The Catholic Record.

"Christianus mihi nomen est, Catholicus vero Cognomen."—(Christian is my Name, but Catholic my Surname.)—St. Pacian, 4th Century.

VOLUME XV. LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1893. NO. 748.

IRISH HOME RULE.

MR. GLADSTONE INTRODUCES HIS BILL

Details of the Measure.

London Feb. 13.—Mr. Gladstone is in admirable form, and looking forward with pleasure to the exertion of the day. He slept well during the night, and began work at half-past nine this morning, assisted by his secretaries. From early morning the scene in the palace yard, Westminster, was of the most animated description, groups of people assembling to watch the arrival of members. At 9 o'clock a number of representatives of the Irish cause were at the door of the House, and by 10 o'clock sixty members were waiting for admission. When noon arrived the inner lobby was packed with members, and the approaches were crowded, and when the doors opened there was a disorderly rush for seats; members shouting and struggling like a mob of excursionists, several being thrown to the floor in the excitement. The veteran, Caleb Wright, Liberal M. P. for South West Lancaster, who is 82, fell in the doorway and was trampled upon, but John Burns, M. P. tor Battersea, rescued him. Meantime the struggle for entrance grew more exciting, and cries could be heard of "keep back," "don't kick," and other exclamations of a more emphatic character.

Mr. Gladstone entered the House at 3:30. Every Liberal and Irish Nationalist in the House stood up and greeted him with prolonged and enthusiastic cheers. When Mr. Gladstone arose at 45 minutes past 3 o'clock, to introduce the Home Rule Bill, there was another demonstration so irrepressible that it was several minutes before he could be heard.

THE PREMIER'S SPEECH.

Mr. Gladstone spoke as follows, in a clear, strong and resonant voice:

"I may, without impropriety, remind the House that the voices which usually plead the cause of Irish self government, in Irish affairs, have, within these walls, during the last seven years, been almost entirely mute. I return, therefore, to the period of 1885, when a proposition of this kind was submitted on the part of the Government of the day, and I beg to remind the House of the position then taken up by all the promoters of these measures. We said that we had arrived at a point in our transactions with Ireland where the two roads parted. You have, we said, to choose one or the other. One is the way to Irish autonomy, according to the conceptions I have just referred to. The other is the way of coercion. That is our contention. It will be in the recollection of the House how that contention was most stoutly and largely denied. It was said over and over again by many members opposite, "We are not coercionists: we do not adopt that alternative, and neither can we adopt it." (Ministerial cheers.) That assertion of theirs was undoubtedly sustained by the proposals, especially from the dissentient Liberals, of various plans dealing with Irish affairs. Those plans, though they fell entirely short, in principle and in scope, of

IRISH SELF-GOVERNMENT,

yet it were of no trivial or mean importance. They went far beyond what had heretofore been usually proposed in way of local self-government for Ireland. Well, what has been the result of the dilemma, as it was then put forware on this side of the House and repelled by the other? Has our contention that the choice lay between autonomy and coercion been justified or not? (Liberal cheers.) What has become of each and all of these important schemes for giving Ireland self-government in provinces, and giving her even a central establishment in Dublin with limited powers. All vanishes into thin air, but the reality remains. The roads are still there—autonomy or coercion. The choice lay between them, and the choice made was to repel autonomy and embrace coercion in an absolutely uniform method. In 1885, for the first time, coercion was imposed on Ireland in the shape of a permanent law added to the statute book. This state of things constituted an offence against the harmony and traditions of self government. It was a distinct and violent breach of the promise on the faith of which union was obtained. That permanent system of repression inflicted upon the country a state of things which could not continue to exist. It was impossible to bring the inhabitants of the country under coercion into

SYMPATHY WITH THE COERCION POWER.

Mr. Gladstone proceeded to debate at length upon circumstances under which the Act of Union was passed; the promise of equality in laws and commercial equity, under which the union was effected. It was then prophesied confidently, he said, that Irishmen would be taken into the Cabinet of the country, but it had been his honored destiny to sit in Cabinets with no less than sixty to seventy statesmen, of whom only one [the Duke of Wellington] was an Irishman, while Castlereagh was the only other Irishman who had sat in the Cabinet since the Union. Pitt promised equal laws when the Union was formed, but the broken promises made of Ireland were unhappily written in indelible characters in the history of the country. Coming to 1832, when the resurrection of the people began, and thence down to 1880, when Ireland could present here a small minority in favor of restoring to her something in the nature of constitutional rights and practical self-government, he said:—It is to me astonishing that so little weight is attached by many to the fact that before 1885—before 1885, in fact—Irish wishes for self-government were represented only by

A SMALL MINORITY.

