"German Syrup"

For Coughs & Colds.

John F. Jones, Edom, Tex., writes: I have used German Syrup for the past six years, for Sore Throat, Cough, Colds, Pains in the Chest and Lungs, and let me say to anyone wanting such a medicine—German Syrup is the best.

B. W. Baldwin, Carnesville, Tenn., writes: I have used your German Syrup in my family, and find it the best medicine I ever tried for coughs and colds. I recommend it to everyone for these troubles.

R. Schmalhausen, Druggist, of Charleston, Ill., writes: After trying scores of prescriptions and preparations I had on my files and shelves, without relief for a very severe cold, which had settled on my lungs, I tried your German Syrup. It gave me immediate relief and a permanent cure. ⑤

G. G. GREEN, Sole Manufacturer,
Woodbury, New Jersey, U. S. A.

UNPRECEDENTED ATTRACTION!
OVER ONE-QUARTER OF A MILLION DISTRIBUTED.

L.S.L.

Louisiana State Lottery Company.

Incorporated by the Legislature for Educational and Charitable purposes, and its franchise made a part of the present State constitution, in 1879, by an overwhelming popular vote.

To Continue Until January 1st 1895.

Its GRAND EXTRAORDINARY DRAWINGS take place Semi-Annually, (June and December,) and its GRAND SINGLE NUMBER DRAWINGS take place in each of the other ten months of the year, and are all drawn in public, at the Academy of Music, New Orleans, La.

FAMED FOR TWENTY YEARS FOR INTEGRITY OF ITS DRAWINGS AND PROMPT PAYMENT OF PRIZES.

Attested as follows:

"We do hereby certify that we supervise the arrangements for all the Monthly and Semi-Annual Drawings of The Louisiana State Lottery Company, and in person manage and control the Drawings themselves, and that the same are conducted with honesty, fairness, and in good faith toward all parties, and we authorise the company to use this certificate, with facsimiles of our signatures attached, in its advertisements."

G. T. Beauregard
J. A. Early
W. L. Cabell
Commissioners.

We the undersigned Banks and Bankers will pay all Prizes drawn in The Louisiana State Lotteries which may be presented at our counters.

R. M. Walmsley, Pres. Louisiana Nat. Bk.
Pierre Lanaux, Pres. State Nat'l Bank.
A. Baldwin, Pres. New Orleans Nat'l Bk.
Carl Kohn, Pres. Union National Bank.

THE MONTHLY $5 DRAWING,
At the Academy of Music, New Orleans,
Tuesday, September 13, 1892.

Capital Prize, $75,000.

100,000 Numbers in the Wheel.

LIST OF PRIZES

1 PRIZE OF	$75,000 is	$75,000
1 PRIZE OF	20,000 is	20,000
1 PRIZE OF	10,000 is	10,000
1 PRIZE OF	5,000 is	5,000
2 PRIZES OF	2,500 are	5,000
5 PRIZES OF	1,000 are	5,000
25 PRIZES OF	300 are	7,500
100 PRIZES OF	200 are	20,000
200 PRIZES OF	100 are	20,000
300 PRIZES OF	62 are	18,060
500 PRIZES OF	40 are	20,000
APPROXIMATION PRIZES.		
100 Prizes of	$100 are	$10,000
100 do	60 are	6,000
100 do	40 are	4,000
TERMINAL PRIZES.		
999 Prizes of	$20 are	$19,980
999 Prizes of	20 are	19,980
3,434 Prizes,	amounting to	$265,460

PRICE OF TICKETS.
Whole Tickets at $5; Two-Fifths $2;
One-Fifth $1; One-Tenth 50 c;
One-Twentieth 25 c.

Club Rates, 11 Whole Tickets or their equivalent in fractions for $50.

SPECIAL RATES TO AGENTS.
AGENTS WANTED EVERYWHERE

IMPORTANT.

SEND MONEY BY EXPRESS AT OUR EXPENSE IN SUMS NOT LESS THAN FIVE DOLLARS,

on which we will pay all charges, and we prepay Express Charges on Tickets and Lists of Prizes forwarded to correspondents.

Address PAUL CONRAD,
New Orleans, La.,

Give full address and make signature plain.

Congress having lately passed laws prohibiting the use of the mails to ALL Lotteries, we use the Express Companies in answering correspondents and sending Lists of Prizes.

The official Lists of Prizes will be sent on application to all Local Agents, after every drawing in any quantity, by Express, FREE OF COST.

ATTENTION.—The present charter of The Louisiana State Lottery Company which is part of the Constitution of the State, and by decision of the Supreme court of U. S. is an inviolable contract between the State and the Lottery Company will remain in force until 1895.

In buying a Louisiana State Lottery Ticket, see that the ticket is dated at New Orleans; that the Prize drawn to its number is payable in New Orleans; that the Ticket is signed by PAUL CONRAD, President; that it is endorsed with the signatures of Generals G. T. BEAUREGARD, J. A. EARLY, and W. L. CABELL, having also the guarantee of four National Banks, through their Presidents, to pay any prize presented at their counters.

