BUSINESS NOTICE.

The "MIRAMICHI ADVANCE" is published at Chatham, Miramichi, N. B., every THURSDAY morning in time for despatch by the earliest mails of that day.

It is sent to any address in Canada, the United States or Great Britain (Postage prepaid by the Publisher) at the following rates:—

If paid in advance, - - -	$1.00.
" " within 3 months - - -	$1.50.
" " after 3 months. - - -	$2.00.

Advertisements are placed under classified headings.

Advertisements, other than yearly or by the season, are inserted at *eight cents* per line nonpareil, (or eighty cents per inch) for 1st insertion, and *three cents* per line (or thirty-six cents per inch) for each continuation.

Yearly, or season, advertisements are taken at the rate of $6·75 an inch per year. The matter in space secured by the year, or season, may be changed under arrangement made therefor with the Publisher.

The "MIRAMICHI ADVANCE" having its large circulation distributed principally in the Counties of Kent, Northumberland, Gloucester and Restigouche (New Brunswick), and in Bonaventure and Gaspe (Quebec), among communities engaged in Lumbering, Fishing and Agricultural pursuits, offers superior inducements to advertisers. Address

Editor "Miramichi Advance," Chatham N. B.

Miramichi Advance.

CHATHAM. - - - APRIL 27, 1882.

The Miramichi Valley Railway.

NO. III.

In our last article we referred to the position of the Attorney-General, Hon. J. J. Fraser, in respect of the Valley Railway, showing that, according to his arguments as Provincial Secretary in 1874, he must now believe that the Province is as well able as it was at that time to offer a subsidy of $5,000 a mile to the railways provided for in the Act of last session, instead of the $3,000 to which the subsidy is cut down. As it must have been manifest to him that $3,000 a mile was an insufficient subsidy for the Valley Railway, at least, he, as leader of the Government which carried the bill through the legislature, is fairly chargeable with being unwilling to do our railway interests justice, and with squarely discriminating against the undoubtedly just claims of the Miramichi. He knew that so small a subsidy was never before offered to any railway in New Brunswick and that its offer, in full view of the General Assembly elections, was only an attempt on the part of the Government to influence this and other constituencies in its favor. This, we think, none of our readers will doubt when we place before them the record of the Hon. Mr. Wedderburn, who occupies the position of Provincial Secretary—the same as Mr. Fraser did in 1874, when the latter laid before the Legislature the financial exhibit which formed the basis of last week's article on this subject.

The member of the Legislature who, in 1874, led a little band against the Subsidy Act of that year was this same Mr. Wedderburn, and we shall not soon forget the speech he made on that occasion. That bill, like that of 1882, included a good many of the roads provided for in the bill which he, himself, was a party to this year and he characterised some of these roads as mere make-weights thrown into the measure so as to influence every member of the House. Some of the lines provided for were, he said, necessary, and he deprecated the course of the Government in throwing them all in together. "If," said he, "bills embracing most of the "lines contemplated in this bill were "introduced separately they would be "fairly considered on their merits." Yet we find this same gentleman, in 1882, turning his back completely upon the policy he advocated in 1874. In 1874 he objected to a bill because it threw thirteen different lines of Railway all in together, so that every constituency would be affected, yet in 1882, he is custodian of the Provincial finances in a Government introducing a bill in which seventeen roads, a bridge and a dry dock are thrown together, in the hope that every County in the Province may, being touched, be induced to assist in sustaining that Government. If, as he professed to believe in 1874, the bill of that year was "an electioneering dodge," what must be believed of the measure of this year? If the Government was merely trifling with the constituencies then, what are they doing now?

If we desired, merely, to show Mr. Wedderburn's inconsistency, we might stop here, but we propose to prove that the bill of this year cannot be viewed by him in any other light than that of a mockery of those whose interests it is professedly enacted to serve. It will be remembered that the bill of '74 provided a subsidy of $5,000 a mile payable in either cash or Provincial debentures, the latter bearing six per cent. interest, while the bill of '82 provides a subsidy of $3,000 per mile, payable in money or debentures, the latter bearing four per cent. interest. Now, if Mr. Wedderburn believed that the aid offered in 1874 was too small and he comes forward, with others, in 1882 and offers only three fifths of that aid in the way of bonus and reduces the interest by one third, what shall be said of his sincerity? In 1874 Mr. Wedderburn speaking in the debate on the Subsidies bill of that year, said:—

This $5,000 a mile is not sufficient aid to secure the success of the undertakings contemplated, as shown by the experience of Western Extension, which had a subsidy of $10,000, and a grant from St. John of $60,000, and afterwards an additional provincial allowance of $300,000. *The objections to the scheme* are that it is too large for the province finances, *and too small for the purpose* sought. Each of the roads should be placed before the House on its own merits, as argued by the Attorney General last year or the year previous. The fact that the bill gives the Legislature a first mortgage on the roads to be undertaken, will prevent companies from getting any assistance in the money markets of the world, and that provision shows the Government feel the proposed subsidy is not enough to enable lines to be safely undertaken. Some of the lines contemplated are so small that the explosion of a locomotive would bankrupt companies owning them, and the Government has thrown them all in together, in order to save the weak ones from defeat. * * *

Even narrow gauge roads cost little less than broad gauges, and $5,000 is not nearly enough to construct a mile of any kind of road.

