high-
award a special prize of
rson raising the heaviest
cken hatched from eggs
e unquestionably the best
for the Canadian farmer.
Circular of this valuable
guaranteed fresh and true
cked in baskets and deliv-
pany, $2.00 per sitting of
A. WILLETS,
of Plymouth Rock Fowls
Weston, Ont.

HOME RULE.

Mr. Gladstone Introduces His Long Expected Measure to Settle the Irish Question.

A Speech of Far More Than Ordinary Interest, Eloquence and Importance.

How It Is Proposed to Adjust the Financial and Other Difficult Problems.

London, Feb. 13.—From the early morning the scene in Westminster palace yard was of the most animated description, groups of people assembling to watch the arrival of members. P. J. Foley, Nationalist member for Connemara, was the first to make his appearance, closely followed by David Sheehey, secretary of the Irish National Federation and brother of the well-known Rev. Father Sheehey. Mr. Sheehey is member for South Galway and is grateful to Mr. Gladstone for having denounced the magistrate who refused him bail when his wife was dangerously ill. "Honest" John Roche, Nationalist M.P. for East Galway, was also among the first arrivals as well as Dr. Charles Tanner, M.P. for Cork, one of the most fiery and popular of the Nationalist leaders. By ten o'clock sixty members were waiting for admission. By noon the inner lobby was packed with members and the approaches were crowded. When the doors were opened there was a disorderly rush for seats, the members

SHOUTING AND STRUGGLING

like a mob of excursionists on a holiday, several being thrown to the floor. The veteran Caleb Wright, Liberal M.P. for Southwest Lancashire, 82 years of age, unable to hold his own in the crush, fell down in the doorway; others were pushed upon him by the eager, heedless throng, and he was trampled upon more than once before Labor Representative John Burns, M. P. for Battersea, came to his rescue. Meanwhile the struggle for entrance grew more exciting, and cries could be heard, "Keep back!" "don't kick!" and other exclamations of a more emphatic character, while yells of pain left no doubt that a marked impression had been made on the feelings of some usually dignified and phlegmatic Britton. Reporters watched with considerable interest, and one or two of them claimed to notice that the kicking and punching was not altogether accidental, and that the demonstrations were rather more active and conspicuous when some dignified old Conservative British squire happened to be caught in a group of Irish Nationalists. However, the melee settled down at last, and all got safely in their seats and forgot their aches, in waiting for a feast of Gladstonian eloquence. Every seat in the House, except the Government benches, was occupied. Mr. Gladstone entered the House at half past three o'clock. Every Liberal and Irish Nationalist in the House stood up and greeted him with prolonged and enthusiastic cheering. When Mr. Gladstone arose at forty-three minutes past three to introduce the Home Rule bill, there was another demonstration, so earnest, so enthusiastic and irrepressible that it was several minutes before it could be heard. Mr. Gladstone, who was in splendid form, spoke as follows in a

CLEAR, STRONG, RESONANT VOICE:

I may, without impropriety, remind the House that the voices which pleaded the cause of Irish self-government in Ireland's affairs have within these halls during the last seven years been almost entirely mute. I return, therefore, to the period of 1886, when a proposition of this kind was submitted on the part of the Government of the day, and I beg to remind the House of the position then taken up by all the promoters of these measures. We said that we had arrived at a point in our transactions with Ireland where the two roads parted. 'You have,' we said, 'to choose one or the other.' One is the way of Irish autonomy, according to the conceptions which I have just referred to; the other is the way of coercion, that was our contention. It will be in the recollection of the House how that contention was most stoutly and largely denied. It was said over and over again by many members opposite, 'We are not coercionists, we do not adopt that alternative, and neither can we adopt it.' (Ministerial cheers.) That assertion of theirs was undoubtedly sustained by the proposals, and especially from dissentient Liberals, of various plans for dealing with Irish affairs. Those plans, though they fell entirely short in principle and scope of Irish self-government, yet were of no

TRIVIAL OR MEAN IMPORTANCE.

They went far beyond what had heretofore been usually proposed in the way of local self-government for Ireland. Well, what has been the result of the dilemma as it was then put forward on this side of the House and repelled by the other. Has our contention, that the choice lay between autonomy and coercion been justified or not? (Liberal cheers.) What has become of each and all of those important schemes for giving Ireland self-government in local affairs, and for giving her even a central establishment in Dublin, with limited powers? All have vanished into thin air, but the reality remains. The roads were still there, autonomy or coercion. The choice lay between them, and the choice made was to repeal autonomy and embrace coercion. You cannot always follow coercion in an absolutely uniform method. In 1886, for the first time coercion was imposed on Ireland in the shape of a permanent law, added to the statute books. This state of things was a contravention of the constitution, an offence against the harmony and

TRADITIONS OF SELF-GOVERNMENT.

