

dia

ed. We should be inclined to Mr. Rees' suggestion that a might be made with each but it is not without good excellent chapter, perhaps the is that upon social reform, wisdom, and is marked by for the Indian peoples, manifestly possesses in com-Anglo-Indians who, while spurious virtues, decline to h fulsome adulation. We Mr. Rees in his contention of Indian women need not be ercourse between the two ne may theorize, there will remain a barrier so long as a privilege which their cus- a from conceding in return, the foreign affairs of India, a powerful argument in fa- ure of money in the develop- erests on the shores of the atter of some urgency just that if we are willing to ex- dizing Afghanistan and mak- al and elsewhere, and sup- and ungrateful tribesmen, we ate about incurring some out- that is a very pertinent and tion.

ling concisely with such a there are naturally one or ular name for the wilder- ess is still the "Extremists," nals," as they would like n Mr. Rees says that inter- n and children in factories "is without materially assist- is intended to advantage," has studied the evidence re- e the factory commission in the children working in Cal- m six to nine years old and er fourteen are working as ne intervention is plainly ne- ment that Lord Curzon "acu- larity among the educated Bengal" in consequence of opals is presumably a mis- a few other minor blemishes, dency to repetition of state- ver, seriously detract from important and timely contri- ledge of current Indian af- is essential to a proper un- present situation; for there that covers quite the same

ARMY DESTROYERS

agreement made early last wers in the southern Illinois topped killing non-poisonous ear the wisdom of the agree- Heretofore melon planters elds devastated—in a single hich burrowed into the hills, seed. It was decided to check by not killing snakes, e are seen.—Carmi corres- polis News.

DICE AGAINST OVER-COATS

grandmother looked at me when I approached her clad coat, and I'll never forget the me for having one," said Louis.

no sensible man would dominy of an overcoat and wearing one was to reduce diness that comes of battling r. She pointed to the fine esman with whom she had a lance, the Hon. Hannibal vice-president of the United bln, who in his whole career, no matter how low the mer-Baltimore American.

SLIDING IN BED

which is a condition where powers differ in the different eye, is in most cases heredit- acquired. The error of ism often takes place during illness, and can be avoided tions. The whole system is condition, and the person so onfined to the house, will re- pass away the time, and this while in a reclining position, hing more injurious than this

er these conditions overbur- s, and the action of these e form of the eye causes an the curvature of the cornea as astigmatism. This is detri- vision and makes reading difficult.—Health.

rk World, after conducting an nounces that Gotham women zy.

Merrill, of East Eddington, ted herself for ten years and ys through college by making real goose down and selling ngland.



MR. BALFOUR, during the Home Rule debate in the British House of Commons on March 30, delivered the following speech:

The right hon. gentleman who has just sat down expended the greater part of his speech in expounding to the House two flagrant instances of English misgovernment in Ireland. The first related to the Irish system of land tenure, under which, as everybody knows, it has been customary for the tenant to make the improvements—not a good system in my opinion, but a system which we on this side of the House—the party to which I belong, the government of which I was a member—have done, not only something to remedy, but everything to remedy. (Cheers.) What was tinkered at before by Radical governments and Conservative governments in the way of land purchase has been finally and conclusively settled by the Land Purchase Act passed by my right hon. friend the member for Dover, and what can be the relevance of a system of land tenure in Ireland which is remedied by legislation passed by this House to an argument which discusses whether this House is capable of dealing with Irish problems utterly passes my comprehension. (Cheers.) But I go further, and I ask—How, if Home Rule had passed either in 1886 or 1893, could the land question have been settled? If it has been settled now, or if it is in the way of being settled now by the use of British credit and British capital—and does the right hon. gentleman suppose that after his ideal is carried into effect, and there is in Dublin an independent parliament with an executive responsible to it, it is likely that a British House of Parliament, which has nothing whatever to do with Ireland except occasionally to coerce the representatives of Ireland in the management of Irish affairs? (that, understand, is the theory)—how they would have dealt with the Irish land problem on just and sound lines without British credit behind them passes my comprehension, and the right hon. gentleman forgot in the course of his speech to explain it. (Cheers.)