It is abundantly clear, from the above that, as a member of the Government which secured the passage of the Subsidies Act of 1882, Mr. Wedderburn was simply mocking us. As Provincial Secretary he must have known exactly the financial condition of the Province and become convinced that the figures of the Secretary of 1874, which he then professed to have little confidence in, were correct. Had he not believed in the Railway-aiding ability of the Province this year he could not, for a moment, remain in the position of Secretary and allow the subsidies bill to be introduced as a Government measure. In doing so, therefore, he admitted the ability of the Province to subsidize Railways, while, at the same time—in view of his record—he mocked the people interested by offering what he believed to be altogether inadequate.

We have, thus far, shown the insincerity of the Attorney-General and Provincial Secretary in their treatment of the railway question, generally, and of the Miramichi Valley Railway in particular. In the next and succeeding articles we shall consider the relationships with the latter undertaking of gentlemen better known to our local readers. We shall show that, either knowingly or ignorantly, they have allowed our chances for securing the road to slip for the present and attempted, meantime, to delude the people into the belief that they were promoting the object we all have so much at heart, while they were, in fact, sacrificing it to their own selfish interests, and the advancement of their political plans, —using it to gratify an empty vanity that is as conspicuous as it is amusing, and so all-absorbing to those who cultivate it as to be the next dearest thing in their regard to a hold on the public purse, which they have ever managed to retain in one way or another.

The Irish Address.

On Thursday last the long looked-for address on the subject of the condition of Ireland were moved in the House of Commons, Ottawa, by Mr. Costigan, as an amendment to Sir Leonard Tilley's motion to go into supply. In the ordinary parliamentary sense this course would be deemed a motion of want of confidence in the Government, but that idea was removed by the fact that the Government had, with apparent reluctance, consented to Mr. Costigan taking this mode of bringing the matter up.

Mr. Costigan, in introducing the resolution, spoke with much moderation. As it was generally conceded, he said, that a change of government was requred in Ireland, he thought the majority of reasonable men admitted that a solution of the difficulties now existing was to be had in the extension of home rule to that country. He was of opinion that Canadians, enjoying as they do the benefits of self-government, would not be unwilling to extend the hand of sympathy to an oppressed fellow-countryman. He cited the history of the country during its parliamentary independence in proof of the fitness of Ireland for self-government. He closed his remarks by an appeal to the House to be influenced by the very highest motives and not by mere sympathy, and then moved the resolution as follows:—

MOST GRACIOUS SOVEREIGN.—We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of Canada, in Parliament assembled, desire most earnestly, in our name and on behalf of the people whom we represent, to renew the expression of our unswerving loyalty and devotion to Your Majesty's person and Government.

(1) We have observed, may it please your Majesty, with feelings of profound regret and concern the distress and discontent which have prevailed for some time among Your Majesty's subjects in Ireland.

(2) We would respectfully represent to Your Majesty that your Irish subjects in the Dominion of Canada are among the most loyal, most prosperous, and most contented of Your Majesty's subjects.

(3). We would further respectfully represent to Your Majesty that the Dominion of Canada, while offering the greatest advantages and attractions for those of our fellow subjects who may desire to make their homes among us, does not receive that proportion of emigrants from Ireland which might reasonably be expected, and that this is due in a great measure in the case of many of our Irish fellow-subjects who have sought foreign homes to their feeling of estrangement towards the Imperial Government.

(4) We would further most respectfully represent to your Majaesty that in the interests of this your loyal Dominion, and of the entire Empire, it is extremely to be desired that Your Majesty may not be deprived, in the development of Your Majesty's possessions on this Continent of the valuable aid of those of Your Majesty's Irish subjects who may feel disposed to leave their native land to seek more prosperous homes.

(5). We desire respectfully to suggest to your Majesty that Canada and its inhabitants have prospered exceedingly under a federal system, allowing to each Province of the Dominion considerable powers of self-government, and would venture to express a hope, that if consistent with the integrity and well-being of the Empire, and if the rights and status of the minority are fully protected, and secured, a sure means may be found of meeting the expressed desire of so many of your Irish subjects in that regard, so that Ireland may become a source of strength to Your Majesty's empire, and that Your Majesty's Irish subjects at home and abroad may feel the same pride in the greatness of Your Majesty's Empire, the same veneration for the justice of Your Majesty's rule, and the same devotion to and affection for our common flag as are now felt by all classes of Your Majesty's loyal subjects in this Dominion.

6. We would further express a hope that the time has come when Your Majesty's clemency may, without injury to the interests of the United Kingdom, be extended to those persons who are now imprisoned in Ireland charged with political offences only and the inestimable blessing of personal liberty restored to them.