It was a distinct and violent breach of the promise on the faith of which union was obtained. The permanent system of repression inflicted upon the country was a state of things which could not continue to exist. It was impossible to bring the inhabitants of the country under coercion into sympathy with the coercion power. Mr. Gladstone proceeded to dilate at length upon the circumstances under which the act of union was passed, the promise of equality in the laws and of commercial equality under which union was effected. It was then prophesied confidently, he said, that Irishmen would take their places in the Cabinet of the United Kingdom, but it had been his destiny to sit in cabinets with no less than sixty to seventy statesmen, of whom only one, the Duke of Wellington, was an Irishman, while Castlereagh was the only other Irishman who had sat in a Cabinet since the Union. Pitt promised equal laws when the union was formed, but the broken promises made to Ireland were unhappily written in indelible characters in the history of the country. Coming to 1832, when the resurrection of the people began, and thence down to 1880, Ireland could present here only a small minority in favor of restoring to her something of the nature of constitutional rights and practical self-government. It is astonishing to me that little weight is attached by many to the fact that before 1886, before 1885, indeed, Irish wishes for self-government were represented

ONLY BY SMALL MINORITIES.

Since 1887, when the wide extension of the franchise was protected by secret ballot, Ireland's position has been improved in Parliament. In 1886 there were eighty-five Nationalists, or more than five-sixths.

Alluding to English feeling towards Irishmen, Gladstone said he would refrain from urging that England would find herself exhausted and her work made impracticable by resistance to Irish demands. He could not conceive England maintaining, if so minded, resistance to Irish demands; but England's conversion to Home Rule had been rapid. In 1886, England's majority adverse to Home Rule was 211; it had now declined to 71. In face of such a fact, who would guarantee the permanence of the opposition of the remainder? (Cheers.)

He would ask the patient indulgence of the House while giving an account of the bill. (Cheers.) He could not undertake to supply a mere table of the contents. He would rather seek to present the salient points, trying to leave a living impression. Of Ireland's representative 80 are in favor of Home Rule. They have been reduced from 85 to 80 under circumstances somewhat peculiar (hear, hear), and I must frankly own, to myself among others, for reasons totally and absolutely unintelligible (loud cheers). Let us look at the state of the case as it now stands. There are but 80 out of 101, that is to say

THE WISHES OF IRELAND FOR IRISHMEN

to govern Irish matters are represented only by four-fifths (laughter and Ministerial cheers). Hon. gentlemen seem to have no respect for such a majority as that. Do they recollect, sir, that never in England has there been such a majority as that? (Cheers). No Parliament of the last fifty years has come within a measurable distance of it, if there be anything in the great principle of self-government which, if it be a reality, never can work except through the machinery and laws of representation. At any rate, the voice of the Irish people, the persistency of the Irish people in delivering that voice, and the peaceful constitutional circumstances under which it was delivered (Ministerial cheers and Opposition laughter) constitute

A GREAT FACT IN HISTORY.

It is said, and I admit with truth, that Ireland is not a united country. I don't deny that the division which exists is a fact of great moment. In truth, were Ireland united, anything that can render Ireland formidable would become much more formidable? Were Ireland united all opposition would vanish as a shadow. (Hear, hear.) Ireland is not united in this sense, that in one part of the country not only the majority of the higher classes but considerable popular feeling is opposed to the present national movement. I will not attempt to measure the numerical strength of the minority. It is said by the party opposite that the minority in the north of Ireland is arrayed in unalterable opposition to home rule, unhappily at the successful instigation of those whose plot it was to divide the people of Ireland when they were united at the close of the last century. Through the medium mainly of Orange lodges and religious animosity there was an alteration of feeling, but the Protestants of Ireland, during the period of the independent Irish parliament, were themselves not only willing but zealous and enthusiastic supporters of Irish nationality. Inasmuch as their political life was at that period more highly developed they led the Roman Catholic population in the political movement which distinguished the period. (Cheers.) This is written broadcast in the history of the times.

GENUINE NATIONAL SENTIMENT

in the sense of national unity had at one time prevailed among the North of Ireland Protestants. We who have seen them alter, not through their own fault, are not ready to be persuaded they will not alter back again to sentiments of their own ancestors (cheers), and with their own blood and their own people form one noble and glorious union. He might omit, what in view of some member ought to be mentioned, therefore he begged them to wait and consult the bill itself, which he hoped would soon be in their hands.