There are so many inferior and dishonest schemes on the market for the sale of which vendors receive enormous commissions, that buyers must see to it, and protect themselves by insisting on having LOUISIANA STATE LOTTERY TICKETS and none others, if they want the advertised chance for a prize.

INVALIDS

Gain rapidly in health and strength by the use of Ayer's Sarsaparilla. This medicine substitutes rich and pure blood for the impoverished fluid left in the veins after fevers and other wasting sickness. It improves the appetite and tones up the system, so that convalescents soon

Become Strong

active, and vigorous. To relieve that tired feeling, depression of spirits, and nervous debility, no other medicine produces the speedy and permanent effect of Ayer's Sarsaparilla. F. O. Loring, Brockton, Mass., writes: "I am confident that anyone suffering from the effects of **scrofula**, general debility, want of appetite, depression of spirits, and lassitude, will be cured

By Using

Ayer's Sarsaparilla; for I have taken it, and speak from experience."

"In the summer of 1888, I was cured of nervous debility by the use of Ayer's Sarsaparilla."—Mrs. H. Benoit, 6 Middle st., Pawtucket, R.I.

"Several years ago I was in a debilitated condition. Other remedies having failed, I began to take Ayer's Sarsaparilla, and was greatly benefited. As a Spring medicine, I consider it invaluable."—Mrs. L. S. Winchester, Holden, Me.

Ayer's Sarsaparilla

Prepared by Dr. J. C. Ayer & Co., Lowell, Mass.
Sold by all Druggists. Price $1; six bottles, $5.

Cures others, will cure you

$5999.00 a year is being made by John R. Goodwin, Troy, N.Y., at work for us. Reader, you may not make as much, but we can teach you quickly how to earn from $5 to $10 a day at the start, and more as you go on. Both sexes, all ages. In any part of America, you can commence at home, giving all your time, or spare moments only to the work. All is new. Great pay SURE for every worker. We start you, furnishing everything. EASILY, SPEEDILY learned. PARTICULARS FREE. Address at once, STINSON & CO., PORTLAND, MAINE.

Miramichi Advance.

CHATHAM, N. B., - - - AUGUST 18, 1892.

The Scott Act Business.

The ladies and gentlemen who continue to believe in the Scott Act, are, we understand, conducting what they call a campaign in the columns of the Advocate. At least, that was the purport of an announcement made editorially in that interesting paper a few weeks ago, and since that time the leading matter therein has been on the alleged subject of the Scott Act. The mistakes, the Advocate makes are, of course, apparent to almost everybody but its writers, viz., a failure to comprehend the difference between temperance and prohibition, or, as the yankees express it, tee-totalism, and an attempt to propagate the erroneous idea that the Scott Act is better calculated to minimise the evils of the liquor traffic than the existing and comparatively new license law of the province, which is, in one of its essential features, practically a local option law.

The largest part of the majority of those who are opposed to the Scott Act are quite as desirous of promoting temperance as the friends of that Act are. Many of them voted in favor of the Scott Act when it was proposed to bring it into operation in Northumberland, but being now satisfied, after years of trial, that it cannot be enforced, and that its operation is pernicious, in many respects, they wish to have it revoked, so that the traffic may be pulled out of its present lurking places into the daylight, and be carried on under conditions that will enable the whole public to see what it is doing.

It may be assumed that those who take this view are not to be easily moved by the methods of the ladies and gentleman who differ from them, and whose views are expressed in the Advocate. It will not affect those opposed to the Scott Act to be called the "liquor party" or to be told that they are an "odious mass of unwashed humanity," etc., because they know that such misrepresentation and abuse will not help the Scott Act, even with the better class of its present friends. If the Advocate would imitate the ADVANCE, which has been placing before its readers the testimony taken on the prohibition question before the Royal Commission that has been sitting in Halifax, St. John and Fredericton, and in which the Scott Act is referred to on its merits—sometimes favorably and, oftener, unfavorably—it would do a better service to the cause of temperance than by playing its one solitary and monotonous tune on its favorite Scott Act string. It would learn something, too, of a more self-respecting tone of discussion, that might possibly win converts to its side. If it should, however, continue as it is now doing, to claim that the sin of intemperance, which everybody admits, and the evils flowing from the liquor traffic, which nobody denies, will be the more effectually lessened by retaining an inoperative law than by replacing it with something better, and to fortify its position by applying naughty and vulgar epithets to those who think they are better enlightened on the subject, it will not only convert nobody but disgust many. The tone and temper of the Scott Act advocates, as expressed in their chosen organ, seem to clearly show that they are beating the air—fighting wildly and otherwise exhibiting a loss of calmness and self-control which indicates a hopeless cause. So many of their former number having been brought to see that the best way to repress the evils of the liquor traffic is to get rid of the Scott Act, it would be a graceful thing for the remainder to come over in a body and do as they once promised, through a local clergyman, who said, more than five years ago, before the Municipal Council:—

I would rather see the law swept from the statute book than to continue as it has been in the past. We first want to see an endeavor made to enforce the law and, if it is still a failure, then we—the temperance people—will be the first to take steps to sweep away the law and look for something more feasible.