We pray that the blessings of Your Majesty's reign may for your people's sake be long continued.

The Toronto *Globe* says:—"The resolution had been read from the chair and there was a brief pause. It seemed as if the motion would be passed without further discussion, as the Ministers seemed to expect. Just then, however, a ringing cheer on the Opposition side greeted Mr. Blake as he rose. There was apparent surprise on the Ministerial side, which deepened into concern, as with a comprehensive grasp of his subject Mr. Blake took a bold course, which was characteristic of his speech. Never yet has a Canadian statesman, in any deliverance, taken a stronger hold upon the attention of Parliament. At first he was repeatedly cheered on the Liberal side of the House, but soon the infection caught on the other side, and cheers became general on both sides of the House. At this stage there came to be visible some symptoms of commotion in the Conservative camp. The managers could be seen consulting together. They afterward seemed to frown upon the spontaneous applause which again and again broke from the entire House. Mr. Blake recalled that he had two years ago pointed out the necessity for some measure of local self-government for Ireland. Recounting briefly the condition of that unhappy country before the Union, he showed that under the Union Ireland had not been pacified by having her condition ameliorated as it should have been. It took thirty years to reach Catholic emancipation and fifty years to reach the disestablishment of the Irish Church. Looking over the remedial legislation proposed from time to time in the English Parliament, he showed that this had been too long delayed and only passed under pressure of emergency. Legislation had been too much in effect to give luxury to absentee landlords and misery for resident tenants. Turning from the remedial legislation, which was the brighter side, Mr. Blake turned to consider the darker side of coercion acts and government by force, declaring that the English government of Ireland had proved a disastrous failure. It had not been government in accord with the wishes of the people, but government by force. He pointed out that the British Parliament could not properly legislate for Ireland while over-weighted with other matters and the interests of a majority of its membership were not in line with Irish interests. He quoted Gladstone's utterances when out of power in favour of some system of local self-government for Ireland. He also quoted Gladstone's subsequent utterances in Parliament, in which he stated that the Home Rulers had proposed no plan for practically carrying out their object. This he characterized in strong language, and asserted that it was Gladstone's duty to have grappled with the question, and by a well-considered measure of right and justice to have pacified Ireland. Before closing Mr. Blake quoted with marked effect the resolutions with regard to the disestablishment of the Irish Church, which were moved by Mr. Holton in the Canadian Parliament of 1870, and which Sir John Macdonald's Government had then choked off by moving the previous question. He quoted Sir John's speech on that occasion, in which he had declared the impropriety of bringing up such questions in the Canadian House. From this doctrine Mr. Blake warmly dissented. He declared our right to pronounce opinions and to aid Her Majesty's Government by our counsel in protecting the best interests of the Empire, whose glories and whose shame we were alike called to share. Before sitting down he characterized forcibly the manner in which Mr. Costigan had emasculated his resolution after giving notice of it. No mere synopsis can give any impression of the breadth, scope, force, fullness of detail, and convincing effect of Mr. Blake's speech. It is one which will be read and challenge attention wherever the English language is spoken. It carried conviction with it, and no one who heard it doubted the candid earnestness and sincerity which prompted its utterance. An ovation of applause testified the approval of the House when Mr. Blake resumed his seat.

Sir John rejoined. He was cheered by his followers on rising. He began by expressing his interest in the question and eulogizing Mr. Costigan for his moderation and his devotion to Ireland. This was in preparation for an attack upon Mr. Blake, whose speech he characterized as improper and unworthy of him; the speech of a demagogue; mere clap-trap designed to catch Irish votes. He declared that Mr. Blake's speech would injure and not promote the object of the resolution. He reiterated that he and those acting with him (Sir John) were the real friends of the Irish people. Sir John's speech was particularly rambling. It was brief and ineffective. He at first made some palpable attempts to elicit applause, which were not honoured. Some of his characterizations were greeted with loud cries of "Oh" from various parts of the House, but further on, by the usual means, he aroused a fair amount of euthusiasm among his followers. During his speech he characterised that of Mr. Blake as "a lecture against landlordism" and said.—"We have none of that here, every man is his own londlord," when Mr. Casey adroitly said.—"Except in the Northwest," which produced great laughter at Sir John's expense.

Sir R. J. Cartwright followed, pointing out how ill it became the Premier to charge Mr. Blake with insincerity after his conduct in the Riel matter, when loudly professing his hope of catching the outlaw, he was privately furnishing public money to get him out of the country. At this stage an attempt was made by sundry spirits on the Tory side to interrupt the speaker, but the House would not permit such a course, besides members and spectators, of which there was a great throng in the gallery, were desirous of hearing all that was said. He proceeded to discuss the general question at some length.

Mr. Coursol followed Sir. Richard and referred to the struggle of the French in Canada for self-government, which being at last, accorded to them, enabled them to prove that, when justly treated, there were no more loyal subjects of the Queen in all her empire. He also eulogized the Irish as being among the best people in any land, and expressed his hearty sympathy with them in their struggles against the present condition of their country.