Since 1885, when the wide extension of franchise was protected by the secret ballot, Ireland's position has been improved in Parliament. In 1886 there were eighty-five Nationalists, or more than five-eighths. (Cheers.) They have been reduced from eighty-five to eighty-nine under circumstances somewhat peculiar (hear, hear), and, I must frankly own to myself, among others, for reasons totally and absolutely unintelligible. (Loud cheers.) Let us look at the state of the case as it now stands. There are but eighty-nine out of one hundred and one—that is to say, the wishes of Ireland for Irish self-government in Irish matters are represented by only four-fifths. (Laughter.) Honorable gentlemen seem to have no respect for such a majority as that. Do they recollect, sir, that never in England has there been such a majority? (Cheers.) No Parliament of the last fifty years has come within measurable distance of it. If there be anything in the great principle of self-government which, if it be a reality, never can work except through the machinery and by laws of representation, at any rate—the voice of the Irish people, the persistency of the Irish people in delivering that voice, and the peaceful circumstances under which it has been delivered—(Ministerial cheers and Opposition laughter)—constitute a great fact in history. It is said, and I admit with truth, that Ireland is not a united country. I don't deny that the division which exists is a fact of great moment. In truth, were Ireland united, anything that can render Ireland formidable would become much more formidable. Were Ireland united all opposition would vanish as a shadow. (Hear, hear.) Ireland is not united in this sense: that one portion of the country not a mere majority of the higher classes, but a considerable popular feeling—is

OPPOSED TO THE PRESENT MOVEMENT.

I would not attempt to measure the numerical strength of this minority. It is said by the party opposite that the minority in the north of Ireland is arrayed in unalterable opposition to Home Rule. Unhappily, at the successful instigation of those whose plot it is to divide the people of Ireland, when they were united at the close of the last century, through the medium mainly of Orange lodges and through religious animosity, there was an alteration of feeling, but the Protestants, during the period of the independent Irish Parliament, were themselves not only willing but zealous and enthusiastic supporters of Irish nationality, inasmuch as their political life was at that period more highly developed. They led on the Roman Catholic population in the political movement which distinguished that period. (Cheers.) This is written broadcast upon the history of the time. Genuine national unity had at one time prevailed among the North of Ireland Protestants. We who have seen them alter, not through their own fault, are ready to be persuaded that they will fall back into the

SENTIMENTS OF THEIR OWN ANCESTORS

—(cheers)—and with their own blood and their own people form one in noble, glorious unity. Alluding to English feeling toward Irish Home Rule, Mr. Gladstone said he would refrain from urging that England would find herself exhausted, and her work made unpracticable, by resistance to Irish demands. He could well conceive England maintaining. If so minded, resistance to Irish demands, but England's conversion to Home Rule had been rapid. In 1886 England's majority adverse to Home Rule was 211. It had now declined to 71. In face of such a fact, who would guarantee the permanence of opposition of the remainder. (Cheers.) He would now ask the patient indulgence of the House while giving an account of the bill. (Cheers.)

He could not undertake to supply a mere table of contents. The Bill, if he did, would probably bewilder his hearers. He would rather seek to present the salient points, hoping to leave a living impression on the minds and memories of his hearers. If he might omit what in the view of some members, ought to be mentioned, therefore he begged them to wait and consult the Bill itself, which, he hoped, would soon be in their hands. It would be remembered that the Bill of 1886 laid down five propositions as cardinal principles to which he had endeavored to closely adhere. Change there was, but not a tremendous change, from the principles of 1886. The object of the Bill of 1886 was to establish a legislative body in Dublin for the conduct of both legislation and administration in Irish as distinct from Imperial affairs. (Renewed cheers.)

THE LIMITING CONDITIONS

which were then observed, and have since, so far as we were able to do so, been closely observed, were these: We were to do nothing inconsistent with Imperial unity. Of this I will say, whatever our opponents may say, that so far as our convictions and intentions are concerned, they would be but feebly stated by being covered in the declaration that we do not mean to impair it. We wish to strengthen it. (Cheers.) We wish to give it greater intensity than it had ever yet possessed. First, then, Imperial unity is observed, and the equality of all is observed. Secondly, the equality of all the Kingdoms would be borne in mind. Thirdly, there would be equitable repartition of Imperial charges. Fourthly, any and every practicable provision for the protection of minorities would be included. The plan proposed ought to be such as to present the necessary characteristics of a real and continued settlement. In the first place we have made it a desire to meet what we thought was the not unreasonable demands for express mention of the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament. There were two methods in which that might be done. It might be done by clause; it might be done in the preamble. We have chosen the preamble as worthier and better, for if it had been done by clause it would be too much in the character of a mere enactment. It is not necessary to say many words for such a purpose. Our words are: "Whereas, it is expedient, without impairing or restricting the supreme authority of Parliament." And then the preamble goes on to declare

THE CREATION OF AN IRISH LEGISLATURE.