So many of the temperance people of the County are in favor of keeping the promise made in their behalf that those who write so intemperately in the Advocate, as well as those who have heretofore favored the Scott Act because it enabled them to carry on the traffic without even paying a license fee, will, doubtless, "make it unanimous" when the time comes to vote repeal.

A Serious Loss.

The Dominion Government will probably have a large bill to pay to parties on the Northwest river who have met with serious loss through the breaking away of the dam on the Mill Stream. This dam was built by the railway authorities to form a reservoir for the water supplying the big tank at Newcastle station. It was only an earthwork, when it should have been of stronger material. As soon as the pressure of the heavy freshet caused by last week's rain came against it, it gave way. As a consequence, James Jones' grist mill, together with its dam, was carried away by the great rush of water thus let loose, and John Jones' saw mill also, was much damaged. Near the mill there was a lot of manufactured lumber owned by Mr. Jas. O. Fish and it was carried away and completely lost. In the cove below there were over two millions feet of logs, most of which were owned by Mr. Edward Sinclair, the remainder by Mr. Fish—a large proportion of these being carried out into the river and either lost or strewed about, so that the cost of recovering them will be almost as great as if they were to be got out of the woods. There is no question about the damage being caused by the government's dam giving way, as the water had fallen several inches in Jones' mill pond, before the flood from the reservoir came down, carrying everything before it.

The Governorship.

Some of those who are opposed to Mr. Burns, M. P., being appointed to the governorship of New Brunswick are endeavoring to boom Mr. Adams, M. P. for the position. We understand, however, that Mr. Adams favors the appointment of Mr. Burns. The Gazette, referring to Mr. Burns' fitness for the office says:—

'It is understood that a successor to our present governor will be appointed at an early date. The names of several gentlemen have been spoken of in this connexion, and among them that of Kennedy F. Burns, M. P. for Gloucester. Mr. Burns has had a long experience, both in local and Dominion politics, and would grace the gubernatorial chair not only from a political but also from a personal and social standpoint.

'If Mr. Burns can see his way clear to make the necessary business sacrifice to accept the position, we feel assured his appointment will receive public indorsation. He has always been deservedly popular since he entered public life, and his private character is above reproach. Our view is that an office such as this, should be given to the man whose claims are strongest from the standpoint of ability, character and service to the public. Judged from this criterion, we fail to see many competitors with Mr. Burns. His appointment would be a graceful and fitting compliment to the business men of the community, as Mr. Burns has a most honorable and successful record as a merchant and lumber operator. His claims politically are very strong on the Conservative party as he has the honor of having defeated and driven from public life the most bitter and determined opponent of the party, Timothy Warren Anglin, in 1882, and has since held his county against all political opponents and has consistently followed his leaders in the House. His business and political influence have been largely instrumental in making the north a solid unit in favor of the Government. We have no doubt but that the Executive will fully appreciate and recognize his claims.'

Opinions Differ.

The Montreal Herald, which generally condemns anything produced under the auspices of the Dominion Government, says, in its issue of 9th inst.:—

"Mr. F. B. Polson, of the Polson Shipbuilding Company, Judge Morson, Mr. R. H. R. Monro and Mr. F. P. Smith, who have been upon the trial trip down the gulf of the new Dominion cruiser, Curlew, returned to the city last evening. The Curlew was found to be most seaworthy and proved creditable to her Canadian makers."

The St. John Sun, which generally approves anything produced under the same auspices, says, in its issue of 12th inst.:—

"The dominion government has obtained from the Polson company of Ontario a strong looking and apparently serviceable cruiser for the fishery service. The hull and the machinery are believed to be well constructed. But the woodwork and the fittings about the decks and in the various rooms is all about as rough and uncouth as one would expect to find in a woodboat. The average coasting schooner is fitted up in much neater style than this cruiser. The schooner has hard wood where the cruiser has pine, brass where the cruiser has iron, and tasty painting where the Curlew has a dreary monotony of one plain color. Captain Pratt is not dissatisfied. He would have cheerfully performed his duties had he been placed on a scow, but the Polson company ought to have given the government as good a job as is usually turned out of a Nova Scotia or New Brunswick shipyard."