Mr. Casey expressed his pleasure as an Irishman with the utterances of the last speaker. He was not, however, so well pleased with Sir John's attitude in the matter. The leader of the Government, he said, intimated that the Parliament of England ought to be approached in a beseeching tone, like that of the poor tenant in arrears for rent to his landlord, but the Irish were only asking for what belonged to them as a matter of right and justice, and they should stand respectfully but firmly on that right and justice, backed by the facts of history and such arguments based thereon as the leader of the opposition had so ably advanced; and he believed that nothing in connection with the debate would tend more to weaken its effect with the Parliament of Great Britain than the charge by Sir John Macdonald—the Premier of Canada—that Mr. Blake's utterances on the subject were prompted by a desire to catch the Irish vote. That was an attempt, and the first made, to import party feeling into the discussion and to weaken the effect of the action the Commons of Canada would take in the matter. Mr. Casey proceeded to discuss the question on its merits, his speech being a very effective one.

Messrs. Brecken, Mills, Bunster, Anglin, White (Hastings) Landry and Wallace, of York also addressed the House on the resolution, and Mr. Costigan closed the debate. Referring to the speeches, he especially thanked Mr. Blake for his, which he said he had listened to with pride, and he also characterized that of Mr. Anglin as an able one.

In the *Hansard* report Mr. Bunster is obviously credited with much of Mr. Anglin's speech, so that we cannot tell where the latter gentleman is even supposed to begin his remarks. It may seem absurd that the reporters have "mixed" Mr Bunster and Mr. Anglin "up" like "little Buttercup" did the children in "Pinafore," but such is the fact. One thing is certain, viz. that Mr. Bunster profits by the error, as he gets credit thereby for speaking well and to the point—something he is ordinarily incapable of doing. Mr. Blake covered the ground on which the resolutions were based so effectively that his speech conveys information which should be before all who desire to understand the Irish question and we therefore, commence its publication in this issue and will finish it in that of next week, after which we will endeavor to give that of Mr. Anglin:—

Mr. Blake said:- If no other hon. member proposes to address the House on the subject, I do not, for my part, feel disposed to give a silent vote upon it. It is now two years ago since, in the course of a very important discussion here, I ventured to suggest in my place in Parliament that the accession to power which had then recently taken place of the Liberal Administration in England, would lead very shortly to the concession of some measure of Home Rule to the Irish people. I believed, as I said, that such a solution as could be obtained of the land question, such solution as had been from time to time reached of other questions, would, after all, not settle the Irish question, and that unless the dictates of prudence and of justice alike were observed and fulfilled by the granting of some measure of control over their local affairs, we would see that which has been the disgrace and the humiliation of the British Empire for many years still continued. I also observed, as the hon. gentleman in his speech and in his motion has observed, that we had one amongst many material interests here, in Canada, in the solution of that question, and the change which might be expected from it in the attitude of the great bulk of the Irish people towards the Empire, that we had a material—although I regard that as a much lesser interest than the interest which has been mainly discussed—we had a material interest of a serious character with reference to the chances and the opportunity of immigration to our soil so long as the present state of feeling continued. Now, I propose to justify the attitude which I took upon that occasion and which did not then meet with any very animated response in the House or in the country; I propose to justify it by a reference to some obvious historical facts which it appears to me can lead to only one inevitable conclusion.

In order that we may understand the grounds upon which, as I conceive, some action in this direction is demonstrably necessary, it is by no means needful to go further back than to the time of the Union. It is not needful here to recur in detail to the more ancient events in connection with Irish history, to the history of the conquest, to the history of the confiscations, to the history of the proscriptions, to the history of the penal laws, directed at one time against Protestants, and at one time against Catholics, to the history of these penal laws of the most serious and terrible description, laws and events to which I have briefly alluded, but which ought to make us all, when we recur to them, blush with shame, and which had left the marks of human error and of human crime almost indelible, and enhancing, there can be no doubt, even to-day, the difficulties of the situation. I say it is needles for the purposes of this discussion that we should revert to them in detail, for I am willing that this question should be tried not upon the history of the past eighty years, but upon the history of the government of Ireland under the present constitution of the United Kingdom.

Of the history of Ireland since the Union, we all know the means of the basest corruption by which the Act of Union was passed. However beneficial the public men who carried that measure may have believed it to be, I do not suppose it will be to day urged that the end justified the means, and I have myself a strong belief that the nefarious means by which that measure was carried, operated very largely to increase the difficulties of its working and produced a state of feeling which gave it, perhaps, a poor chance of being satisfactory to the people of the country which were by such means brought into more intimate connection. But, Sir, since that period, for a little more than eighty years has Ireland been managed by the Parliament of the United Kingdom and I do not hesitate to say that the result of that management has been a dreadful failure. There has been time enough to try the question out. Eighty years in the history of a country, and such eighty years as Ireland has experienced, is surely time enough to try the question out. Now, let us apply some obvious, plain and palpable tests as to whether there has been a good and successful administration of Irish affairs under the existing system.