The Irish Council Bill

His other illustration, if he will allow me to say so, was, if possible, more unfortunate. He told us that he had driven many hundreds of miles on an outside car through Ireland—I am sure enjoying the lovely scenery and the kindly hospitality of its inhabitants (hear, hear)—but he said he had discovered in the course of his investigations that there were no less than 67 boards in Ireland.

Mr. Ellis said he took the 67 boards from Lord Dunraven's book. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. Balfour—I beg pardon. That was not discovered in the outside car. But the right hon. gentleman cannot have been in this House when the Chief Secretary for Ireland spoke this evening. The Chief Secretary for Ireland made a very interesting speech, to which I shall refer later, and in the course of that speech he had a long and interesting parenthesis, in which he re-made the speech which, by his own account, he ought to have made when he brought in the Irish Council Bill last year. (Cheers.) He indicated to the House that he, like the right hon. gentleman, had been misled by Lord Dunraven in his book. He did not mention the name or the source, but he did mention the 67 boards, and he said it was a very unfortunate argument to have used. He felt he had weakened his case by it, because these 67 boards were now quite an illusory argument, and the whole justification of the abortive bill of last year did not depend upon 67 boards, but, I think, upon six—a percentage of diminution which my powers of mental arithmetic are unable at the moment to calculate (laughter), but which the right hon. gentleman himself will admit is very large. So much for the two instances that the right hon. gentleman mentioned.

A Survey of the Debate

If I go back, leaving the right hon. gentleman's speech, to a general survey of the debate, I have one or two general observations to make. The first is this, that it is clearly impossible to discuss the merits of Home Rule in the course of a debate which begins at 4 o'clock and ends, let us say, at half-past 11. I remember on the second reading of Mr. Gladstone's bill of 1893 we took a fortnight; and though in those days, as in these, there was occasional repetition in argument (laughter), still I am not making an extravagant statement when I say that it is impossible for any speaker, whatever his powers of compression may be, to deal, within the limits prescribed by the conditions under which we are discussing this question, with so vast a theme in any adequate fashion. The second observation I have to make, or the second question I put to myself, is whether we are engaged in a serious discussion at all? (Cheers.) I confess that when I heard the hon. and learned gentleman who initiated the debate make his speech, I felt, as I have always felt when he speaks to us, that he has strong convictions on this matter which he is as capable as any man in this House of expressing eloquently and effectively. But then, when I heard the reply of the Chief Secretary, I did not know whether I was assisting at a pre-arranged comedy (cheers) between the government and their friends on that side and their consistent and faithful supporters below the gangway, and whether, in fact, this was not a mere attempt to make the outside public believe that the Irish Nationalist members were as interested as ever in the question of Home Rule,

but that hon. gentlemen opposite were not to be driven into any unpleasant corner or compelled to make any unpleasant declarations, but were to have the same latitude of interpretation of their Home Rule declarations as they had enjoyed in the past. (Cheers.)