It would be remembered that that the bill of 1886 laid down five propositions as cardinal principles, to which he had endeavored to closely adhere. Change there was, but not trenchant change, he declared, from the principles of 1886. The object was to establish a legislative body in Dublin for the conduct of both legislation and administration in Irish as distinct from Imperial affairs. (Cheers.) The limiting conditions which were then observed, and have since, so far as we are able to do, been sedulously and closely observed, were these: We were to do nothing inconsistent with Imperial unity. This, I will say, whatever our opinions may be, that so far as our convictions and intentions are concerned they would be but feebly stated by being couched in the declaration that we do not mean to impair Imperial unity; we wish to strengthen it; (cheers); we wish to give it greater intensity than it has ever yet possessed. First, then,

IMPERIAL UNITY

is observed and the equality of all observed; secondly, the equality of all the kingdom would be borne in mind; and, thirdly, there would be an equitable distribution of Imperial charges; fourthly, any and every practicable provision for the protection of the minority would be included. The plan proposed ought to be such as to present the necessary characteristics of real and continued settlement. In the next place, we have made it a point to meet what we thought the not unreasonable demand for and express mention of the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament. There were two methods in which that might be done. It might be done by a clause; it might be done in the preamble. We have chosen the preamble as the worthier and better, for if it were done by clause it would be too much in the character of a mere enactment. It is not necessary to say many words for such a purpose. Our words are: "Whereas it is expedient, without impairing or restricting the supreme authority of Parliament," and then the preamble goes on to declare the creation of the Irish Legislature. With reference to the charge frequently with good faith made use of, that we are destroying the act of union,

I WISH TO CHALLENGE INQUIRY

upon this fundamental point. What is the essence of the act of union? (Hear, hear.) That essence is to be appreciated by comparing the condition of things found in the country before 1800 with the condition of things now subsisting in England. Before 1800 we had two sovereignties in the country. One was collectively lodged in the King, the houses of Lords and Commons of England; and the other was lodged in the King and the houses of Lords and Commons in Ireland. There was no more right in the true historical and legal sense, for the sovereignty residing in Great Britain to interfere with the sovereignty of Ireland in Ireland than there was in the sovereignty of Ireland to interfere with the sovereignty in England.

This bill respects and maintains these rights of sovereignty equally throughout the entire range of the three kingdoms. Then the bill constitutes the Irish Legislature. Power is granted to the Irish Legislature, which consists first of all of a legislative council, secondly of a legislative assembly empowered to make laws for the peace, order and good government of Ireland in respect to matters exclusively pertaining to Ireland, or to parts thereof. That power is subject to a double limitation. First of all, it is subject to the necessity of obvious limitations, imposing certain

RESTRAINTS ON THE IRISH PARLIAMENT,

Including all that relates to the Crown, a regency or the vice-royalty. The subjects of peace or war, public defence, treaties and foreign relations, dignities, titles, and treason do not belong to the Irish Legislature. I know no argument of an abstract, theoretical or constitutional character against the retention of Irish members at Westminster; but to revert to an old expression which has become rather familiar, I do not think it in the wit of man to devise a plan for their retention which would not be open to some serious practical difficulties. (Cheers) Retention involves two points. First, as to numbers, and secondly, as to voting power. Now as to the first question, that of numbers, is Ireland to be fully represented in the House? (Hear, hear.) Well, probably the feeling will be in favor of the affirmative. Then arises another difficulty, what is full representation for Ireland? In 1884 the House treated Ireland in a wise and liberal spirit by assigning 103 members to that country. That number was then beyond what, according to the calculation of population in this country, Ireland was entitled to, and it is claimed that, unhappily, the disparity has since been aggravated by a double process. The population of Great Britain has increased while that of Ireland has decreased, and has now reached a point that, whereas formerly entitled to 103 members, it would, according to this same rule, now have 80. There ought to be a general determination to interpret full representation as meaning representation according to existing population. Speaking of full representation, then, I imply that the representation in the House from Ireland would be composed of 80 Irish gentlemen. Of course, it follows that there would have to be an election. These 80 members from Ireland in the House would probably be indisposed to recognize a commission given to 103 members, so when it had been determined that 80 was the proper number, we endeavored to arrange the schedule of the bill in such a manner that this Imperial representation would practically not clash with representation in the Legislature at Dublin. Now comes the greater difficulty. What voting power are these 80 members to have? Ireland is to be represented here fully, that is my first postulate; my second postulate is that Ireland is to be