The population of Ireland in 1726 was 2,300,000, in 1805 it was 5,400,000, and that increase, nearly doubling, occurred during a time of difficulty, of religious proscription and of immigration. In 1841, the population had abnormally increased under circumstances which it is not necessary to discuss, but it had increased to the number of 8,200,000. But since 1841 the history of Ireland has been a history of periodical distress, of famine and of emigration, and the result is that the population, which at the time I have stated stood at 8,200,000, stands to-day at 5,160,000 only, or 235,000 less than eighty years ago at the time of the Union, and 3,000,000 less than it was forty years ago. In the last thirty years, from 1851 to 1881, there has been an emigration from that country of no less than 2,750,000. Now, it may be said that Ireland is overcrowded. I deny that Ireland, as a whole, is over-crowded. There are parts of Ireland in which the distribution of the population is probably too dense; but I maintain that, judging by all the tests which we can reasonably apply to it, Ireland, as a country, is not an over-crowded country. The number of inhabitants to the square mile in France is 180; Italy, 225; Belgium, 221; Flanders, 718; England and Wales; 442; in the whole of Great Britain, 333; in Ireland, 161. The acreage of Ireland is 20,325,000 acres, of which there is at present arable 13,465,000 acres and an additional acreage easily made available for tillage of 4,000,000 acres more, making a total of land actually arable and available for tillage of 17,465,000 acres. How many acres are cultivated at this time—only 5,200,000; and this is the case with respect to a country of which the soil is indubitably very fertile, which has raised in times past enormous crops, comparing favorably in past times with crops at the same time raised in England, of wheat, rye, barley, peas, beans, potatoes and turnips, and no one doubts the capacity of Ireland for raising cattle. It has very great advantages. It has great quantities of bog land from which is produced a very cheap fuel, and which lands when reclaimed are inferior to none in the world whether as wheat or as pasture land. It has splendid coal fields, although these are hardly used at all. It has magnificent, perhaps unequalled fisheries in regard to the quantities of fish caught and harbor and other facilities in connection with the industry. It is possessed of valuable mines of gypsum, gold, silver, lead, copper and zinc. It has, besides, great facilities for manufacturing both as regards facilities for the transport of manufactured goods, for the supply of raw material, and for the cheapness of the labor to be employed. It has, moreover, great water power, encouraging the manufacture of the raw material with the perfected article. It has a population confessedly very free from crime of the ordinary kind; a population which, whatever its prospects and chances and capacities may have been demonstrated to be in its own country, has shown in every other country than Ireland, that it possesses the capacity to rise, and, by its industry, its ability and its capacity, to take its own place in the world, wherever its lot may be cast. That population is also a population confessedly affectionate, and grateful, and possessing, in a large degree, the organ of veneration, and easily impressed by any act of kindness shown towards them.

With such a population, with such a soil, with such natural advantages, how does it come that we have such a result, with respect to population, as I have mentioned? How does it come to pass that the population of Ireland should have diminished instead of increased, that the emigration should have been so great, and that the condition of the country should be such as we know it to be? The whole is due to the chronically wretched state of Ireland, its miseries, social, material and political. That is the reason why. Although there may be, although there has been, as we all rejoice to know, some improvement in the physical condition of some portion of the population during the last few years, this is to-day a pressing question, and no man holds that the condition of Ireland is satisfactory, when viewed in those aspects to which I have referred. The condition of the people materially, as well as in other respects, is one which ought to create in all of us who call ourselves British subjects a feeling of shame. I say that the condition of Ireland to day is due largely to the want of security and contentment, to the want of identification with the soil and attachment to the Constitution, to the want of hope, of improvement and of bettering their condition, which is really the most essential thing to induce men to labor. I say that it is due to a feeling that their grievances are not in reason redressed, to the lack of a feeling that their Government is conducted according to their needs and wishes, and to the lack of any machinery for the management of their local affairs.

There can be no doubt that Ireland, at and before the time of Union, was subject to some great political grievances. There can be no doubt that those grievances were not of a sentimental character, but were such as to a large extent are to-day, acknowledged to be grievances which demand the attention of legislators, and should be redressed by legislation. If you go back over the history of the parliamentary government of Ireland for the last eighty years, and if you begin your enquiry by a reference to those great and important land marks or grievances, and should enquire as to the time when, and the circumstances under which, those grievances have been, so far as they have been redressed, you will find a very good reason there, if you sought no further, for a deep seated and justifiable dissatisfaction in the parliamentary government of Ireland, by the Parliament of the United Kingdom. There was the question—at that time as much a question of justice and of right as it was at any later time—of Roman Catholic emancipation. There was the question—at that time as much a question of justice and of right as at any later time—the disestablishment of the nominal church of the minority. There was the question—at that time as much a question of what was called here the lamentable question, but still in the condition of the country none the less a pressing question—of a proper measure for the relief of the poor, required because of the unnatural conditions that ruled distribution. There was a question of reform of the land laws, by the creation of proper interest in the soil by those who occupied the soil. There was the question of creating local institutions to manage local affairs, and rendered very important because of the abrogation of the rights of the Parliament of Ireland and the transfer to Westminister of the management of those minute affairs which, up to that time, was under the control of the Legislature which sat in the capital city of Ireland. These leading questions, to which I have referred, have been in part—all but the last one, and that one has never been substantially dealt with—disposed of, and it may be asked, since such is the fact, why do I refer to them. I refer to them, because I see that the circumstances under which, and the time under which, those questions were dealt with, demonstrate more clearly than anything else can do, the unsatisfactory character of the Government of Ireland by the Parliament of the United Kingdom.

