

the desire of the Irish people. Therefore he leads. But the transfer of self-government is not to Mr. Parnell nor to the Parnellites, but to Ireland and the Irish people. In these years of terrible conflict much that is unwise has been spoken—much that is wrong has been done—much that is execrable has been perpetrated. If I do not gratify those who will neither see nor speak of anything else by denouncing such deplorable blemishes and such ignominious brands upon the cause essentially just and sacred, it is not that I deny them or condone them, but they are used for a purpose, and they obscure the truth. Mr. Parnell and his followers have led the forlorn hope which has carried the stronghold. Forlorn hopes are for ever remembered with gratitude and honour, but they return into the army out of which they came, and the army holds the field. What Mr. Parnell and his singularly able lieutenants have accomplished will never be forgotten, but it is Ireland that by self-culture will order and unfold itself. Society which springs from the soil, and forms itself by the tillage of the land, training its people to thrift and industry, and unfolding its steady growth in homes, hamlets, villages, towns and cities, ripening by centuries of time, and blending all orders and inequalities of rich and poor, master and servant together in mutual dependence, mutual justice, mutual charity, making the idle to be thrifty, and the powerful to be compassionate—this growth of human happiness and social order, which in England and Scotland is so symmetrical, and mature, in Ireland has been checked at the root. The centuries which have ripened England and Scotland with flower and fruit have swept over Ireland in withering and desolation."

"We are beginning in the nineteenth century to **IRREVERSIBLE**; undo the miseries of the seventeenth and eighteenth. But let us not excuse ourselves by alleging the faults of national character. If our Irish brethren have faults they are for the most part what England has made them. Englishmen, with a like treatment, would have been the same. The root that has been checked is the possession and the culture of the land on which the people have been born, and to which they will return with the love of children to a mother. It is the law of nature, which is the law of God, and they who fight against it must fail at last. It was violated by warfare; it must be revived by wise and peaceful legislation. It may cost much, but reparation must be made, and reparations are always costly, and involve those who are innocent of the ancient wrongs. In your majestic Union, America, there is a central power which binds your liberties and legislatures into one commonwealth. England, Ireland, and Scotland must, in my belief, all alike have some rule in affairs that are not Imperial. The growth of empire and the fulness of time demand it. But there is an august sovereignty of a thousand years—the centre of a world-wide empire standing in the midst of us. England and Scotland and Ireland can be handed over to no man and to no movement; neither can they wrong one another, nor put fetters on the liberties of any member of our great Imperial commonwealth. The sovereignty pervades all its parts, and will ever restrain and promptly redress all excesses of delegated powers."

CARDINAL MANNING concludes his letter with the **SHORT ENOUGH**, following sentence. "I wish I could have written a shorter reply but on a subject near my heart, I hardly know when or where to stop." For our own part however, and we think there are multitudes who will agree with us, we would not have this letter curtailed so much as by a word.—We have heard no more powerful an utterance on the question. It ranks among the very first that have been published, and neither in Parliament nor out of it has it been surpassed. The writer need not, indeed, tell us that he has the subject near his heart, for it is out of the fulness of his heart, as well as out of the clearness of his intellect, and the wisdom of his mind, that he evidently speaks.—And while he talks of making reparation, does he himself not make it thoroughly? What meaning for us now have the calumnies of the Duke of Norfolk? What value shall we set upon the opposition and misrepresentations of the *London Tablet*, or how shall we appraise the various marks of ill-will shown towards us by many people known as leaders among the English Catholic body? Cardinal Manning has perfectly atoned for all this, and shown us as the source of such malevolence the bigoted, foolish, or evil, mind of the individual rather than the united conclusions of the entire body.

A BURNING QUESTION THE much-voiced question of Protection versus Freetrade is now causing a good deal of agitation in New South Wales. The arguments on both sides are urged in the most energetic manner possible, and each party insists that the facts it can adduce in support of the side taken by it are infallibly convincing. It is a little remarkable, nevertheless, although perhaps not altogether without precedent, that both parties occasionally advance the same facts as proving their several and opposite points:—Melbourne, say the Freetraders, for example, is as much haunted by the unemployed as is Sydney. But, say the Protectionists, only look at the unemployed in Melbourne.