With reference to the charge frequently with good faith made against us, that we are destroying the Act of Union, I wish to challenge enquiry upon this fundamental point. What is the essence of union? (Hear, hear.) That essence is to be appreciated by comparing the constitution of things found in the country before 1800 with the constitution of things now subsisting in England. Before 1800 we had two sovereignties in the country. One of these was collectively lodged in the King, House of Lords and Commons of Ireland. There was no more right, in a true, historical and legal sense, in the sovereignty residing in Great Britain to interfere with the sovereignty of Ireland than there was in the sovereignty of Ireland to interfere with the sovereignty of England. This Bill respects and maintains these rights of sovereignty equally throughout the entire range of the kingdoms. Then the Bill constitutes the Irish Legislature. Power is granted to the Irish legislature which consists, first, of a legislative council; secondly, of a legislative assembly, empowered to make laws for the peace, order and good government of Ireland in respect to matters exclusively relating to Ireland or to a part thereof. That power is subject to

A DOUBLE LIMITATION.

First of all, it is subject to necessary and obvious limitations, imposing certain incapacities upon the Irish Parliament, including all that relates to crown agency or the viceroyalty. The subjects of peace and war, public defence, treaties and foreign relations, dignities, titles, law and treason, do not belong to the Irish Legislature. The law of alienage does not belong to it, nor everything that belongs to external trade, the coinage and other subsidiary subjects. Other incapacities are imposed similar to those contained in the Bill of 1886. These provide for the security of religious freedom, the safeguard of education, and for the security of personal freedom, in which we endeavored to borrow one of the modern amendments of the American constitution. Then, coming to

EXCLUSIVE POWERS,

we retain the vice-royalty of Ireland, but we divest it of the party character heretofore borne by making the appointment run six years, subject to the revoking power of the crown. Then also the post is freed from all religious disability. (Cheers.) Then comes a clause which may be considered formal, although it is of great importance, providing for the full devolution of executive power from the sovereign upon the viceroy. Then comes an important provision for the appointment of an Executive Committee of the Privy Council of Ireland. We propose to make this an Executive Council for the ordinary affairs of the Cabinet of the Viceroy. The question arises, shall there be any Legislative Council? All decided that there ought to be such a council. It has appeared to us to be highly inconvenient to alter the members of the Legislative Assembly. If we were to increase the number we do not know what the increase ought to be. If we were reduce, we run serious risks of causing practical inconvenience in Dublin, especially at the time when the functions of internal government come to be newly exercised, and then probably there will be a great deal to do. We, therefore, leave the number at 103, and we fix the term at five years. We leave the constituency as it is now. Next, as to

THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Mr. Gladstone said he did not think they would have been warranted without some strong necessity, in establishing the system of a single chamber; but in Ireland, he added, far from finding any such necessity, we look to the legislative council as enabling us to meet the expectation that we shall give to the minority some means of freer and fuller consideration of its views. The next thing is, Shall the legislative council be nominated or elected? We came to the conclusion that a nominated council would be a weak council. (Ministerial cheers.) If it should be made weak the council would probably enjoy a very short term of existence. We therefore propose an elective council, believing it to be the only form wherein we can give any great force to the vitality of the institution. Well, then, how do we differentiate this council from that of the popular assembly? We propose to fix the number at 48, with an eight years' term of office, the term of the popular assembly being lesser. We then constitute a new constituency. The council constituency must, in the first place, be associated with a ratable value of £20 whereby to secure an aggregate constituency approaching 170,000 persons, including owners as well as occupiers, but subject to a provision that no owner or occupier has a vote in more than one constituency. Then there is no provision in the Bill making the legislative council alterable by Irish acts.