When was the question of Roman Catholic emancipation dealt with? It was not dealt with until nearly thirty years after the time of Union. Thirty years is about a generation, and it required about a generation for the Parliament of the United Kingdom to nerve itself to the task of dealing with that question. And how was it then granted? Was it granted them as the boon of a cheerful giver?—No, Sir. It was granted grudgingly and of necessity. It was granted, avowedly granted by the Ministry because they were forced to do it. Not because it was just, because they had been proclaiming to the ends of the earth that it was not just. Not because it was right, because they had been proclaiming that it was wrong. It was granted, because, as they themselves stated in Parliament, the question was between granting that concession and civil war, not an ordinary outbreak, but the condition of things had come to that pass that there was to be an immediate outbreak, a civil war, unless Roman Catholic emancipation was granted. Well, Sir, did that do good? Of course, you could not remove, even under such circumstances, a monstrous injustice of that description without some good being done; but I say the good was minimized by the delay which took place, and the attitude which was assumed by those who received and by those who gave that Act. The Irish people were taught that dreadful lesson, so far as the administration of the Parliament of the United Kingdom could teach them it, that England's difficulty was Ireland's opportunity. They were taught this by the delay, and by the disposition with which those Ministers acceded to the grant. They were taught not to rely upon that constitutional agitation which is the proud basis of our system, and which everyone is free to engage in, but upon other and worse methods of accomplishing by unconstitutional revolt. I say that no doubt something was done by the removal, even under those circumstances, of that great blemish, yet nothing was done towards relieving, or conciliating the feeling of the Irish people, towards leading them to believe that they had a right to expect from the unconstrained sense of justice of the British Parliament the relief which they had a right to have; or towards obtaining those golden fruits which might have been reaped from a great act of justice cheerfully performed in sufficient season.

The next great measures of relief for Ireland—and I am dealing now only with remedial legislation—I am dealing with those measures to which the English Parliament may point with the greatest pride as marks of its parliamentary government with reference to Ireland—the next great measures of remedial legislation occurred, how long after? Nearly twenty years after. It was not until nearly twenty years had elapsed that we had the measure for the relief of the poor to which I have referred, followed shortly by, and intended at the time to be followed as soon as possible by an Act for the sale of encumbered estates. The years 1846 and 1849, are, I think, the years in which those two measures were passed; one full lytwenty years after the Emancipation Bill and the other a few years earlier. These Acts, as I have said, were not of a late date, they were not the offspring of fresh institutions lately developed. They were the approach by the English Parliament, the Parliament of the United Kingdom, to dealing with old difficulties, and how again was it that they were brought about? How was it, that the public opinion of the British people and the opinion of the Parliament of the United Kingdom, were aroused to action, such action as was then taken in these two particulars? Sir it was not the hand of the insurgent upon that occasion, it was not the hand of the agitator, so much as the hand of famine and of pestilence. It was not until the direst calamity which has beset the modern Christian world came upon us, and until a famine took place in which more human lives were lost than in all the wars with which England has reddened the soil of Europe or the world, it was not until that had happened, that the public opinion to which the House referred was sufficiently aroused to deal with this question; such was the unhappy condition of Ireland, and the measure passed for the relief of the poor was a great boon to them. The Encumbered Estates Act, too, was greatly needed. It was hoped, however, that that Act would have had an indirect effect very beneficial to the tenants, but that hope failed. The condition of the tenants as a whole from the practical operation of the Act was not mitigated, because it happened that the sales of many of the lands that were sold under the Encumbered Estates Act were made to persons entirely new to the country, and who in a great many instances, were wholly neglectful of and defiant of those customary—I cannot call them rights—but those customary favors which were granted by the former proprietors to the tenants, and the system of rack renting and the other difficulties which might naturally be expected to grow from such an unnatural system as existed, were aggravated and intensified by the new proprietory; and so it happened that the demand for tenant right became more—pressing as it was before—became still more pressing by reason of the practical operation of the Encumbered Estates Act,