Captain Pratt—we beg his pardon, Commodore Pratt—appears to have a peculiar gift for fault-finding in the matter of cruisers, the strong feature of its manifestation being its too apparent and, therefore, badly concealed source. The commodore is not dissatisfied. It isn't himself he cares for, but his grief is entirely over the mean work palmed off by the Polsons upon the unsophisticated government, and which was left to be discovered by him, or the Sun people. The wood-work of the Curlew ought to be made the subject of an official enquiry under the auspices of the marines, to be held at the Joggins, or Jemseg, and at which the evidence of commodore Pratt, the Sun and the experts of the Dream should be taken on the subject of the Dominion Government's stupidity in accepting so poor a craft as the Curlew at the contractors' hands, and surrounding the "not dissatisfied" commodore with woodwork hardly fit for a scow. As to the lack of variety of colors, if the department will give the commodore carte blanc at some establishment where paint is sold, and let him do the rest, the Curlew will, probably, leave nothing to be desired on the part of those who think a fishery cruiser ought to resemble a Kalamazoo indian rigged out for war, or a Loch Lomond belle adorned for the bridal ceremony. The stern sense of duty which impels the noble commodore to be the last man to leave a vessel almost unseaworthy, by reason of faulty government inspection, pine finish and lack of rainbow hues in the pigments embellishing her wood-work, challenges the admiration of land-lubbers and proclaims the kind of stuff our sea-dogs are made of.

British Politics.

LONDON, Aug. 9:—When Mr. Gladstone arose to address the House of Commons to-day, he was greeted with loud and prolonged cheering by the members of the opposition. Mr. Gladstone opened his speech by referring to the procedure of the government in departing from precedents in not resigning when the verdict of the country was against them. The House had met, Mr. Gladstone said, but they did not know for what. (Cheers.) The Queen's speech told them nothing. Was it a fact, he asked, that the judgment of the nation was without appeal? Was the House of Commons to fight the battle of the last six years over again? Never had there been a great issue submitted to the country that had been so fully discussed as the issue decided at the last general election. The government were perfectly well aware of that. They knew well that a majority of the House had come prepared to give effect to the verdict of their constituents. (Cheers.) They could not do otherwise.

Mr. Goschen had said that home rule must be carried by an Irish majority if it were carried at all. In point of fact the majority in the House was no more Irish than Scotch or Welsh. Nobody had any title to distinguish votes for the purpose of invalidating the decision of the House or country. Such an argument struck at the roots of the constitution of the United Kingdom. There certainly was a sense in which Parliament was justified in examining votes, that was when a scheme was proposed that affected fundamentally any part of the country. For example, it was customary to give effect to the wishes of the people of Scotland. The observations about an Irish majority were in deference to a bad tradition. Those making them would not venture to make similar ones about any other part of the United Kingdom. The fact that the majority was Irish was a recommendation rather than otherwise. (Cheers from the Irish members.)

As to the coming government it would be time to criticise its words and deeds when it came into office, not while it remained a nebulous hypothesis. The conservatives said that in the liberals' speeches home rule was not always prominent. The verdict of the country had shown that the people meant it to be prominent, and therefore to put an end to the present government. The supporters of the government made much of the peace now prevailing in Ireland, holding that it was due to coercion. The tendency towards peace began in 1885 with the better prospect of home rule. True, after the present government came into power there was a bad state of affairs in 1886, partly arising from agricultural depression.

Mr. Gladstone added that in justice to the government he must say they were entitled to credit for what they did toward relieving the distress by the Land act of 1887, but that came too late. It was not associated with the administration of laws in harmony with the sympathies of the people. A perpetual Coercion act not only violated civil rights between Englishmen and Irishmen, but was in the highest degree injurious to respect for the law and its administration.

As he had been asked questions respecting the continuance of coercion he would reply at once that the Coercion bill ought not to be retained on the statute book longer than required by parliamentary usage. (Cries of "Hear, hear!")

Mr. Gladstone then proceeded to refer to the government's legislation. He credited them with the conversion of the national debt, but complained that they had inflicted on Ireland a gross wrong in making her pretended reparation by a local government bill too limited to satisfy Irish wants or to offer any solution of the Irish troubles.

THE IRISE BILL.

Passing from these matters, Mr. Gladstone acknowledged that the debate could not be altogether retrospective. The House must have some light upon the future. He would not anticipate who would govern when the present administration was displaced. It was not possible for a liberal government to say what measure they would submit to Parliament six months hence. In regard to the suggested holding of a session in November, he could only say that any government taking that course would show an inadequate sense of the magnitude and variety of the subjects it had to deal with. Attempts had been made to contrast the claims of Ireland as against the claims of Great Britain to the attention of Parliament. Much could be said on both sides, but the claims of Ireland had for years been in the fore front of the battle and still held that position. (Opposition cheers.) The principles of his Home Rule bill were pretty well known. By its provisions there would be a full and effectual maintenance of imperial supremacy, while Ireland would be given the conduct of her own affairs. Irish representation in the House of Commons was also contemplated under certain conditions. As to the form in which these principles would be embodied, it was the duty of the liberals to select the best form, but not until they had been placed in power.

THE ANTAGONISM OF THE LORDS.

