

life of an Irish peasant because the House of Commons would not interfere in his behalf. This was the condition of things which existed when the Union was established, and it is because Irishmen had been so ground down, persecuted, oppressed and wronged that they were ready to accept the Union, if it had carried with it the freedom which was intended when Pitt proposed the measure. I say, then, that an opportunity existed at that time by which the people of Ireland might have been united to the other portion of the United Kingdom, as the people of Scotland and Wales are at this moment. Why was it not done? It was because the same system of intolerance, though perhaps milder in form, was perpetuated under the government of the Union, as it had been under the Government which preceded it. We know, Sir, that when Lord Granville's Government, in 1807, proposed that certain offices in the army and navy and in the civil service might be held by Roman Catholics, he was driven from power; that the vast majority of those in authority were against him; that a new Government was organised which laid down, as a maxim of its policy: "The King, the Church, and no Popery,"—two positive and one negative plank in its platform. It was on that line that the government of Ireland and the United Kingdom was conducted down until Mr. O'Connell secured Catholic emancipation in 1829. Everybody knows that the effort put forward by O'Connell secured emancipation. He adopted a course that the people were ready to pursue, because they were devoted to him and regarded his advice as wise. But we know that the Government who granted that concession declared that they did so, not because they thought it was right or just, but because they said that otherwise there would have been civil war. It is not surprising, therefore, that this concession, made after thirty years of denied justice and hopes deferred, the people of Ireland refused to credit to their enemies the victory due to their own exertions and to the patience, perseverance and eloquence of their leader. Now, let me call the attention of the House to the circumstances surrounding that concession. Mr. O'Connell had been elected for Clare. Because he was Roman Catholic he could not take the Oath of Supremacy, and he was not allowed to take his seat. The measure of Catholic Emancipation having been carried, it would have been a gracious act to provide in the same Bill that he should be entitled to take his seat. But the Government was hostile to him because he had forced the measure upon them, and they compelled him again to seek election after the measure became law. Before emancipation was granted the qualification of the Irish voter was a freehold of the annual value of £2, which was at once increased to £10; so that while Emancipation was granted, the vast majority of the Irish voters were disfranchised; and that continued to be the law until 1884, when Mr. Gladstone put the people of Ireland in this respect upon a footing of equality with those of other parts of the United Kingdom. But let me turn for a moment to the legislation had since the time of the Union regulating the relation between landlord and tenant. In 1816 a measure was carried in the British Parliament to enable the landlord, in anticipation of a loss of rent, to take possession of the crops and the estate of his tenant—to put a caretaker in charge and harvest the crop if he chose, at the expense of the tenant,—not because the tenant had been guilty of any forfeiture or failure in the performance of his portion of the contract, but as security against such failure. Then, by the Act of 1818, the landlord could bring an action of ejectment against the tenant, against which the tenant could make no defence until he first gave security for costs; and as many of the tenants could not give such security, they were deprived by Act of Parliament of means of defending their rights. And yet we are told that the people of

Ireland ought to be contented with the general policy of the Government since the Union. I might, Sir, give other instances to show the way in which the government of Ireland has been administered; but I think I have cited sufficient to show this House that General Buller did not express himself too strongly when he said that the law was in the interest of the landlord and against the tenant; and that has always been the policy of legislation for Ireland until remedial measures were proposed by Mr. Gladstone. Now, let me call the attention of the House for a moment to the measure of 1870, for that was the first measure in a period of seventy years in the interest of the peasant population of Ireland. One of the provisions of that Act is that a tenant, if he is evicted, may recover from the landlord compensation for his improvements to a limited extent, but that compensation cannot exceed the rental value for a certain number of years. Under that measure the landlord had the power of indefinitely increasing the rents, but the tenant had no power to collect any portion of the moneys he expended in improving his landlord's property so long as he was not disturbed in his possession. It was only when he was evicted that he could obtain any compensation. A provision was inserted in that measure in the House of Lords, providing that if the tenant was evicted for non-payment of rent, then he could collect nothing, even though his improvements might have exceeded in value seven-fold the amount of rent due. That is the measure which has been spoken of as a measure for robbing the landlord of his rights. Are men who are so prejudiced by their interests and by a long course of legislation in their favor, capable of dealing fairly with the great mass of the peasant population of Ireland? Sir, we are told that the Irish people are lawless and discontented, that they set law at defiance, and are therefore not entitled to our sympathy or moral support. I hold in my hand the *Nineteenth Century* for 1886. Among the articles in it is one upon the subject of Home Rule, by Mr. Godkin, the very able editor of the *New York Nation*, a man who has given a great deal of attention to this subject, and whose observations are worthy of all consideration. He describes the condition of the southern States during the period that the carpet-bag governments existed there, when the Freedmen's Bureau was established, and when the state governments set up by the people of the north exercised a controlling influence over the affairs of the south. The Ku-Klux Klan was called into existence. This secret society committed depredations far more outrageous and numerous than those committed upon the landholders in Ireland. The governments of those States were practically powerless. When one reads the report, of which Mr. Godkin gives a summary, that was made in the Committee of Congress on the subject, one imagines he is reading a report of the condition of things in Ireland, as described by the present Irish Secretary. This is what the committee state in their report:

"There is a remarkable concurrence of testimony to the effect that, in those of the late rebellious States into whose condition we have examined, the courts and juries administer justice between man and man in all ordinary cases, civil and criminal; and while there is this concurrence on this point, the evidence is equally decisive that redress cannot be obtained against those who commit crimes in disguise and at night. The reasons assigned are that identification is difficult, almost impossible; that, when this is attempted, the combinations and oaths of the order come in and release the culprit by perjury, either upon the witness-stand or in the jury-box; and that the terror inspired by their acts, as well as the public sentiment in their favor in many localities, paralyses the arm of civil power.

"The murders and outrages which have been perpetrated in many counties of Middle and West Tennessee, during the past few months, have been so numerous, and of such an aggravated character, as almost baffles investigation. In these counties a reign of terror exists which is so absolute in its nature that the best of citizens are unable or unwilling to give free expression to their opinions. The terror inspired by the secret organisation known as the Ku-Klux Klan is so great, that the officers of the law are powerless to execute its provisions, to discharge their duties, or to bring the guilty perpetrators of these outrages to the