Mr. Redmond's Arguments

I had intended speaking on the merits, but—cries of "Go on!"—then you bring it on yourselves (laughter), and, if I am to survey, even in the briefest fashion, the merits of the question, I must ask the indulgence of the House, though I shall not really travel outside the limits of today's debate. What said the leader of the Irish party? He gave his version of the arguments that had been used in favor of Home Rule, and said, "The whole situation is altered. There may have been strong arguments against Home Rule in 1886 and in 1893, but those arguments, which may have been strong then, have been destroyed since, and destroyed by the action of a Unionist government." What were his two arguments? The first was that you required to do justice in the matter of land. You had to do justice to Irish landlords as well as Irish tenants, and if Home Rule had been passed in 1886 or 1893 justice would not have been done. Justice will now be done because the Land Act of 1903 has been passed, and that question is in the way of solution. I am proud to be a member of the government which passed that act (hear, hear); but, when it is suggested that it is inconsistent with Unionist policy, let me say that I had been an ardent advocate for years of that policy before I held office in this House at all. More than 20 years ago I seconded a resolution on the subject of land purchase when I was in opposition, and ever since then I have, in office and out of office, ardently advocated that policy, and it is absurd to say that we borrowed it from the hon. member for Waterford and his friends. I believe the public man whose name was most identified in early life with it was Mr. Bright; but, whatever may have been the small beginnings of that policy, all that has been done of a great and effectual character has been done by us, all the great steps have been taken by us, and they have been absolutely consistent with the whole theory of Unionist administration. The second argument used by the hon. and learned gentleman was that the opponents of Home Rule laid down the principle that Irishmen, qua Irishmen, were incapable of administering affairs, and that that argument had been entirely disposed of by the fact that a Unionist government gave a full measure of local administration to Irish county councils. Local government in Ireland, again, has always been a part of Unionist policy. (Ministerial cries of "Oh," and a Nationalist member—What did Lord Salisbury say at Newport?) He certainly said nothing inconsistent with that. Long before the Irish Local Government Act passed, I and my friends have always said that privileges of that kind which you gave to England must be given to Ireland. They were not given to England, remember, until a Unionist government gave them in 1888 (cheers); and, as soon as they were given to England, then, in my opinion, it became absolutely necessary, right, and just that the same privileges should be given to Ireland; and they were given, not when a Radical government came in, but when a Unionist government again took office in 1895. (Cheers.)

Who has ever suggested that an Irishman is incapable of dealing with government? (A Nationalist member—Lord Salisbury.) I beg pardon. He did nothing of the kind. You have only to see the parliamentary ability of hon. members below the gangway—an ability which I have experienced sometimes pleasantly and sometimes painfully, for the last 30 years—to know that Irishmen yield to no nation in the world in their parliamentary aptitudes. And I am delighted to learn what we have heard to-day—that the Irish county councils have shown great administrative ability, and have been a very creditable institution. As one of those who created that institution, am I expected to stand in a white sheet on that account? (Cheers.) No, sir, no one ever objected to Home Rule on the ground that Irishmen ever lacked the necessary ability to deal with questions of public policy, and no one suggested that the Irish county councils would fail in their duty except as far as they allowed their political prejudices to interfere. And I am afraid that, if the matter were inquired into impartially, it would be found that, so high does party feeling run in Ireland, and not on one side only, that you cannot count on county councils to appoint to places of emolument those best qualified to carry out the functions unless they share the political opinions of the majority. If that is the fact, surely it bears out the conclusion to which my noble friend, in his brilliant speech tonight, called attention—that if Ireland were left entirely to her own political resources she would be the scene of violent political faction fights in which the minority would fare very badly, the minority being in this case that section of the population which certainly has shown the greatest industrial aptitude. That is the only moral that can be drawn from the county councils; but surely it is enough.

The Impossibility of Home Rule

The members of this House, three-fourths of whom do not remember the old debates on this subject, absolutely underrate the practical difficulties that would arise in menacing power directly any one tries to formulate Home Rule. Most of the gentlemen whom I am addressing are new to this question. They have not had to

face the difficulties in their concrete shape in a bill. If they had they would see that such questions as those regarding the position of the Irish representatives and the relations of the two exchequers are questions so incapable of solution that by themselves they would make any government desiring to pass a practical bill shrink from the colossal task. (Cheers.) But behind all these questions, which may perhaps be regarded as questions of detail, there lies a far greater issue. I have heard the leader of the party and his friends constantly talk of the analogy between Ireland as they would wish to see it and a British self-governing colony. Sir, there is no analogy. (Cheers.) I remember an observation written 20 years before the Home Rule controversy began, in which the late Professor Freeman stated that there had been a vast number of cases in which a federal system had been created, but that in every case except one the federal system was an effort to draw together the parts of a great community which had become separated. It was a process of integration and not of disintegration. The one example he pointed to in the contrary sense was the case of the Germanic communities, which, in the early Middle Ages, were a relatively united nation, and which, through various historic stresses, gradually got broken up into semi-independent states. They had some kind of organic unity, but one which was ineffective, costly, and prolific of wars and friction—the very cause of all modern European difficulties. How has that process been reversed? Germany was united; it became disintegrated; it has been united again by blood and iron. And it is only by blood and iron, when this kind of disintegration has been allowed to proceed, that you can reunite elements which should never have been allowed to separate. (Cheers.)