REGARDING THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,

these 103 members must be elected for Irish legislative business by constituencies in Ireland. We make these provisions in regard to the assembly alterable in respect to electors and constituencies after six years, but in altering constituencies the power of the assembly will be limited by the declaratory act to the effect that due regard must be had to the distribution of population. The Bill must include a provision for meeting what is called a deadlock. In a case where a Bill has been adopted by the assembly more than once, and where there is an interval of two years between the two adoptions or a dissolution of Parliament, then upon its second adoption the two assemblies may be required to meet and the fate of the Bill is to be decided in joint assembly. (Cheers.) Next, all appeals shall lie to the Privy Council alone, not to the Council and Lords. The Privy Council may try the question of the invalidity of any Irish Act—that is, try it judicially and with reasonable judgment under the initiative of the Viceroy or Secretary of State. This judicial committee is now recognized by us as the only approach we can make to the Supreme Court of the United States. In composing this judicial committee due regard must be had to the different elements of nationality. (Cheers.) We have not apprehended any difficulty there.

OTHER CLAUSES PROVIDE

for the security of the emoluments of existing judges and officers generally. Then there is a clause intended to correspond with the colonial validity law, the effect of which is that if the Irish Legislature should pass any act in any way contrary to acts of the Imperial Parliament, such law shall be good except in so far as it is contrary to the Imperial enactment. The exchequer judges shall be appointed under the authority of the Crown mainly for financial business. Besides the exchequer judges it is provided that for six years all judges shall be appointed as now. We do not reserve for the Imperial Parliament the power to fix emoluments. These will be fixed in Ireland, and the effect will be to establish a joint control of these appointments. The month of September is probably the most convenient month for the assembly to meet. Therefore, a clause provides that it shall meet on the first Tuesday in September. (Prolonged Irish cheers.) Certain clauses secure the initiative in regard to money bills to the assembly. We are now coming to the important

QUESTION OF THE CONSTABULARY.

We propose a gradual reduction and the ultimate dissolution or disappearance of that force, with the discharge of every obligation towards them in such a way as will not adversely affect the interests of that honorable force. During the period of transition they are to be under the control of the Viceroy. It is contemplated that they will be replaced by a force owing existence to the Irish authorities in local areas. On the important subject of the retention of Irish members in the Imperial Parliament, I do not regard and never have regarded it as touching what are sometimes called the fine principles of the Bill. It is not included in any one of them, but whether it be a principle or whether it be not, there is no question that it is a very weighty and organic detail, which cuts rather deep in some respects into the composition of the Bill. There are strong arguments which may be alleged in defense of the

RETENTION OF IRISH MEMBERS

in Parliament, but there is one argument I must put aside as a most dangerous argument and in itself quite untenable—the argument of those who say, unless you retain the Irish members there is no Parliamentary supremacy over Ireland. I entirely decline to admit that argument. I say that if you do admit it at a stroke you shatter Parliamentary supremacy in this country. Although I do not at all admit that Parliamentary supremacy depends upon the retention of Irish members, I yet quite admit that the retention of Irish members has great practical importance, because it visibly exhibits that supremacy in a manner intelligible to the people. Besides, it gives Ireland a voice and a full voice, in all imperial matters. (Hear, hear.) It has this advantage—we cannot in our financial arrangements get rid of all financial connection between the two countries unless you are prepared to face a very inexpedient and inconvenient system of different sets of treaties and trade laws. Besides being so, it must be that British budgets will more or less influence Irish pecuniary balances. It is therefore desirable, for the purpose of mitigating any inconvenience which might then arise, that Ireland should have something to say about these British budgets. I know no argument of an abstract theoretical or constitutional character against the retention of Irish members at West minister, but to revert to an old expression which has become rather familiar, I do not think it is in the wit of man to devise a plan for their detention which would not be open to some serious practical difficulties. (Cheers.) Retention involves two points,

FIRST AS TO NUMBERS, AND SECONDLY AS TO VOTING POWER.

Now, as to the first question—that of numbers—is Ireland to be fully represented in the House? (Hear, hear.) Well, probably the feeling will be in favor of the affirmative. Then arises another difficulty—what is full representation for Ireland? In 1884 the House treated Ireland in a wise and liberal spirit by assigning 103 members to that country. That number was then beyond what, according to the calculations of population in this country, Ireland was entitled to, and it is claimed that unhappily the disparity has since been aggravated by a double process. The population of Great Britain has increased, while that of Ireland has diminished, and has now reached a point that whereas, formerly entitled to 103 members, it would, according to this same ratio, now have 81. There ought to be a general determination to interpret full representation as meaning representation according to existing population. Speaking of full representation, then, I imply that the representation in the House from Ireland would be composed of 81 Irish gentlemen. Of course it follows that there would have to be an election. These 81 members from Ireland in the House would probably be understood to recognize a commission given to 103 members. So when it had been determined that 80 was the proper number, we endeavored to arrange the Schedule of the Bill in such a manner that this Imperial representation would practically not clash with representation in the Legislature at Dublin. Mr. Gladstone continued:—Now comes the greater difficulty