Their whole number is comparatively insignificant, and a chief part of them are men who will not and, in many instances it may be, cannot work. In Sydney we have even in one branch of trade alone a larger number than this total, of genuine workmen who cannot find any work to do. Look at America, cry the Freetraders, where the number of men out of employment amounts to no less than a million. Look at America, repeat the Protectionists, where two per cent only of the population are paupers, whereas the per centage of the pauper population in Freetrading England amounts to five. Take England, say the Freetraders, as your model and consider her great prosperity. Consider the case of England, plead the Protectionists, who even under the peculiar circumstances of being obliged to import the greater portion of her food supplies still is forced to contemplate a movement towards a protection policy. And so they go on with ditto and ditto repeated in a manner tending towards much confusion for those who are not fully initiated into the mysteries of the question, and who indeed can pretend to be so in a matter on which men of great abilities and much experience are divided?

A LAME ARGUMENT

ONE of the most fervent supporters of Freetrade, meantime, is Sir Henry Parkes, who would strike out an original course for himself, and leave marks worthy of his genius in the records that shall teach the future generations how their predecessors finally settled the question. Sir Henry would bring into the matter another element and identify the course he supports with that of freedom, with which as we know, that eminent Statesman has close and intimate sympathies. All that is genuine, upright, and manly, still as of yore lies close to the heart of Sir Henry Parkes. "If," says Sir Henry "they cast their eyes abroad they could see that protection was now identified with despotism." But even so, admitting this to be the case—which, perhaps, we may do even although certain countries that profess to be free as the air are to be reckoned on the Protectionist side, for despotism and the freedom of the age come very nearly in contact, and give us another illustration of the time-honoured fact that extremes are wont to meet. Still may we not take a useful lesson from a despot also, and may there not be cases in which rigorously to avoid every step taken by such a one would be to risk a stumble? We have no reason to suppose, for instance, that the despots of the age desire to impoverish their countries, and to keep their people on the very brink of starvation. There might, perchance, be circumstances in which such a course of proceedings would find acceptance in the eyes of despotism, but, as things are, despots have great expenses to cover. There are great armies to be maintained, and great armaments to be renewed and kept up, and there are serious reasons why means should be at hand to meet a heavy taxation. Besides while Socialism leavens the masses, and finds in all discontent a prolific breeding ground, it would not be politic of despots to encourage or cause among their people such efficient motives to desire any change that might offer itself to those in the throes of want and despair. There are positively reasons at the present time why despots should be anxious to secure the prosperity of their countries, and to see contentment and happiness spread abroad throughout their people. And despots there are, moreover, who should be pretty well able to judge as to the best means of bringing about such results. Perhaps, indeed, Prince Bismarck, for example, who is probably one of the despots alluded to by Sir Henry Parkes, may be regarded as almost as well endowed with all statesmanlike qualities as Sir Henry himself. The argument therefore against protection derived from the proclivities of despotism has very little in it, and may easily fall to the ground.

WHAT, however, it nearly concerns us to determine **A REASONABLE CONCLUSION**, nearly now than ever since the Colonies bid fair to become a scene of rivalry in commerce, in which one country will try to undersell another until the unsuccessful rival is finally beaten from the field, and the successful competitor is left alone to make his own terms. What it concerns us to determine is as to whether we may not be situated so as to have the capacity for producing certain articles as good and nearly as cheaply as articles of the same kind can be produced elsewhere, so that the competition we should encourage would be that between colonial manufacturers capable of good workmanship and able to sell with fair profits at reasonable prices. In cases where this can be done we should have no hesitation whatever about pronouncing in favour of protection. We should not regard the theory that we should still delay our manufactures until it had been proved what articles we were capable of producing more cheaply than those that could be produced elsewhere, so that we might exchange them for others produced under like circumstances in other countries. This we should regard as something like sacrificing facts to theories and surrendering the interests of the Colony to a chimera. It is undoubtedly for the benefit of the Colony generally that manufactures should be established here, and it is, therefore, to the advantage of the community to give to the enterprise the support necessary to insure its success. We should not hesitate to advocate such a measure of protection as would secure this object.