INVESTED WITH SEPARATE POWERS,

subject, no doubt, to Imperial authority. Still, as we must, from experience, practically separate a certain independent power, as has been done in other Legislatures of the Empire, Ireland is to be endowed with separate powers over Irish affairs. The question before us is: Is she, or is she not to vote so strongly upon matters purely British? I propose this question in the true parliamentary form: "Yea or No." There are reasons both ways. We cannot cut them off in a manner perfectly clean and clear from these questions. We cannot find an absolutely accurate line of cleavage between questions that are Imperial questions and those that are Irish questions. (Cheers.) Unless the Irish members are allowed to vote on all British questions they must have too little or too much, because there are questions which defy our efforts to arrange them with accuracy and precision on the proper side of the line as either English or Irish. We do not see the possibility of excluding them from one of the highest and most important functions of the House, namely, that of determining the composition of the Executive power. A vote of confidence is a simple declaration, but it may be otherwise. I do not see that it is possible to exclude Irish members from voting on that great question. Next, unless the Irish members vote on all questions you break the Parliamentary tradition. The presence of eighty members with only limited powers of voting is a serious breach of that tradition which, whether you resolve to face it or not, ought to be made the subject of most careful consideration. Now I come to reasons against the universal voting power. It is difficult to say "everything on this side Irish, everything on this side Imperial." That, I think, you cannot do. If you ask me for a proportion, I say nine-tenths, nineteen-twentieths, perhaps ninety-nine one-hundredths, of the business of Parliament can without difficulty be classed as Irish or Imperial. It would, however, be a great anomaly if these 80 Irish members should come here continually to intervene in questions purely and absolutely British. If some large question of controversy in British affairs should then come up, causing a deep and vital severing of the two great parties in this House, and the members of those parties knew that they could bring over eighty members from Ireland to support them, I am afraid a case like that would open a possible door to wholesale,

DANGEROUS POLITICAL INTRIGUE.

My colleagues found themselves not well able to face a contingency of that kind. They inserted in the bill limitations on the voting power of the Irish members to exclude them first, from voting on a bill or motion expressly confined to Great Britain; second, from voting on a tax not levied upon Ireland; third, from voting on a vote or appropriation of money otherwise than for the Imperial service, and fourth, from voting on any motion or resolution exclusively affecting Great Britain. The whole subject is full of thorns and brambles, but our object is the autonomy and self government of Ireland in all matters properly Irish. The Irish people certainly did not raise the difficulty to which I have just alluded—the retention of Irish members in the House. This is a secondary matter in their eyes and ought not to interfere with the principal aim. In face of the feeling that a shade of uncertainty still hangs over the question of retention of the Irish members we have affixed to the paragraph concerning this question the words: "Excepting and until Parliament shall determine the coming financial legislation." I wish to supply the key note to the financial part of the legislation. That keynote is to be found in the provision included in our plans from the first, and wisely and generously acceded to by Ireland through her representatives, that there is to be one system of legislation for all the kingdoms. As far as external things are concerned, that will be found to entail very important consequences. It has guided us to the conclusion at which we have arrived, of unity of the commercial legislation for the three kingdoms. This includes customs and excise duties, post offices and telegraphs. By the adoption of this keynote, we can attain to the most valuable results, and will be likely to avoid the clashing and friction of agents of the Imperial and agents of the Irish Government. We make, under cover of this proposal a larger and more liberal transfer to Ireland in the management of her own affairs than we could make if we proceeded on any other principle. We hope to escape in this way all collection in the interior of Ireland of any revenue whatever by Imperial authority. The principle to which we are bound to give effect is: "Ireland has to bear a fair share of Imperial expenditure." The word "Imperial" is defined in the schedule which gives the list of Imperial burdens. The first mode is the lump sum payment adopted in 1886; this method, we thought, should disappear naturally from the new bill, for, through the retention of Irish representation here, Irish members will

VOTE THE IMPERIAL EXPENDITURE.