WHAT VOTING POWER

are these eighty members to have? Ireland is to be represented here fully—that is my first postulate. My second postulate is that Ireland is to be invested with separate powers, subject no doubt to Imperial authority, yet still, as we must from experience practically separate a certain independent power as has been done in other legislatures of the Empire, Ireland is to be endowed with separate powers over Irish affairs. Then the question before us is: Is she or is she not to vote so strongly upon matters purely British? I propose this question in the true Parliamentary form—aye or no? There are reasons both ways. We cannot cut them off in a manner perfectly clean and clear from these questions. We cannot find an absolutely accurate line of cleavage between questions that are Imperial questions and those that are Irish questions. (Cheers.) Unless the Irish members are allowed to vote on all British questions they must have too little or too much, because there are questions which defy our efforts to arrange them with accuracy and precision on the proper side of the line as either English or Irish. We do not see the possibility of excluding them from one of the highest and most important functions of the House, namely, that of determining the composition of the executive power. A vote of confidence is a simple declaration, but may be otherwise. I do not see how it is possible to exclude Irish members from voting on that great subject. Next, a less

IRISH MEMBERS VOTE ON ALL QUESTIONS

you break the Parliamentary tradition. The presence of eighty members, with only limited powers of voting, is a serious breach of that tradition, which, whether you resolve to face it or not, ought to be made the subject of the most careful consideration. Now come the reasons against the universal voting power of Irish members. I say: Everything on that side Irish, everything on this side Imperial. That, I think, you cannot do. If you ask me for a proportion I say nine-tenths, nineteen-twentieths, perhaps ninety-nine one-hundredths, of the business of the Parliament can, without difficulty, be classed as Irish or Imperial. There would, however, be a great anomaly if these eighty Irish members should come here continually to intervene in questions purely and absolutely British. If some large question or controversy in British affairs should then come up, causing a deep and vital severing of the two great parties in this House, and the members of those parties knew that they could bring over eighty members from Ireland to support their views, I am afraid a case like that would open a possible door to wholesale, dangerous political intrigue. (Hear hear.) My colleagues found themselves not well able to face a contingency of that kind. They inserted in the bill

LIMITATIONS ON THE VOTING POWER

of the Irish members, to exclude them—first, from voting on a bill or motion expressly confined to Great Britain; second, from voting on a tax not levied upon Ireland; third, from voting on a vote or appropriation of money otherwise than for the Imperial service; fourth, from voting on any motion or resolution exclusively affecting Great Britain. The whole subject is full of thorns and brambles, but our object is the autonomy and self-government of Ireland in all matters properly Irish. The Irish people certainly did not raise the difficulty to which I have just alluded—the retention of Irish members in the House. This is a secondary matter in their eyes, and ought not to interfere with the principal aim. In the face of the feeling that a shade of uncertainty still hangs over the question of the retention of the Irish members, we have affixed to the paragraph concerning this question the words: "Excepting and until Parliament shall determine the coming financial legislation." I wish to supply the keynote to the financial part of the legislation. That keynote is to be found in the provision included in our plans from the first, and wisely and generously acceded to by Ireland through her representatives, that there is to but

ONE SYSTEM OF LEGISLATION FOR ALL THE KINGDOMS.

As far as external things are concerned that will be found to entail very important consequences. It has guided us to the conclusion at which we have arrived of unity of the commercial legislation for the three kingdoms. This includes customs and excise duties, post office and telegraphs. By adopting this keynote we can attain to the most valuable results, and will be likely to avoid the clashing friction of agents of the Imperial and agents of the Irish Government. We can make under cover of this proposal a larger and more liberal transfer to Ireland in the management of her own affairs than we could make if we proceeded on the other principle. We hope to escape in this way all collection in the interior of Ireland of any revenue whatever by imperial authority. The principle to which we are bound to give effect in Ireland is, Ireland has to bear a fair share of the imperial expenditure. (Hear, hear.) The word "imperial" is admitted in the schedule, which gives the list of imperial burdens. There are three modes in which this fair share may be apportioned. The first method is the lump sum payment, adopted in 1885. This method we thought should disappear naturally from the new Bill; for through the retention of Irish representation here Irish members will vote on the Imperial expenditures. Consequently, it would seem strange under these circumstances to revert to the method of a lump sum. Another method is what may simply be described as the method of a quota—that is to say, that Ireland shall pay 6 per cent., or 5 per cent., or 4 per cent., or what you please of the Imperial expenditures, which shall be taken out of the common fund. She will be debited to that extent, and will have to pay it over from her account to ours. If you fix the quota, and the quota is absolutely elastic, should the Imperial expenditures swell the principle of the quota would still secure the relative share to be contributed by Ireland. But there is