Well, Sir, about twenty years more elapsed before the next great remedial measure for Ireland was carried through the British Parliament. It was, I think, in 1868 the law for the disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish Church was passed, nearly fifty years after the Union took place. Now, who can pretend that that act of justice was not as much an act of justice at the time of the Union as it was at the date it became law. The principle on which the disestablishment was carried is immutable, eternal, and the question had been raised, as we all know, generations before. Public men in advance of public opinion of the United Kingdom and of Parliament—intelligent men, statesmen, had raised it, had pointed out that it was impossible that that establishment could be defended and maintained—had proposed that an act of justice should be performed, but it was utterly impossible to make progress in that direction. An old, old grievance a grievance so old as to be almost out of date, a grievance of the most pressing character—how, I ask was redress to that grievance obtained? Now, Sir, I shall give you an authentic account of how it came that Parliament and the people of the United Kingdom decided to remove that ancient grievance. I shall give you the account which the author of that great measure for Ireland hinself gave in 1878 in the Midlothian campaign. These are the words Mr. Gladstone used in explaining how it came about that the Irish Church was in 1868 disestablished and disendowed.

"Down to the year 1865, and the dissolution of that year, the whole question of the Irish Church was dead. Nobody cared for it. Nobody paid any attention to it in England.

"That is the nobody in England and Scotland, not the nobody in Ireland, nobody paid any attention to it in England. Then circumstances occurred which drew the attention of the people to the Irish Church. I said myself, in 1865, and I believe that it was out of the range of practical politics, that is the politics of the coming elections."

Now, what was it that brought it within the range of practical politics; what was it made it possible to carry that measure of reform? Some new events, some new chain of reasoning that led to conviction on the part of the people that it was a just measure. I will read you what it was:

"When it came to this, that a great jail in the heart of the metropolis was broken open under circumstances which drew the attention of the English people to the State of Ireland; and when in Manchester policemen were murdered in the execution of their duty, at once the whole country became alive to Irish questions, and the question of the Irish Church revived. It came within the range of practical politics."

That is the reason in this great measure of legislation which the people and politicians of the United Kingdom were led to the belief that the question was within the range of practical politics, and led to see what was their duty to the people of Ireland. Once again there was the same moving cause to the remedy. Once again there was the same long heart breaking delay, and once again English and Scotch opinion would not act until compelled to do so. Once again, therefore, there was no meed of grace in the measure so obtained. It was forced from the British Parliament, and was so acknowledged, and therefore if it did remove the grievance it did not—as timely and cheerful legislation would have done, as any consideration of justice would have done—avoid the element of grace and did not excite a feeling of gratitude in the hearts of those to whom the benefit was granted. Sir, that measure was a great measure in two distinct aspects. First of all it destroyed the preeminence of the church of the minority. It removed a crying injustice; it changed a condition which had combined the religion of the majority with their patriotism, a patriotism which so long as it was the policy of the Parliament and people of the United Kingdom to maintain, the church of the minority was necessarily an anti-national patriotism. Besides that there was the material gain that Irish funds to the amount of many millions were set free for legitimate and proper Irish purposes, not denominational, not sectarian, not for the minority, not for the majority, but for the whole people. Besides all this, the practical results of the disestablishment of the Irish Church, it had the indirect effect hardly less important. It was the first effective measure for giving to the occupiers of the Irish soil a great and tangible interest in the soil, and for increasing the number of Irish proprietors. The just provision which gave to the tenants, on church lands, the pre-emption right to purchase those lands on moderate terms, a very small sum being payable down, and the residue being spread over instalments for thirty-two years compounding principle and interest at a low rate, which made the annual payment not materially more than the accustomed rent, and so gave the tenants of church lands an opportunity of which they gladly availed themselves of becoming the owners of the lands they occupied. And thus it added no less than 5,000 to the number of Irish proprietors of the soil. With our notions having regard to the figures I have given as to the population, you may say that 5,000 Irish proprietors is a trifle.—What is the use of saying so much about 5,000 Irish proprietors? I admit that it is a drop in the bucket, but then the bucket had very little more than a drop in it at the time. The total number of Irish proprietors at that time was but 16,000; so that this measure in its operation added no less than 5,000, or very nearly one-third, to the number of Irish proprietors, and a measure which has such an effect cannot but be regarded as a very important measure of relief.

[We shall give the conclusion of this speech next week.]

What the Lumber Trade Thinks of it.

In their trade circular issued in London on 7th ult. Messrs. Stewart Bros. remark as follows on the effect of the Canadian tariff:—

"The results of the protection policy of the Canadian Government are now being severely felt in New Brunswick, as well as all over Canada, and the price of provisions, clothing, wages, and, in fact, everything that enters into the cost of producing wood is much higher than usual, and, as a natural consequence, the stock that is now being handled will cost considerably more than last year. Indeed, the present rate of production in New Brunswick is kept up with difficulty, and there is a great deal more trouble in arranging where to procure stock, than where to sell it."