This bill for seven years had had his primary and absorbing interest, and it would so continue to the end. (Cheers.) The House would address itself seriously to a bill giving Ireland self government. It would pass the house of Commons and then go to the House of Lords. He would not argue upon the probability of the House of Lords rejecting the bill. If the measures passed the House of Commons, springing out of a continuous controversy lasting seven years, which had been carried on with zeal and ability under such diversity of circumstances, never would the House of Lords have before them a question of greater importance to the Empire at large, never a greater question to themselves. (Opposition cheers.) The obligations of a liberal government would utterly forbid aquiescence in the rejection of those obligations. To promote the settlement of a great subject it would remain unweakened and unchanged. (Cheers.) At the same time it would be necessary to deal in 1893 with a sensible portion of British wants, the demand for which had grown accelerated. (Cries of "Hear, hear!") He reminded the House that the liberals had beed vainly trying to pass various measures of reform while in opposition. Speaking broadly, these represented the essential character of the liberal policy, and in conjunction with, or rather in subjection to the great question between England and Ireland, had received the distinct approbation of the country. (Cheers.)

MORAL SUASION.

Referring to the amnesty of Irish prisoners, Mr. Gladstone said it was impossible for other than responsible Ministers to give any pledge either for the revision or remission of sentences. In regard to evicted tenants, he expressed the hope that during the autumn a voluntary arrangement between landlords and tenants would obviate the necessity for such legislation as would become inevitable if no arrangements were made. In concluding his speech Mr. Gladstone recurred to the conservative argument that the Irish majority was trying to coerce England. He held that such was the strength of England in relation to other kingdoms that she never could be coerced by them. She had a giant's strength, but let her not use it like a giant. It would be most unfortunate if any party placed undue reliance in the power and strength of England against other members of the federation in forgetfulness of the fact that in the long run moral force would predominate over material force. On that predominance depended what should be the first object of their desires, as it was their daily official prayer—that union of heart and sentiment which constituted the truest basis of strength at home and good fame throughout the civilized world. (Loud cheers.)

BALFOUR'S REPLY.

Mr. Balfour, in his speech, protested against Mr. Gladstone's describing the influence Ireland had exercised in recent years on British politics as derived from moral considerations. Immoral considerations, he said, was the right phrase. Mr. Gladstone's conversion to home rule was not due to moral forces, but to material party considerations. Referring to the coercion policy, Mr. Balfour reminded the House that Mr. Gladstone in 1885 proposed to retain the coercion law with the assent of Sir G. O. Trevelyan, Lord Spencer and other colleagues. In regard to the proposed vote of no confidence, continued Mr. Balfour, the Government might be in a minority, but what was the majority? Had that motley group the confidence of the house? ("Hear, hear!") The government seeing the existing circumstances, had a right to review the situation. The division of the opposition into sections with different aims could not be left out of account. The existing partnership between Great Britain and Ireland could not be dissolved without the assent of both on terms acceptable to both. Considering the fact that Irish members would be kept at Westminster, and that an English majority might find itself at the mercy of a combination of an English minority with Irish members, it was clear that England had, at least as much interest in home rule as Ireland had. They had a right to insist that one of the parties to the existing partnership objected to its being dissolved.

Unfortunately for all parties, Mr. Gladstone's allies were his masters. The Irish members told the liberals, "Unless you do this and that we will turn you out." (Conservative cheers.) How dangerous would such a state of things be to the interests of the empire if the Irish dominance continued. Before the government resigned they had the right to ask what were the conditions under which the alliance between the liberals and the Irish would be maintained; what conditions there were between the nationalists who had been "squared," and those who had not been "squared," and what demands had been made upon the Liberals when they came into power? (Hear, hear.")

THE NEW COMPACT.

If disturbances arose in Ireland such as marked Mr. Morley's last period in office there, was disorder to have a free hand? Was it part of the new compact that Daly and other convicted dynamiters should be let loose upon the world? (Conservative cheers.) The Irish members said that evicted tenants must be restored to their holdings, and that some thousand others who had purchased them should be punished for their industry. ("Hear, hear!") Were the liberals going to accede to the demands of Mr. Redmond that there should be no interference with the acts of the Irish Parliament, or would they tamely submit to Irish dictation, refusing legislation for England until the home rule bill was passed? The conservatives might be beaten by that party, but as yet they had not been so beaten. (Cheers and counter cheers.) They knew that the future was with them. They knew that if the work of social legislation was to be undertaken by the House at all it must be by unionists and not by a party under Irish coercion. ("Hear, hear!") In turning the government out had the liberals the slightest prospect that home rule first, repeal of the Crimes act next and third the destruction of the House of Lords—(laughter)—would allow the government time for passing other important measures which the country heartily desired and which they could not touch owing to the Irish allies? The country had returned most of the liberal members under the absolutely mistaken conviction that they were going to deal with the Newcastle programme. The time would come when the electors would turn to the party having the power and the will to press forward the social question to legisiative issues. The country would get sick of Irish dictation and would turn to the party that had shown during recent eventful years that it was not unworthy to frame the laws and guide the destinies of a great empire. (Cheers.)