A THIRD METHOD, WHICH ONE WE ADOPT—

that of deducting from the Irish revenues the amount due England. There is one of these revenues to which the greatest difficulty adheres. When explaining the subject in 1885, I pointed out that there was a large revenue locally received in Ireland, but really belonging to Great Britain. The principle of that revenue was within the excise department. With the advantage of the consideration which the Inland Revenue department has had since the former plan was produced, we got rid of the difficulty altogether as far as the Inland Revenue is concerned. We provide that revenue levied in Ireland shall be revenue really belonging to Ireland that is, revenue from goods consumed in Ireland. It is not so with the customs. With the customs there is a large debt from Ireland to this country. It is not so large as is involved in the case of excise, but still it comes up to several hundred thousands. If we adopted the method of a quota we should expose Irish finance to large and inconvenient shocks from changes introduced in English Budgets. Imperial reasons also would, perhaps, make it necessary for us to do what we are, I think, very unwilling to do, namely, to give Imperial officers a meddling and intervening power in relation to Irish affairs (Hear, hear.) The third plan is to appropriate a particular fund, say this fund shall be taken by us, and shall stand in acquittance of all obligations of Ireland for Imperial services. This fund will sweep away all the difficulties of calculation and intervention which might belong to the quota method. Then we have the fund practically in our hands in the management of the customs revenue of Ireland, which must be British. Consequently, we shall be

RECEIVERS OF A FUND

which will never go near the Irish exchequer. If it be deemed a fair and convenient arrangement there can be no question of handing it backwards and forwards. We should keep it and give Ireland a receipt in full instead of coming upon her for heavy payments from year to year. Then next the customs fund would be nearly the right amount. I do not know what the House might consider the right amount. Judgments might fluctuate. Some might say 4 per cent., some 5 per cent., some a little more than 5 per cent. But the amount is this—£2,450,000 yearly gross. Sixty thousand pounds allowed for collection leaves £2,370,000 net. With the Imperial expenditure at £90,000,000, £2,370,000 is a sum that drops between a charge of 4 per cent. and a charge of 5 per cent. The Irish members will observe that by that means everything of a practical nature we will hand over to them. Though the rates of excise and the post and telegraph rates will be a fixed amount, the authority and the whole control over them will be absolutely in the hands of the Irish officers. The fund plan fall shorts of the exactitude of the quota plan. The latter method meets every exigency of peace and war, but this plan is not quite so exact. Questions may arise such as, are we assured we shall obtain from Ireland a fair share of assistance in a great imperial emergency? I myself am bound to say that there is very little to fear from trusting the patriotism and liberality of the Irish Legislature. (Opposition cries of "oh, oh," and cheers from the Government benches). Stinginess was never a vice of the Irish people, and if we look forward very much I am afraid her sufferings will be due to generous extravagance rather than to meanness.

WHEN WE COME TO A STATE OF WAR

we have to look to three sources—customs, excise and income tax. With regard to customs we propose to leave them in our hands, so that there can be no difficulty in adapting contributions so far as customs are concerned. With regard to excise we have in view a proposition to retain considerable control in our hands, which considerable power will enable Great Britain to make sure of having aid from Ireland if she thinks such provision necessary. The Irish balance sheet stands thus: On the credit side would appear excise, £3,220,000; while taxation which goes over stamps, income tax, excise, license, which are £1,495,000; postal revenue, £710,000; Crown lands, £35,000; miscellaneous, £140,000, making a total of £5,630,000. On the other side, Ireland takes over the whole of the civil charges, with the exception of the constabulary charges of £3,110,000; Inland Revenue, £180,000, and postal services, £700,000. We propose that Ireland shall take part of the constabulary charge, amounting to £1,000,000. This would bring the Irish charges to £5,130,000. We propose that she shall receive against that the items I have put to her credit, amounting to £5,630,000. Thus she will have a clear surplus of £500,000

WITH WHICH TO START ON HER MISSION.