The whole tendency of modern times is the creation of great States and communities. That is the process of integration. The whole of the relationship to our Colonies, whether this plan or that plan be good, is that every statesman and every party is desirous of producing a new state of things in which the union of the Colonies shall be closer. (Hear, hear.) If you give Home Rule to Ireland, a superficial observer may say that you are placing Ireland in a position like that of a colony. The true observer sees that you are reversing in the case of Ireland the very process which you are trying to carry out in every other part of the Empire. (Hear, hear.) Instead of aiming at the integration of the great British Empire you are doing something towards its disintegration; and as for telling me that there is any analogy between the case of Ireland—which is, at least, fully represented in a free Assembly—and the case of those communities beyond the sea, which some persons thought that we may have managed from Downing street without representative institutions of their own, I say that there is no analogy at all.

What is the Government Attitude?

But I do not feel that it is the merits of the question that are interesting tonight. What is really interesting tonight is not what we on these benches think. Every one knows what we think. (Cheers.) Nor is the interesting problem by what arguments we support our convictions, because it is an abstract resolution not having the force of a Bill, and we are brought in by a responsible government. The liberty to reserve our arguments until a Bill is really interesting and important; problem tonight is not what we think or why we think it, nor what the hon. members below the gangway think. We want to know what the government think. (Cheers.) The right hon. gentleman who preceded me said that he rejoiced in this resolution because it would clear the air. (Laughter.) Has it cleared the air? We have still to hear the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and no one is a greater master of clear exposition. He may make it clear; but has it been cleared so far? I listened to the characteristic speech of the Chief Secretary, and I do not think he pretended that he cleared the air. (Laughter and cheers.) I remember that he gave us a speech full of the most humorous obiter dicta on all sorts of questions—the late lamented Devolution Bill, the condition of Irish land purchase, and other pressing problems. But on the question of Home Rule he told us nothing about the attitude of the Government as a Government, or of the Radical party as a party. His nearest approach as far as I remember to a specific utterance was in words like these, "Speaking for myself," he said—not for his friends, nor for his followers; he did not say, "I am in favor of a parliament," but, "Speaking for myself, I am in favor of a Parliament which can give constant attention to Irish questions." (Laughter and cheers.) He illustrated that rather cryptic reference by saying what an embarrassment it was with regard to land purchase in Ireland. He said that there is a land purchase question which brings great confusion, that the act of 1903 was a great act, but in order to make it work you have a Parliament which is constantly devoting itself to subsidiary problems that necessarily come in its train.

British Credit

How is an Irish Parliament going to deal with land purchase in Ireland? Is land purchase going to be carried out by Irish money? Is it going to be carried out by British money? (Cheers.) And when the right hon. gentleman looks forward to a devolution of our responsibilities in the matter of land purchase to an Irish parliament, is he going to give the Irish parliament a free hand in dealing with Irish credit and British money? Are we to be ex-