A DISSATISFIED IRISH MEMBER.

Mr. Harrington said he had listened to some of Mr. Gladstone's remarks with anxiety. He felt bound to warn the liberals that some questions required immediate attention. He regretted Mr. Gladstone's scant dismissal of the case of evicted tenants. They had borne the brunt of the battle and had made the greatest sacrifices for their class. He did not think their cases presented an insuperable difficulty. Again if the amnesty question was neglected it would cause a fresh agitation and fresh troubles. If the liberal party was wise it would give specific pledges to satisfy Ireland on these matters.

ARCHBISHOP WALSH THE DICTATOR.

Lieutenant Colonel Edward James Saunderson (conservative,) member for North Armagh, made a bantering speech in which he said he wondered what Mr. Redmond would think of Mr. Gladstone's threat to proceed with the Newcastle programme if the House of Lords rejected his home rule measure. It was not a question of what the Irish members of Parliament intended to do, but what Archbishop Walsh would do. Neither the Scotch nor the Welsh would have any hand in the change of government. The change would be accomplished by Irish members sent to Parliament by an Irish priest. Mr. Asquith, said Colonel Saunderson, was sitting on the lips of an Irish volcano. (Loud laughter.) Who could have imagined that Mr. Gladstone would also have gone to Canossa and terminated his career in such degradation? The chief member of his cabinet would in reality be Archbishop Walsh.

REDMOND RETORTS.

Mr. Redmond predicted that the Irish Parliament would be as free from interference on the part of Rome as from interference on the part of the British Parliament. The tory collapse, he said, must indeed be complete when they put up Colonel Saunderson to raise the bogy of civil war in Ulster. He reminded the House that Dublin was represented in Parliament by men who had been opposed by Archbishop Walsh and that 7,000 votes had been given to Parnellite candidates. He repeated his regrets at Mr. Gladstone's attitude toward the evicted tenants and the Irish political prisoners. He declared that if nothing were done for them it would be the painful duty of the Parnellite members to withdraw their support of Mr. Gladstone.

GLADSTONE'S STIMULANT.

Before he began to speak Mr. Gladstone took a drink of his customary stimulant, sherry flip, and during the delivery of his speech he had occasional recourse to the same drink. As soon as he had concluded his address he left for Mr. Stuart Rendel's country seat, Hatchlands, where he will remain till Thursday.

Both sides of the House admitted the dexterity of his speech and admired the unfaltering power with which he poured out the sequence of neatly turned sentences, suggesting much, yet committing himself to little.

In gleaning the opinion of the lobby I found that the M'Carthyites concurred in the opinion that the declaration, though undecided, were satisfactory. They could hardly express any other opinion, as Mr. Balfour's reference to the party as "being squared" had obtained the credence of the whole House.

PARNELLITES IGNORED.

The Parnellites were not quite so satisfied. They were especially discontented with Mr. Gladstone for refraining from giving a pledge to release the dynamiters. Part of their discontent arises from the studied neglect of the liberal leaders to take them into confidence. The liberal whips ignore them, and have not even invited their vote on the coming division. In spite of this I was assured that the Parnellites would vote with Mr. Gladstone on Thursday and that the M'Carthyite reports that they would abstain was a libel on the spirit of the party.

BALFOUR'S FAILURE.

Mr. Balfour's response to Mr. Gladstone was not the great effort that was expected. The conservative press had led the public to believe that he was preparing a strong vindication of the government policy. It was an elaborate indictment of Mr. Gladstone's clever speech, brightened with some touches of sardonic humor; but it seldom roused enthusiasm, even on his own side.

The House was oppressively crowded until Mr. Balfour had concluded his speech. The peers mustered there in strong force, among them being Lords Spencer, Ashbourne, Knutsford, Northbrook, Brassey, Camperdown and Nelson and the Bishop of Ripon. Canon Farrar was also an interested spectator and left with Mr. Gladstone.

The crowd in the House had somewhat dwindled when Mr. T. P. O'Connor arose to denounce the "bribery and beer" practices of the conservatives, and interest in the proceedings died out as Mr. T. W. Russell, Sir Henry Thompson and others proceeded to tell yarns.

Dadabhai Naoroji, the Parsee, in his maiden speech, which was all about India, introduced to the House another probable bore.

It has been arranged to suspend the midnight rules on Thursday so as to enable the House to effect a division.

LONDON, August 10, 1892.—Mr. Gladstone to day received a communication from General the Right Hon. Sir Henry F. Ponsonby, private secretary to the Queen, announcing that arrangements were being made for his reception on Friday at Osborne, House, the Queen's residence on the Isle of Wight, whither Mr. Gladstone will proceed in response to a summons from Her Majesty. The object of the Queen in summoning Mr. Gladstone to Osborne House is to intrust to him the formation of a new government.