I will now release the House from the painful consideration of details which it has pursued with unexampled patience. I have tried to convey the fundamental conception and spirit of the scheme. I submit that the plan may be imperfect, but I hope it will receive impartial consideration. Although there may be friendly and unfriendly criticisms, I hope I shall not give offence when I express my deep conviction that a plan closely resembling this, if not the present, proposal of an identical legislative chamber for Ireland may shortly become a law. There is one risk, and that is that if the controversy is unduly and unwarrantedly prolonged the demand for the self-government in Irish affairs may become a demand for the repeal of the Union and the re-establishment of dual supremacy in those Islands. I hope that the ship of state will be steered from that rock. I would ask you to contrast the present condition of the Irish people with what it was at the time of swift, when the Irish ascendancy Parliament begged to be admitted to the British Parliament, and was refused, or with what it was at the beginning of the century immediately after the Union, when Irish voters were trooped to the polls for the simple purpose of recording their votes in order to return landlords to Parliament. We have concluded that we have before us now

A DIFFERENT STATE OF THINGS.

Ireland has on her side the memory of vast victories earned by the sweat of labor, but really earned and recorded on her behalf. Ireland has mighty sympathies. She requires this larger and stronger island. She has obtained the suffrage of Scotland and the suffrage of Wales, and in the short space of seven years she has changed a majority of more than two-hundred against her in England to one-third that number. She was situated in franchise and representation. Now she possesses a most extended franchise, with most perfect protection. Her remaining objects she has not yet attained to, but she looks forward to the attainment of them with more means in her hands. One other source of strength she has—the moderation of her demands. (Hear, hear.) She has ever since 1885, if not before, but unequivocally and nationally since, abandoned the whole argument that perhaps she was entitled to make on the subject of the Act of Union. She has asked you to save for yourselves every imperial power. She has consented to accept the House of Commons and the universal supremacy of the Empire. In return she has asked you only that she have the management of her own affairs, which reason and justice, combined with the voice of her people, I hope will soon move this nation to say soon shall be awarded her. If this is to be the end of the matter I think di passionate men would say

THE SOONER ENDED THE BETTER.

The sooner we stamp the seal which will efface all former animosities, and open the era of peace and good will, the sooner come the better. But these are matters which human vision is hardly equal to penetrating. I must say, however, for my own part, that I never will and never can be a party to bequeathing to my country the continuance of this heritage of discord which has been handed down from generation to generation with hardly momentary interruption through seven centuries—this heritage of discord, with all the evils that follow in its train. I wish no part nor lot in that process, it would be misery for me that I had forgone or omitted in these closing years of my life any measure it was possible for me to take towards upholding and promoting the cause which I believe to be the cause—not of one party or one nation—but of all parties and all nations. To these nations, viewing them as I do with their vast opportunities under a living union for power and happiness—to these nations I say: Let me entreat you, if it were my last breath, I would so entreat you, let the dead bury their dead, and cast behind you former recollections of bygone evils; cherish, love and sustain one another, though all the vicissitudes of human affairs in times that are to come. (Prolonged Liberal cheers.)

C. O. F.

We had the pleasure last Wednesday evening of attending an "At Home" given by the local branch of the Catholic Order of Foresters. It was held in their meeting room, in the Duffield Block. We may at the outset say that their hall is the finest one of the kind in the city. It is large enough to hold a meeting of four hundred persons, and it is fitted up in the most luxurious fashion. The surroundings, the large gathering of intelligent and gentlemanly Catholic young men, the commendable modes of amusement, the choice music, and the tempting and plentiful refreshments supplied by Bro. McGinn—all combined to make a favorable impression on a visitor. We need not state that good results will follow the holding of these socials. They enable the members to exchange thoughts and form attachments which are most desirable aids in the race for life; and important too is the fact that the good example shown by the great majority will have a powerful influence in the blessed work of keeping the feet of the wayward ones in the path that leads to true happiness in this world and eternal bliss in the hereafter. Great credit is due the officers for the admirable and energetic manner in which they are recruiting the ranks of the C. O. F. It is a sister society of the C. M. B. A., and as such we wish it all manner of prosperity. There is room enough for both, and their aims and objects are such that no friction need ever occur.

A. O. H.

Toronto, Ont., Feb. 7, 1893.

A very successful meeting of Div. No. 1, A. O. H., was held in Temperance Hall, on Feb. 5, at which two members was initiated and four applications for membership was received before the close of the meeting. President Brother John McGarry, on behalf of the Div., presented Brother W. J. McLean with a short address, accompanied with a marbleised clock, on the occasion of him retiring from the office of Treasurer, which he held so long and efficiently.