Consequently it would seem strange under these circumstances to revert to the method of a lump sum. Another method is what may simply be described as the method of a quota. That is to say, that Ireland shall pay six per cent., or five per cent., or four per cent., or what you please of the Imperial expenditures, which shall be taken out of the common fund, and she will be debited to that extent and will have to pay it over from her account. If you adopt the quota, and the quota is absolutely elastic, should the Imperial expenditure swell the principal, the quota would still secure the relative share to be contributed by Ireland. But there is a third method which we might adopt, that of deducting from the Irish revenues the amount due England. Here is one of the revenues to which the greatest difficulty adheres. When explaining the subject in 1886 I pointed out that there was a large revenue locally received in Ireland, but it really belonged to Great Britain. The principal of the revenue was within the Excise department. With the advantage of the consideration which the Inland Revenue department has had since the former plan was produced, we get rid of the difficulty altogether, as far as the Inland Revenue is concerned. We provide that revenue levied in Ireland shall be revenue really belonging to Ireland. That is, revenue from goods consumed in Ireland. It is not so with the Customs, there is a large debt from Ireland to this country. It is not so large as is involved in the case of Excise, but still it comes up to several hundred thousands. If we adopted the method of quota we should expose Irish finance to large and inconvenient shocks from the changes introduced in the English budgets. Imperial reasons, also, would, perhaps make it necessary to do what we are, I think, very unwilling to do, namely, to give Imperial officers a meddling and intervening power in relation to Irish affairs. The third plan is to appropriate a particular fund. Say this fund shall be taken up by us and shall stand in acquittal of all the obligations of Ireland for Imperial services. This fund will sweep away all the difficulty of calculation and intervention which might belong to the quota method. Then we have the fund practically in our hands in the management of the customs revenues of Ireland, which must be British. Consequently, we shall be receivers of a fund which will never go near the Irish exchequer, if it be deemed a fair and convenient arrangement. There can be no question of handing it backwards and forwards. We should keep it and

GIVE IRELAND A RECEIPT IN FULL,

instead of coming upon her for heavy payments from year to year. Next, the Customs revenue would be very nearly the right amount. I do not know what the House might consider the right amount. Judgments might fluctuate; some might say 4 per cent., some 5 per cent., some a little more than 5 per cent.; but the amount is £2,430,000 yearly gross, £60,000 allowed for collection, £2,370,000 net. With the Imperial expenditure at £59,000,000, £2,370,000 is a sum that drops between a charge of 4 per cent. and a charge of 5 per cent. The Irish members will observe that by that means everything of a practical nature we will hand over to them, though the rates of excise and the postal and telegraph rates will be a fixed amount. The authority and the whole control over them will be absolutely in the hands of Irish officers. The fund plan falls short of the exactitude of the quota plan, the latter meets every exigency of peace and war; but this plan is not quite so exact. Questions may arise such as "Are we assured we shall obtain from Ireland a fair share of assistance in a great imperial emergency?" I myself am bound to say that I think there is very little to fear from trusting to the patriotism and liberality of the Irish Legislature. Stinginess was never a vice of the Irish people, and if we look forward very much, I am afraid her suffering will lean to generous extravagances rather than meanness. When we come to a state of war, we have to look to three sources—Customs, Excise and Income Tax. With regard to the customs, we propose to leave them in our own hands, so that there can be no difficulty in adopting other contributions so far as customs are concerned. With regard to excise we have in view a proposition to retain considerable control in our hands, which, with considerable power, will enable Great Britain to make sure of having aid from Ireland if she thinks such a provision necessary. The Irish balance sheets stands thus. On the credit side it would appear that the excise revenue is £3,220,000, while the taxation which goes over stamps, income tax, excise license, is £1,495,000; postal revenue, £740,000; crown lands, £65,000; miscellaneous, £140,000. Making a total of £5,660,000. On the other side Ireland takes over the whole of

THE CIVIL CHARGES

with the exception of the constabulary charges of £3,110,000, inland revenues £160,000, and postal services £790,000. We propose that Ireland shall take part of the constabulary charges, amounting to £1,000,000. This would bring the Irish charges to £5,160,000. We propose that she shall receive against that the items we have put to her credit, amounting to £5,660,000. Thus she will have a clear surplus of £500,000 with which to start on her mission. I will now release the House from the painful consideration of the details which it has pursued with unexampled patience. I have tried to convey the fundamental conception and spirit of the scheme. I submit that the plan may be imperfect, but I hope it will receive impartial consideration. Although there may be friendly and unfriendly criticism, I hope I shall not give offence when I express my deep conviction that a plan closely resembling this, if not the present proposal, of an identical legislative chamber for Ireland, may shortly become a law. There is one risk, and that is, if the controversy is unduly and unwarrantably prolonged, the demand for self-government in Irish affairs may become a demand for the repeal of the Union and the re-establishment of dual supremacy in these islands. I hope that the ship of state will be steered from that rock. I would ask you to contrast the present condition of the Irish people with what it was at the time of Swift, when the then Irish ascendancy Parliament begged to be admitted to the British Parliament and was refused, or with what it was in the beginning of the century immediately after the Union, when Irish voters were trooped to the polls for the simple purpose of recording their votes in order to return landlords to Parliament. We have concluded that we have before us a different state of things. Ireland has on her side the memory of vast victories, earned by the sweat of labor, but really earned and recorded on her behalf; Ireland has mighty sympathies, she requires this larger and stronger island. She has obtained the suffrage of Scotland and the suffrage of Wales, and in the short space of seven years she has changed a majority of more than 200 against her in England to one-third that number. She was

