

[FOR THE CRITIC.]

## THE DOWN-EAST GIRL.

(OLD STYLE).

She was a merry down-east maid,  
Her face was freckled with tan,  
Her eyes were blue her cheeks were red,  
She washed and baked and span;  
She was a thorough country-bred,  
Bouncing Liza Ann.

She wore no city frill nor cuff;  
Her beau was her "young man";  
Her gowns were all of home-made stuff—  
Her mirror, a milk can;  
It showed a jewel in the rough,  
Rare Liza Ann.

She courted if a stranger passed,  
And if he stopped, she ran;  
Her schooling was of useful cast  
She knew her frying pan;  
In shoes her fashion was the last,  
Lovely Liza Ann.

She was a merry down-east maid,  
Her face was brown with tan,  
Her eyes were blue her cheeks were red,  
She washed and baked and span;  
She was a thorough country-bred,  
Was Liza Ann.

J. ROBERT HUTCHINSON.

## THE IRISH QUESTION.

Before I had the pleasure of reading Mr. F. R. Gibson's thoughtful article in your issue of 21st ultimo, I had myself some thought of trying to generalize a little on the Home Rule subject. Almost precisely contemporaneously with Mr. Gibson's article, appeared one in the *Week*, entitled "Tenton and Celt," which incidentally points out the remarkable fact that the discontented race in Canada has not only no grievance, but enjoys singular privileges, a lion's share of the loaves and fishes, and holds the balance of power to a remunerative extent unattained as yet even by the Home Rulers. My own ideas tended more in the direction of the possible effect on the British Empire of the concession of Home Rule to Ireland, and to an endeavor to point out some stubborn facts, both on the side of those who hope and trust, and on the side of those who fear, which under various influences, are generally ignored by the Canadian Press; but "Race" aspirations, which have of late developed themselves—in view of the cosmopolitan tendencies of the age—in so remarkable a manner, are, unhappily, considering the truculence of their manifestations in some prominent instances, inseparable from any consideration of the subject. The rational lover of individual liberty, who, laying claim to freedom of thought, opinion, and action for himself, is precluded by his sense of justice from interference with his neighbor, may find it difficult to understand why races of differing temperaments should not, like individuals of differing temperaments in this age of the world, dwell side by side in peace and harmony; but the fact remains that the conscientiousness of the Race is not as the conscientiousness of the individual. The individual Irishman, Scotchman, Frenchman, and Englishman, of different habits, of different tones of thought, of different creeds, may and do live together with mutual esteem and respect, oftentimes with strong mutual regard. With the Race it is unhappily otherwise. That forthcoming measures may assuage existing acerbities is the earnest hope of every sound heart and mind, but there are features in the situation which inspire fear as well as hopefulness.

The observer who endeavors to approach the subject in a spirit, so far as in him lies, of absolute equity, must, in the first place, concede that the wrongs of Ireland have been great and long continued. The Irish, though by no means an entirely Celtic race, are yet deeply imbued with its passionate impulsiveness. To that characteristic is added the strongest tenacity of historical wrongs, and deep-seated and long-enduring intuitions of vengeance. It cannot be denied that this latter, carried to extremes, is a blot on a national character otherwise conspicuous for many kindly and notable traits, and for remarkable purity of life in many essential respects.

But the seditious cultivation of the natural instinct of revenge blinds its victims to a sense of justice. Consequently, we find the great mass of Irish men visiting the sins of long past generations of Englishmen, who lived in times destitute of the ethical lights of to-day, with an indiscriminate hatred of the British empire. It is here that the Irish sense of justice fails, and it can scarcely be otherwise while the people receive their political teaching from demagogues who carefully keep out of sight all extenuation, and whose motives are not limited to pure patriotism, but who live and flourish by the inculcation of violence, sedition, and the insatiable nature of revenge which is exalted into a cardinal virtue. The late utterance of General Burke—that "a man who would hesitate to shoot a landlord is a coward," the Phoenix Park murders, the dynamite atrocities, the useless and cruel maiming of cattle, the cowardly murders of landlords and agents, the boycotting, the heartless treatment of women bereaved by assassination, may serve as instances of the growth of blind and savage hatred when Christian duty and morality are resolutely thrust aside.