cluded from any say in that matter, or is that to be the prerogative entirely of hon. gentlemen below the gangway? And if we who provide the money are to have something to say to the policy, how are we to be relieved by a dozen parliaments in Ireland? The truth is the right hon. gentleman neither in his speech to-night, nor in his speech on Thursday, nor, so far as I know, in any speech he has yet made, has dealt with any Irish question which does not require the use of English money. "If I could only get the money, there is nothing I would not do for Ireland," says the right hon. gentleman. "I have a great plan, a great reform. British money is required." How is that going to be cured by Home Rule, unless, indeed, as some cynics have suggested, Home Rule is another plan for gradually increasing at the general taxpayers' cost the expense of Irish government? (Laughter.) Otherwise how are these great reforms with British money to be carried out except by the British parliament? Clearly there is no conceivable method; and I could wish the right hon. gentleman, when dealing in his airy and delightful manner with the pressing problem of Irish government, had chosen questions as illustrating the necessity for Home Rule which do not so palpably involve the use or misuse of British credit. That is all we have as yet had from the government in the way of an expression of their convictions. I thought myself when I came down that Home Rule was a question which had been so thoroughly threshed out on two occasions by the British parliament that there was no argument one way or the other, no plan for dealing with the objections which had not been canvassed and re-canvassed a hundred times—in other words, that the problem of Irish Home Rule was no new question. Fiscal reform may be thought to be a new question in the last few years, but Home Rule is an old question upon which every argument has been thoroughly sifted. I should have thought every gentleman with this opportunity of estimating every argument would have formed a conclusion upon it. The Chief Secretary told us he was an eager Home Ruler, and ended by making an appeal to the Irish gentlemen below the gangway to deal frankly with the House and say what it was they wanted. (Cheers.)

Mr. Birrell—Not with the House, but with the electorate.

Mr. Balfour—I do not know that from this point of view we could distinguish between the two. Hon. gentlemen may feel that there is sometimes a distinction between the House and the electorate (cheers), but in this connection what distinction can there be? The right hon. gentleman appears to suppose that the hon. gentlemen below the gangway have been wanting in clearness. I have had many controversies with hon. gentlemen below the gangway, but on this subject they have been lucidly itself. (Laughter.) They have never left us in the smallest doubt as to what they wanted. There may be doubt as to what their requests, if granted, will ultimately lead to. That I think is extremely doubtful, and they are not masters of that situation. What they want, at all events for the present, has been made absolutely clear. It was made clear by Mr. Birrell; it has been made clear by each one of the gentlemen who have spoken with the authority of the Irish representation. When the Chief Secretary comes down and asks the Irish to deal frankly with the Radical party and tell them what they want, it does seem to me the most amazing part ever played by a responsible government to a section of their supporters. Remember the present occupants of the treasury bench are not in a position to say—We have promised not to deal with this question in the course of the present parliament; we do not know what is going to happen in the present parliament, and we must wait till the situation arises before we say what we shall do in the new circumstances. Some people may say that; they cannot. I remember when they occupied many nights in the two or three years that preceded the last general election in denouncing in every mood and tense, in every key, the iniquities of the then occupants of the treasury bench, because they did not produce a full-blown project of fiscal reform. (Cheers.) It was admitted on all hands that that parliament could not deal with the subject. That did not content them. They said—it is quite true you cannot deal with it, but you must tell us the plan on which you mean to go to the country. I do not know that that request was a very reasonable one, but at all events those who made it cannot object to our asking what they mean to go to the country on with regard to Home Rule. (Cheers.)

The Radical Party and Home Rule

Home Rule no doubt involves a prodigious revolution, but it is an old question, a question on which the Radical party made up their mind 22 years ago, and on which they showed that they had neither forgotten anything nor learned anything 15 years ago. They had all the debates of 1886 and 1892 of which they might chew the cud, and then the right hon. gentleman—

Mr. Birrell—I know what I mean. Mr. Balfour—The right hon. gentleman has been singularly unsuccessful in explaining it. (Cheers.) If he knew what he meant why did he appeal to hon. gentlemen below the gangway to tell him what they meant? Do they mean something different by Home Rule? Has Home Rule two meanings—a Radical meaning, which the right hon. gentleman represents, and an Irish meaning, which the member for Waterford represents? Are these two kinds of Home Rule? ("No.") If there is only one kind,