STINTED IN THE FRANCHISE

and means of representation. Now she possesses a most extended franchise with the most perfect protection. Her remaining objects she has not yet attained to; but she looks forward to the attainment of them with more means in her hands. One other source of strength, she has the moderation of her demands. (Hear, hear.) She has ever since 1886, if not before, but unequivocally and nationally since, abandoned the whole argument that, perhaps, she was entitled to make on the subject of the act of union. She has asked you to save for your-selves every Imperial power. She has consented to accept the House of Commons and the universal supremacy of the Empire. In return she has asked you only, that she have the management of her own affairs, which reason and justice, combined with the voice of her people, I hope will soon move this nation to say shall soon be awarded her. If this is to be the end of the matter, I think dispassionate men would say the sooner ended the better. The sooner we stamp the seal which will efface all former animosities and open the era of peace and goodwill—the sooner done the better. These are matters, however, which human vision is hard to penetrate. But I must, of my own part, say that I never will, and never can be a party to bequeathing to my country the continuance of this heritage of discord, which has been handed down from generation to generation with hardly a momentary interruption, through seven centuries, with all the evils that follow in its train. I wish no part nor parcel in that process. It would be misery for me, if I had foregone or omitted in these closing years of my life any measure, it was possible for me to take towards upholding and promoting the cause, which I believe to be the cause not of one party or one nation, but of all parties and all nations. To these nations, viewing them as I do, with their past opportunities under a a living union for power and happiness; to these nations I say: Let me entreat you, if it were my last breath I would so entreat you, let the dead bury their dead! and cast behind you forever recollections of bygone evils. Cherish love and sustain one another through all the vicissitudes of human affairs in the times that are to come. (Prolonged Liberal cheers.)

When the cheering had died out, Sir Edward Clarke, who had been Attorney-General in the Salisbury administration, congratulated Mr. Gladstone on the magnificent physical effort which he had just made, and then proceeded to enlarge on the proposals of the bill.

Thomas Sexton, anti-Parnellite, was loudly cheered on rising. He referred to the case of Canada, which he maintained was disloyal almost to rebellion before it was established a home rule colony. Canada, he insisted, would have been lost to England long ago if she had been refused home rule. Mr. Sexton paid a glowing tribute to Mr. Gladstone for his steadfastness in the cause of Home Rule, and to the intellectual power he had shown in laying the bill before the House. He declared that its provisions are on the whole better than those of the bill of 1886. He agreed with the proposal that the Executive should have power from its inception to establish a new police force, after which the Irish constabulary was to be withdrawn from areas in which the new police were placed. Mr. Sexton said he did not object to the Upper Chamber being considered as a safeguard to the minority. The financial proposals were less just to Ireland than those of the bill of 1886. His party was not disposed to make any trouble, considering the retention of Irish members, but it was possible that when Home Rule had been established their voices would be silent in the House, unless the other members troubled them. If the Imperial Parliament should display any tendency to capricious and vexatious use of the veto, or to interfere in the sphere defined by itself for the Irish parliament, he thought it would be found that Ireland's unique position would stand the Irish members in good stead. (Conservative cheers.)

Mr. Gladstone, in answer to Sir Edward Clarke, said the land question was reserved to the Imperial Parliament for three years.

Members then trooped out into the lobbies, where the speech was informally discussed with great animation. The Gladstonian Liberals were disposed to regard it as a conciliatory, well balanced and peace making measure, and seemed to be hopeful as to the second reading. The anti-Parnellite members were guarded in their utterances in favor of the bill as a whole, but were well pleased with the financial arrangements concerning which there had been some apprehension. As to the veto, for the present the anti-Parnellites would not say more than that they would keep an open mind in regard to it. All the Conservatives would say for the new bill was that it was more sagacious and better than that of 1886. The Liberal-Unionists would not make even this favorable admission, and were declaring everywhere, as they have been doing for weeks past, while the provisions of the bill were unknown, that it must inevitably meet the fate of its predecessors. That is that it would never reach the Committee stage in the House of Commons.