Sir Leonard Tilley ought to take up the above paragraph and explain it away. He might get Senator Boyd, also, to show there has been no increase, but "only a readjustment" of the tariff, and that the increased cost of producing lumber is not due to any increase of the burdens of the people. Sir Leonard has already proved, to the satisfaction of his friends on the back benches that an increase of duty on an article really makes it cheaper to the consumer, and he ought to address a letter to Messrs. Stewart at London, through Sir A. T. Galt, presenting his views on the subject.

Our Ottawa Letter.

OTTAWA, 23RD APRIL.

The last week has brought a succession of victories to the Liberal party in the Commons and a corresponding depression in the ranks of the party in power. Sir Charles Tupper's reply to the Railway resolutions was a most unguarded one. He threw down the gauntlet, during the Opposition to repeat their statements of last year. He went over the whole subject from his own stand point, evidently by prearrangement, and in the belief that no more would be required from his side of the House. This appeared to have been anticipated on the Liberal side and Messrs. Blake, Ross and Patterson poured in a broadside each, making one of the hottest and most telling onslaughts of the session. The Government winced, squirmed and interrupted, but could not reply and, Sir John being absent, they were at sea completely.—Ross's speech was, of its kind, a masterly and unanswerable one.

While the Ministerialists were still irritated by the result of the Railway debate came Costigan's resolutions on the Irish question. Mr. Blake's speech on that subject was his master effort and brought down the house, without regard to politics or religion. He received a perfect ovation both when he stopped at six o'clock and when he finished after nine o'clock. I think it can be safely said to be the best speech of the kind ever delivered in Canada. Sir John's reply was feeble, unstatesmanlike and an utter failure. This is the opinion of both sides of the House, on the respective speeches—excepting only, of course, Mr. Thos. White and Mr. Bunting of the Toronto *Mail*. Sir John's followers began to talk freely of his age having impaired his powers, &c. Then, Mr. Blake's foreign relations motion followed. This was the last straw. A good many of the Tories are in revolt, they are quarrelling openly and showing fight against their leaders. Some of the leading members on that side now openly say that Blake is the coming man; that he represents Canada of to-day and Sir John Canada of the past. All this is significant. There are strong signs of a "ratting," another week such as the last would shake the Government more seriously than the people have any idea of. The Liberals are jaunty and jubilant and there is a corresponding depression on the other side. It is reported to-day that Sir John said to a friend that he had made a —— fool of himself applying as he did to Blake on the Irish question. Blake arose above even himself all the week. The Government side feel that they are not able for him and are now showing it in every move.

There is nothing definitely known about the time of general election. Some Conservatives say it will be over by 1st July and as many of the same party—if not more—say it will not be this season. I think the latter opinion is decidedly gaining ground, while the Liberals are getting more anxious for the contest. Their prospects for Ontario now look very bright.

Sir John as a "Poor Man."

There has been, we think, a general impression abroad that Sir John A. Macdonald—notwithstanding his having been in office for a long time and concerned, "for the good of the party," in questionable transactions for "raising the wind"—is "a poor man." No doubt the astute old gentleman has chuckled often over this popular belief, propagated by so many of his political friends and honestly entertained by so many of his political opponents. It seems, however, that the impecunious hero of the "clean hands" has really an income of about $65.00 a day or $20,000 a year, besides his travelling and other expenses. Writing on 18th inst. to the Toronto *Globe*, that paper's Ottawa correspondent says:—

When the Shields payment for the settlement of the Hewson-Macdonald claim was discussed a few weeks ago by the *Globe* Sir John Macdonald, in his defence of himself in Parliament, made an ostentatious show of his poverty. He was "only a poor man," he said, and his followers have from time to time put forward the same story that Sir John, though so long in power, is still poor. In this connection the question has been raised, Is Sir John a poor man? and if so, ought he to be poor? An evening paper discussing this question, which has been much talked of about the lobbies of late, gives the following statement of the Premier's annual receipts:—

As Prime Minister.....	$ 8,000
Sessional allowance.....	1,000
From the Trust and Loan Co.....	4,000
Interest on $80,000 gratuity.....	4,800
Income from rents, etc.....	3,000
Total per year.....	$ 20,800

But in addition to this it appears that during the past three years the country has paid travelling and other expenses of Sir John's amounting to $3,000 per annum. All the residents of Ottawa are familiar with the fact that the Premier has but a small family, lives plainly, gives few entertainments and these on a comparatively small scale. If these statements be true what becomes of the poor man story? The majority of the people of Canada would think themselves rich if they each had half this annual income, and they will read with some surprise Sir John's plaintive talk about being a poor man.

The Lobster Fishery.

A number of editors in Ontario, whose opportunities for even seeing a lobster must, in the nature of things be very limited, and the editors of the St. John *News* and *Sun*, as well as those of the *Advocate* and *World*, who, it is to be presumed, know all about Lobsters, appear to think, with the gentleman in Parliament representing the Portland Packing Company, that a uniform close season for Lobsters on all parts of the Canadian coast is the correct thing. The history of the invention of this uniform close season has been before stated in the ADVANCE, but it will do no harm to again refer to it. Lobsters were, for a long time, canned on the coast of Nova