Lord Salisbury is expected at Osborne House to-morrow to tender the resignation of the present government upon the adoption by the house of Commons of the "no confidence" amendment to the address in reply to the Queen's speech.

HON. EDWARD BLAKE ON HOME RULE.

Hon. Edward Blake, formerly Premier of Ontario, who was elected in the recent campaign to represent South Longford in Parliament, addressed a meeting of the Home Rule Union of London to-night. He spoke in the same general manner as he did during the speech which he delivered at the Eighty Club dinner given in his honor on Thursday last.

He pointed out the necessity of continued work in order to capture all possible bye elections for the home rule cause. Viewed in the light of a curious tendency to equality in popular opinion, he said, the liberal majority was a substantial one. Conservative advocates of unity had analyzed and cut the majority into sections, declaring that the majority had emanated from Ireland, and therefore did not count. Would they have said that if the circumstances had been reversed and Ireland had declared against home rule?

The liberals must be prepared for exaggerated accounts of Irish outrages in the tory papers. That was part of their game. If the Protestants in the various parts of Ireland were to combine—he hoped that they would not—that they could get what terms they liked from either side of the divided majority? He recommended to them an altogether different policy—namely, to banish forever from the arena all religious questions and to join hands with the Catholics and to discuss intelligible differences of opinion, instead of the character of their creeds or the color of their hair. Doubtless there would be blunders and friction in inaugurating the new *regime* in Ireland—bearings would get heated, pipes burst and steam escape—but that would soon be overcome.

He did not idealize democracy. He believed it was being put to the severest test as to whether it would be able to use its new power with wisdom, self-restraint and discernment, but he hoped it would be equal to the task.

The characteristics of the English nation were steadiness, resolution and energy in action—to advance slowly and never to retreat. Therefore English reforms were durable and blessed. Let them advance, and soon the dawn now visible would blaze into the perfect sunshine of the blessed day of reconciliation for joyful and regenerated Ireland—no longer the weakness, despair and shame, but the strength, the pride and the glory of the United Kingdom.

LONDON, August 11, 1892.—The division in the House of Commons to-night on the motion of Mr. Herbert Henry Asquith (Gladstonian), member for the east division of Fifeshire, of "no confidence" in the government resulted as follows:—

For the motion	350
Against	310
Liberal majority	40

Thus 660 members voted out of a total membership of 670—only 10 being absent.

DIVIDED AT MIDNIGHT.

The House divided at midnight. When Mr. Gladstone returned from the lobby the whole liberal party rose and cheered him. The tellers appeared at twenty-five minutes past twelve a. m. with the paper containing the numbers showing the result of the division and handed the paper to Arnold Morley, the liberal whip. This was the signal for a volley of liberal cheers and Irish shouts of "Mitchellstown!" "Down with Balfourism!" &c., and it was some time before Mr. Morley was able to announce the figures. The result announced was:—For the motion, 350; against the motion, 310. Then there was a fresh display of enthusiasm.

The noise having subsided, Mr. Balfour and the whole body of conservatives arose and amid prolonged acclaims Mr. Balfour moved that the House adjourn until Thursday next. The motion was agreed to.

LIBERALS CONTEMPTOUSLY SILENT.

If to-night's proceedings in Parliament had not been invested with the historic interest attached to the fall of the government, the House would not have tolerated the protracted dulness of the debate after Mr. Chamberlain spoke. The liberal unionists had the field all to themselves the most part of the night. Sir John Lubbock, Sir E. Clarke, Sir Henry James and Mr. Chaplin successively challenging replies from the liberal chiefs who persisted in silence. Early in the evening the liberal leaders, after consulting their "whips," decided to let their opponents wallow in whatever floods of talk they chose and say what they might. No response was to be vouchsafed. So with something like contemptuous indifference Mr. Chamberlain's jibes, Sir John Lubbock's predictions of national ruin, Sir Henry James' and Mr. Chaplin's ponderous expositions of liberal iniquities were passed unnoticed under the general conspiracy of silence. Even the most irrepressible of the Irish members remained mute. But for some minor members of the opposition seizing a chance to get a hearing the House would have divided before dinner hour. With stolid patience and devoid of every appearance of excitement the House waited the decisive moment of the division.

AN UNPRECEDENTED SCENE.

The gravity of the occasion was seen in the crowds, waiting in the palace yard till past midnight, the groups filling the lobbies and packed in the galleries within the House. For the first time since the night in 1886 when Mr. Gladstone first introduced home rule chairs had to be brought in to seat the members blocked out of the galleries. For the first time in the history of British Parliaments did the members muster their full strength within ten.

The Prohibition Commission.

At St. John, the Prohibition Commission continued taking testimony on Tuesday afternoon and Wednesday forenoon of last week. Our last week's report brought the proceedings up to adjournment on Tuesday at one o'clock. The commission resumed at 2 p. m.