why did the right hon. gentleman appeal to the Irish party for instruction, information, and guidance? (Cheers.) The right hon. gentleman ended his speech by an appeal to what he called the long and honorable connection of his party with the Home Rule cause. The connection certainly has been long. It is not for me to say that it has been otherwise than honorable. (Laughter.) But let me ask exactly what it is. In the end of 1885 Mr. Gladstone came in with a not very big majority, a large number of whom were hostile to Home Rule, and attempted unsuccessfully to carry a Home Rule Bill. He repeated that experiment a few years later with a small majority under circumstances of extraordinary difficulty, with a courage and an ability which even those who differed from him most violently were glad to recognize. (Cheers.) Fifteen years of meditation passed and the Home Rule party came into power not with a divided majority as in 1885, not with a small majority as in 1892, but with the largest majority of which the history of the British parliament gives us the record; and these gentlemen, after their long and honorable connection (laughter) with the cause of Home Rule, believing, as they are going to say to-night when they vote for this resolution, that it is not only good for Ireland, but good for Scotland and for England; believing that it still stands as it did in 1886 and 1893 ("No, no"); Believing that it stands in the forefront not of a mere local reform admirable for Ireland, but indifferent to the other parts of the United Kingdom; believing, as they think that it is a reform intimately bound up with the prosperity of every part of the United Kingdom—these gentlemen have so contrived their business, have so contrived their electoral promises that they find the majority which perhaps alone could deal with this question evaporating before their eyes (cheers), vanishing before they are able to strike a single blow in favor of that cause with which they have been so long and so honorably connected. (Laughter.) I honestly think that the Chancellor of the Exchequer when he rises immediately to reply to me will put an end to this ambiguous position. If he elects to say—as he will be justified in saying—"I am a Home Ruler, I am in favor of that policy, I have spoken and voted for it, but I recognize that under modern conditions it cannot be carried out, and I therefore abandon it," no one could say that was either dishonorable or ambiguous. It may be statesmanlike; it may be right. If he elects to get up and say—"I am and always have been a Home Ruler, and when the general election comes I will not repeat the tactics of the last election—I will not set up all possible barriers between myself and this policy of Home Rule for England, Scotland or Ireland—I will make Home Rule the first constructive plank in our programme." (Loud cheers.) If he chooses to say that, that also is unambiguous; it is statesmanlike; it is clear, and we know where we are. But if he contents himself, like the Chief Secretary for Ireland, with a nebulous exposition of things in general and with his own personal connection with the cause, and without any statement of the policy of the party to which he belongs and of which at this moment he is in fact the leader, then he is open, not merely to the charge which he, with very little reason, was pleased to level against me in the last parliament on another question, but open to the charge that he is playing with a great issue and with a great cause—he is leading on his Irish followers below the gangway with false hopes and illusory expectations, and he is keeping open with all its attendant evils a great constitutional question which it is to the interests of the whole of the United Kingdom should soon be settled one way or the other. (Loud cheers.)

THE DUCHESS OF ARGYLL

A princess, unlike the woman not a princess, is without the means of hiding her age. Everybody knew, on Thursday last week, when a birthday of Princess Louise, Duchess of Argyll, was announced, that the truly wonderful lady had attained her sixtieth year. All one can say is that the fresh gift of juvenility remains hers with every celebration of the happy day. Indeed, I think the woman of sixty could hardly be pointed out whose step is as springy and whose smile is as insouciant as that of the Princess. Like Queen Alexandra she plays at middle-age, and retains something yet of girlishness. The late Queen entertained a great admiration for her daughter Louise, her pretty coloring and graceful figure, and always spoke of her as the beauty of the family. For her artistic talent she had respect, and in later years would often refer affectionately to "Louise's kindness and constant attentions to myself."

At Kensington Palace Her Royal Highness leads a pleasant life, and spends much time in her studio, which is built out in the garden at the back of the old palace, and is one of the most artistic and beautiful rooms in all London. In her early youth Princess Louise refused the hand of several suitors, and among them that of "Citron," Prince of Orange. Her marriage with the Duke of Argyll has brought her a good deal of happiness, and the artistic work accomplished in days quietly spent means a real satisfaction. The most distinguished of her efforts are the statue of the late Queen, which stands in front of the palace, and the memorial in St. Paul's cathedral to the colonial soldiers who fell in the Boer war. Some years ago her oil painting of Paderewski was much admired at the Royal Academy.—"Hebe," in The Gentlewoman.