THE ADDRESS.

SIR—Your Brothers—and their name is legion—cannot permit you to retire from office without a direct expression of their esteem and regard. I am desired, on their part, to present you with the accompanying clock as a very slight token indeed of their appreciation of so admirable and efficient an officer.

Bro. McLean, although taken by surprise, made a very suitable reply.

The school of experience is not a free school. We have all to pay on own tuition.

THE SIN OF PROFANITY.

Sermon by Archbishop Ireland, of St. Paul.

Archbishop Ireland delivered an eloquent sermon recently in the Cathedral at St. Paul on the irreverent use of the Holy Name. In the course of his remarks the distinguished prelate said:

"'Thou shalt not take the name of God in vain,' said the law-giver of Sinai. The name symbolizes the being; it brings him present to the senses. 'How admirable thy name, O Lord!' 'At the name of Jesus every knee shall bend of those that are in heaven, on earth and under the earth.' And yet the mystery of human conduct. There are believing Christians who bandy to and fro in frolic and contempt the holy names, God and Jesus. There are these who, seeking through the range of the vocabulary words vile enough to evidence the anger of their uncontrolled temper, or the contempt for man or beast offending them, choose—O heavens, be amazed!—O Lord and Saviour, how wondrous the divine patience!—the holiest and sweetest of names, God and Jesus. That the unbeliever should outrage these names, I could not understand, for they recall even to him aspirations grand and ennobling; but how understand that Christians profane them—Christians, whose faith bids them confide in an ever-present God, whose hopes lie at the foot of the cross of Jesus, dying for souls, who know that at their entrance into eternity they shall be confronted by the great Judge, passing sentence upon all thoughts, words and deeds of earthly existence!

BASEST INGRATITUDE.

"I need not say that profaning the holy names is ungentlemanly, boorish, the act of a besotted mind and a callous heart; but I will repeat, it is sinful before the Most High; it is basest ingratitude in presence of Divine love.

"I do not pause to explain the deep malice of perjury. Perjury is the invocation to God to attest as truthful the false saying upon human lips. It is an awful sin. For God is essentially truth, and to connect Him with falsehood is the deepest of injury to His being and majesty. All laws, divine and human, condemn perjury: earth and heaven hold it in abomination. But I would speak of this oath-taking, unceremonious in form, irreverent in tone and manner, which reveals a soul verging upon impiety, or utterly oblivious of God's majesty. The taking of an oath is a solemn invocation to the Deity. The more sacred formula is: 'So help me God.' When the wording is simply, 'I so swear,' all men understand that the import of the words is the same.

HEEDLESS OATH-TAKING.

"How heedless of respect the administration of oaths, the taking of oaths! How hurried the speaking! How quick and commonplace the motion of the hand! Not in this manner do we address fellow-men whom we respect. Have we no respect for Almighty God? I think that when this irreverent oath-taking is not an evidence of existing irreligion, it leads rapidly thither.

"Men in position upon whom the administration of oaths devolves, should see that God be not despised; that the most solemn pledge of human veracity, the most binding social force in human communings, be not shorn of due sacredness and power. Where an oath is administered God is present, the ground upon which we tread is holy and the air we breathe is perfumed with heavenly saintliness.

"Honor to whom honor is due. To God be honor supreme and love most generous."

The Great Destroyer.

Henry W. Grady, in a speech at Atlanta, Ga., said of intemperance:

"To-night it enters an humble home to strike the roses from a woman's cheek, and to-morrow it challenges this republic in the halls of Congress. To-day it strikes a crust from the lips of a starving child, and to-morrow levies tribute from the Government itself. There is no cottage in this city humble enough to shut it out. It defies the law when it cannot coerce suffrage. It is the mortal enemy of peace and order, the despoiler of men and terror of women, the cloud that shadows the face of children, the demon that has dug more graves and sent more souls unshrived to judgment than all the pestilences that have wasted life since God sent the plagues to Egypt, and all the wars since Joshua stood beyond Jericho. It comes to ruin, and it shall profit mainly by the ruin of your sons and mine. It comes to mislead human souls and to crush human hearts under its rumbling wheels. It comes to bring gray-haired mothers down in shame and sorrow to their graves. It comes to drive the wife's love into despair and pride into shame. It comes to still the laughter on the lips of the little children. It comes to still all the music of the home, and fill it with silence and desolation. It comes to ruin your body and mind, to wreck your home, and it knows it must measure its prosperity by the swiftness and certainty with which it wrecks this world."