Dr. G. A. B. Addy, the resident physician of the General Public Hospital, was the first witness. He said that out of 720 cases treated last year there were only 17 alcoholic cases. A prohibitory law properly enforced would have a good effect. He did not think it could be enforced. Drinking wines in moderation was not injurious.

Chas. W. Weldon, Q. C., gave a statement concerning the prohibitory law of 1855, and the elections which resulted in consequence of its enactment. There was nothing to prevent the appointment of officers to enforce the Scott Act. The temptation to break the Scott Act was greater than with other laws. People who did not believe in the law voted for it, saying, they did not like to vote against it. They were really opposed to it and did nothing towards its enforcement.

Dr. Charles Holden said a moderate drinker has as good a chance of recovery in case of accident or sickness as an abstainer. The heavy drinker did not stand as good a chance, he did not think a prohibitory law could be enforced in St. John and the various counties of New Brunswick. It had been a failure in Maine, and the Scott Act could not be enforced here. A prohibitory law thoroughly enforced would in the main be good.

Rev. Dr. Wilson, president of the Evangelical alliance said:

The drink traffic was responsible for a very large proportion of the poverty, crime and ignorance which existed. The restriction of the trade reduced these evils. He lived in Marysville for a time The law of one man was supreme there, and it was that no liquor should be sold. A more orderly and well conducted place could not be found. He had occasion to visit McAdam frequently, and he never saw a drunken man there. If a prohibitory law was enforced it would be of great benefit.

The hotels were dangerous, because people with false ideas of self-respectability went to them who would not go elsewhere for liquor.

He put in evidence the journals of the Methodist conference of N. B., and P. E. I., N. S., and the general conference. Public opinion was overwhelmingly in favor of the enactment of a law prohibiting the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors.

G. G. Gilbert, Q. C., said the Scott act was not observed in Fredericton, Northumberland county, Hampton and Moncton. The reason was that eight out of ten people thought it was no harm to drink and no harm to sell liquor. At first he was in favor of the act, but he was opposed to it now. He favored it because he thought it would stop drinking among certain classes.

Capt. Cowan of the Salvation army said she was a Salvation army rescue officer. She went about visiting the jail, the police court and various places, including the houses of ill-fame. Out of thirty-two persons sheltered, fourteen were liquor cases. A great deal of this rescue work was made necessary by the use of liquor. When they visited the lowest class of bad houses they usually found the inmates under the influence of liquor.

In answer to the chairman Capt. Cowan said St. John had more houses of prostitution than London, Ont. That was probably because it was a seaport town. The inmates of these houses of prostitution had fallen in most cases through drink. The only exceptions were some young girls. About fifty per cent of the prostitutes were intemperate people before their fall and the inmates of the house said they had to drink or they could not keep up their life of prostitution. The removal of the liquor saloons would make the rescue work easier and the reformation of the people who came under their care more permanent.

Thos. F. Raymond, proprietor of the Royal hotel, found himself able to observe the requirements of the license law. He could not keep his hotel open without a bar. His guests required liquor and he had to keep it. He did not make any money feeding people. Those who talked of hotels without bars did not know what they were talking about. If he had his bar fronting on the street he would have no entrance to the hotel itself. The guests would all have to go into the bar. He did not mean to say he made those who patronized the bar feed those who did not go into it. His impression was that the temperance people had great appetites. Those who did not drink made it up in eating. He did not allow everybody to go into his bar. A man had to be respectable, and a drunken man could not get in. If we had a prohibitory law in St. John he would have to close his hotel up.

Asked as regards the Scott Act in the county, Mr. Raymond said he owned a hotel at Loch Lomond. He didn't think it was known out there that the act was in force. Word didn't get out that far. He had visited many of the cities and towns in Maine, and there were lots of rum all along the line.

John Bond city marshall, said he remembered when the Scott Act was brought into force in Portland. The bars were closed for a few days. Then they reopened. The failure to carry out the Scott Act was due to the carelessness of the temperance people themselves. The law could be enforced, and it would have been enforced in Portland if the temperance people had done their duty and the law had been let alone. He knew of a great deal of poverty which was attributable to intemperance. He knew of cases where wives had to work to keep their husbands out of jail, while their husbands spent their time and money in liquor.

Ald. John M'Goldrick said he was a member of the Portland council when the Scott Act came into effect in Portland. The council did not attempt to enforce it, as the solicitor considered it was not in force.

Richard Rawlings, captain of police, said he was chief of the Portland force when the Scott Act was adopted. He made some attempt to enforce it at the start, but as the council did not back him up or appoint an inspector he stopped. He notified the saloon keepers that the act was in force and ordered them to close up their places of business. That was on Monday and on the following Wednesday the solicitor af the city told the council that the act was not in force. When cases did come up the city solicitor appeared as counsel for the defendants. He met the temperance people one night, but as they could not supply the necessary funds to prosecute the violators the matter dropped.

J. G. Taylor, the manager of the Halifax Banking Co., in St. John said the financial affairs of St. John were on a solid basis. He did not know