Meantime, in the House Col. Saunderson, Conservative of North Armagh, was speaking vehemently against any and every plan of Home Rule. The Ulster Royalists, he said, would offer to the last the bitterest opposition to any Home Rule scheme. Without uttering a distinct threat, he would say merely that unless the whole country was blind it could not ignore the demonstration of the Ulster Unionists last summer.

On motion of Col. Sanderson, the debate was adjourned. Mr. Sexton's speech embodied the results of a hasty deliberation of the Irish party under the presidenay of Justin McCarthy. The Advanced Radicals, led by Henry Labouchere and Sir Charles Dilke will oppose the creation of a second chamber. The Moderate Liberals also have some misgivings in regard to complications likely to arise from threefold elections in Ireland. The text of the bill probably will not appear until the end of the week.

Among other distinguished auditors in the House were the Prince of Wales, the Duke of York and the Duke of Teck, who, seated above the clerk, listened intently to the speech. On the table lay the Premier's familiar lozenge pot, an item of all his speeches. The presence of a lamp to aid his failing sight added pathos to the scene. Mr. Gladstone started off in a slow, measured voice, his evident intention being to husband his resources; but his voice, though fine at the start, weakened manifestly during the preliminary sentences. Many eloquent passages were wasted on the audience, owing to impatient curiosity to hear the details of the scheme. Indeed, the introduction suffered from prolixity, hence, by the time the speaker arrived at the provisions of the bill his voice had lowered considerably, and the financial statements were almost inaudible beyond the table. He recovered his voice somewhat, however, during the peroration, which was remarkably fine and impressive. At the conclusion of his speech Mr. Gladstone was overwhelmed with congratulations. He took tea in the House of Commons and, after resting an hour, drove home in high spirits. He dined with his family and maintained his vivacious mood during the entire evening.

The Times says: "Those whom Gladstone failed to convince in 1886 will not be converted now by a less powerful and less persuasive appeal. The exclusion of the Irish members from Westminster, the very first item of Mr. Gladstone's policy of 1886, has disappeared. The most indulgent will fail to discern the faintest sign of finality in the scheme, and an omission of any reference to the land question until questioned on the subject indicates plainly how he has artifically restricted his view. The proposed upper council is an exceedingly doubtful protection for the minority, and the most fertile source of quarrel will be the financial proposals."

The London Standard says: "The measure is impracticable and impossible. If passed, it would never work. The details are open to stronger objection than those of the bill of 1886. Mr. Gladstone has merely substituted one futility for another and has avoided difficulties by leaving them untouched. Why did he not define the Viceroy's cabinet? The device of the retention of the Irish members at Westminster is such a palpable absurdity that Mr. Gladstone himself could not attempt to treat it seriously. The speech, however, was a personal triumph, that might almost reconcile him to a second disappointment."

The Daily News, in a leading article on the new Home Rule bill and Mr. Gladstone's speech, says: "Mr. Gladstone displayed most splendid powers of eloquence and argument. It is utterly childish to call the bill a separatist measure. The double chamber arrangement is infinitely better than the proposal of 1886. The retention of Irish members at Westminster is the most likely part of the bill to excite keen resistance. The proposal is not an ideal one. It would have been better to reduce the Irish representation to one-half or even one-third, and to allow the Irishmembers to vote on every question."

A despatch from Dublin quotes the Freeman's Journal as follows: "Whilst open to improvement the bill is altogether a good water tight measure."

The Irish Times says: "Seven years have failed to teach Mr. Gladstone respect either for the rights of the Irish minority or for the facts of history. Ulster says simply that it will not have it."

The Dublin Express says: "It is mostly a mere repetition of the former bill. Where it differs, it is more complex and impracticable. The suggested safeguards are most illusory."

The Irish Independent says: "No definite opinion can be expressed until the text of the bill is before the public, especially as Mr. Gladstone's method is usually involved. On the point of police and finance the bill seems suecially bad, and justifies Mr. Parnell's account of his interview with Mr. Gladstone."

ANOTHER WRECK.