Now, if all discrimination were not submerged by carefully nursed passion, the Irish people would be made aware that it is not the whole British people, or their representatives, who are chargeable with the determination to ignore the wrongs of Ireland. If the sins of a people are to be borne in mind, in order to stimulate an external and undying hatred, no more is to be said. But it would be almost as reasonable for Englishmen to perpetuate the old national hatred of the Spaniard or the Frenchman, and cherish it as a virtue, as it is for Irishmen to foster the sense of oppressions which two

generations of Englishmen and Scotchmen have sincerely desired to atone for. It is due to no apathy on the part of the true representatives of Britain that measures of justice to Ireland have been fatally delayed. The persistent neglect is chargeable entirely to a class, whose power for repression is now waning fast. That the Commons of England have long desired that justice should be done, will appear from the following extracts from an article in the *Westminster Review*, (October, 1884) for which I solicit space, if the subject be deemed worth pursuing:—

"But it is Ireland which, during the last fifty years, has been the principal victim of the crimes and follies of the House of Lords, and to the majority of that House the disturbances and convulsions of that country within that period of time are mainly due. So far back as 1833, O'Connell told the House of Commons: 'Though a majority in this House may be disposed to do us something like justice, all your efforts will be frustrated by the other branch of the Legislature,' who, in dealing with Ireland, 'do everything of conciliation or justice with contumely and contempt.' 'The Irishman,' said Macaulay, 'has been taught that from England nothing is to be got by reason, by entreaty, by patient endurance, but everything by intimidation.'

"In no part of the United Kingdom was it more desirable and necessary to create Municipal Government than in Ireland. A Municipal Corporation Bill for Ireland on the model of the English measure, passed the House of Commons in 1835 and each following year only to be rejected by the Lords. At length, in 1840, they passed it, but then only 'in a mutilated form, with a higher franchise, differing from the franchise in England, so that the brand might still be left upon the country.' And with the result 'that nine-tenths of Irish borough householders outside Dublin remain to this day without that voice in the municipal government of their town which they enjoy as a matter of course when they migrate to an English or Scotch borough.' Macaulay was guilty of no exaggeration when, in his great speech on Ireland in 1841, he said, 'Every Bill passed by the advisers of the Crown for the benefit of Ireland was either rejected or mutilated.'

"We have no space available for the consideration of the catalogue of woes inflicted on Ireland by the Tory majority in the House of Lords. We must, however, refer to their treatment of one question, because it remains a question of practical politics.

"In 1843, what was known as the Devon Commission, was appointed to enquire into the Irish Land Question, and after two years' inquiry it reported strongly in favor of legislation to secure the tenant compensation for his improvements. What followed, Mr. Gladstone shall relate in his own words:—

"The question of Irish land was one on which an enlightened Conservative Government forty years ago perceived the necessity of making great changes, and it was hoped that, as a Conservative Government, it might perhaps persuade the majority of the House of Lords to listen to its voice. In the year 1845 Lord Derby, the father of the present Lord Derby, being then a member of the Government of Sir Robert Peel, introduced a most important Bill into the House of Lords, for the purpose of giving compensation to Irish tenants for their improvements. And it is perfectly possible that if at this early date that mild and moderate measure had been passed, we to this hour never should have heard a word of the land question in Ireland. But what happened? Although Lord Derby spoke on the part of a Conservative Government, proprietary influence and class influences in the House of Lords were too strong for him, and he was compelled, most reluctantly compelled, to withdraw his Bill. And this, although the Commission had reported 'that no single measure could be better calculated to allay discontent and to promote substantial improvements throughout the country.'

"Lord Aberdeen's Government, in 1853 and the following year, unsuccessfully attempted to induce the Lords to agree to a Tenant Compensation Bill for Ireland, to the principle of such a measure every leading statesman had given an avowed sanction, but a distinguished Conservative member, Sir J. Napier, regretfully admitted, 'It is notorious that the House of Lords will pass no measure, and that for a Government to propose it to them, or to pretend to support it, is an imposture and a sham.' It was not until twenty-five years had elapsed since the report of the Devon Commission that Mr. Gladstone, during his first administration, undertook to give legislative effect to its recommendation. 'The Irish Land Act of 1870' was mutilated by the Lords in committee. Mr. Gladstone felt that these so-called amendments would do, and were intended to do, more to mar than mend the measure, but he accepted most of them rather than sacrifice the Bill. Experience showed the whole tendency of the Lords' amendments was in the wrong direction.

"Their next action in the Irish Land Question Mr. Gladstone shall describe. 'In 1880 we passed through the House of Commons a Bill granting compensation for disturbances and convulsions of that country. The Bill was unfortunately lost in the House of Lords.' We quote with internal assent and consent the remarks of the author of 'Fifty years of the House of Lords.' 'To that vote can be traced the excessive exasperations of the tenants against their landlords, which enabled Mr. Parnell to make the Land League supreme in Ireland, and to intensify those feelings of national animosity which it has been the labour of generations to efface.'

"When, in 1845, Lord Derby abandoned his Irish Land Bill, Lord Brougham might have repeated to his peers the warning he gave them in the Reform debate of October, 1831. 'Hear the parable of the Sybil, for it conveys a wise and wholesome moral', and then, after applying the old legend to show that the consequence of rejecting the Reform Bill would be an increase in the popular demands, he concluded. 'What may follow your course of obstinacy, if persisted in, I cannot take upon me to predict, nor do I wish to conjecture. But this I know full well, that sure as man is mortal, and to err is human, justice deferred enhances the price at which