Port Townsend, Feb. 14.—The bark Merman arrived this morning from San Francisco, and reported passing though a large quantity of drift lumber on February 6, thirty miles southwest of Cape Flattery It was too stormy to approach very close, and subsequently sighting a derelict keel up. It was ascertained that a vessel had capsized lumber laden. The general opinion exists that the new derelict is the bark Cowlitz, which sailed from Port Gamble, January 31, with a very heavy deck load of lumber for San Francisco. The lumber seen by the Merman corresponded exactly with the deck load carried by the Cowlitz. Subsequently to the departure of the Cowlitz, heavy storms were encountered off Cape Flattery, which damaged may vessls by carrying away their sails. The tugs have not returned from the search.

The report that two men had fallen overboard and one was drowned, from the schooner J. M. Weatherwax, as she was towed out of the bay on Sunday night, was confirmed to-day upon the return of the tug Mystic, which towed her to sea. The men were knocked off the deck by the swinging of one of her booms.

FROM MONTREAL.

Montreal, Feb. 13.—(Special)—J. M. Valois, wholesale and retail stationer, has assigned at the instance of Geo. Borgenfeld & Co., of New York; liabilities, $65,000; assets nominally, $75,000.

The Star says much interests is felt here over the rumor that a syndicate is being formed to amalgamate the gas and electric light companies. It says a strong wealthy syndicate has been quietly picking up all the Montreal gas stock, but they claim they are doing so on account of its selling below its value, as an investment, and that the new plant that company is erecting will be in operation this month, thus enabling the company to give better light at reduced cost. It is generally known that a careful examination of the Montreal Gas Company's property has recently been made by an American expert, who, it is reported, will shortly take a proposition to the Montreal Gas Co. shareholders to exchange their stock on a basis that would make the present selling price of gas look cheap.

TOBOGGANING FATALITY.

Montreal, Feb. 13.—(Special)—While a tobogganing party, consisting of Miss Jane Crawford, of Windsor, aged sixteen, her sister, Mary Crawford, and James Montgomery, of Montreal, were coasting down Cote des Neiges hill—a very steep public thoroughfare leading from the mountain into the city—on Saturday night, Montgomery, who was steering, lost control of the toboggan, which was going with lightning rapidity, and at a turn in the road the toboggan ran into a telegraph pole. Miss Jane Crawford, who was seated on the front of the toboggan, was dashed head foremost against the pole and instantly killed, her skull being terribly fractured. Her two companions escaped unhurt.

St. John, N. B., Feb. 13.—William Tower, aged 14, was killed in a coasting collision on Saturday. Those on the other sleigh are held to await the result of the inquest.

CAPITAL NOTES.

The Vice Regal Household Afflicted—Mr. Costigan to Bring Up Home Rule.

Canadian Live Stock Excluded From the World's Fair by Quarantine Regulations.

British Columbia Concerns Receive Attention—Tenders for William Head Quarantine.

(From our own Correspondent.)

Ottawa, Feb. 13.—To-day Government officials have been informed that Canadian thoroughbread stock destined for the World's Fair will be subjected to the quarantine order of last week. The result will be, that no Canadian live stock exhibits go to Chicago. It is believed here that the action of Jerry Rusk was done deliberately with the object of crowding out our prize animals. A deep feeling of indignation prevails around the lobbies to-night, although some express pleasure at the action of the Washington people as calculated to strengthen the national sentiment of the Dominion.

Col. Prior has gone to New York for a couple of days. On his return he will call the attention of the House to Mr. Tupper's remarks regarding the Marine Hospital as reported in the Colonist recently.

Mr. Mara presented the petition of the Nicola Valley Railway for power to amalgamate withe C. P. R.

Mr. Corbould presented the petition of the Chilliwack Railway for a Dominion charter.

The Vice-regal family were in sorrow yesterday over the news that Hon. Arthur Stanley is in a critical condition. To-night's news was more favorable, a slight improvement being discernible. Lady Stanley will probably go to England to-morrow.

Mr. Gamble left for home to-night, authorized to call for tenders for the Quarantine station at William Head and the building of a wharf without delay. Mr. Earle says the cost will be $100,000.

Mr. Corbould presented the petitions of the Vancouver Trades and Labor Council.

Hon. Mr. Costigan is being urged to bring forward a Home Rule Resolution.

The Minister of Public Works, at Mr. Mara's request, will have a survey made of the Columbia River at Revelstoke with a view to the protection of the banks.

Mr. McCarthy's bill respecting dual language in the Territories was introduced today.

The House discussed coal oil all day, and the debate was adjourned.

Ottawa, Feb. 14.—Hon. G. E. Foster delivered his budget speech this afternoon. The galleries were crowded. He said the country's condition was most encouraging. The revenue was better than ever this year, and he an