

The Catholic Record.

"CHRISTIANUS MIHI NOMEN EST, CATHOLICUS VERO COGNOMEN."—"CHRISTIAN IS MY NAME, BUT CATHOLIC MY SURNAME."—St. Pacian, 4th Century.

VOLUME 8.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1886.

NO. 414.

NICHOLAS WILSON & CO
136 Dundas Street,
Tailors and Gents' Furnishers.
FINE AND MEDIUM WOOLLENS A SPECIALTY.

INSPECTION INVITED.

Three Graves.

How did he live, this dead man here,
With the temple above his grave?
He lived as a great one, his cradle to his
He was nursed in luxury, trained in pride,
When the wish was born, it was gratified;
For the day was too short for his vigor's
He gave.
The common man was to him a clod
From whom he was far as a demigod.
His duties? To see that his rents were
paid?
His pleasure? To know that the crowd
obeyed.
His pain? If you felt it, throbb'd apart,
With a separate stroke from the people's
But when did he love, and whom did he
bless?
Was there one of him more than a man's or
less?
I know not. He died. There was none to
blame,
And as few to weep; but these marble came
For the temple that rose to preserve his
name!

How did he live, that other dead man,
From the graves apart and alone?
As a great one too? Yes, this was one
Who lived to labor and study and plan.
The earth's deep thought he loved to reveal;
He banded the breast of the land with steel;
He filled the cities with wheels and smoke,
And workers by day and workers at night,
For the day was too short for his vigor's
right.
Too firm was he to be feeling and giving;
For labor, for gain, was a life worth living.
He worshipp'd industry, dreamt of her,
Sighed for her,
Potent his grew by her, famous he died for
her.
They say he improved the world in his time,
That his mills and mines were a work sub-
lime.
When he died the laborers rested, and
sighed;
Which was it—because he had lived, or
died?

And how did he live, that dead man there,
In the country churchyard late?
O, he? He came for the sweet and field air;
He was tired of the town, and he took no
pride
In its fashion or fame. He returned and
died
In the place he loved, where a child he
played,
With those who have knelt by his grave and
prayed.

He ruled no serfs, and he knew no pride;
He was one with the workers side by side;
He had a mill, and a mine, and a field, and
a town,
For their lot was his, and his was their
own.
He could never believe that a man was made
For nobler end than the glory of trade,
For the youth he snatched with an endless
love,
Who were cast like snow on the streets of
the city.
He would not, maybe; but he lost no friend;
Who loved him in once, loved on to the end.
He married all well, and he loved his
dear,
But he never injured a weak one—never.
When a cure was passed, he was kindly
dumb
He was never so wise but a fault would
come.
He was never so old that he failed to enjoy
The games and the dainties he had loved
when a boy.
He erred, and was sorry, but he never drew
his hand back from the truth.
When friends look back from the years that
go,
God grant they may say such things of me.
JOHN BOYLE O'REILLY.
Boston Pilot.

THE IRISH QUESTION

Right Hon. Mr. Gladstone's
Glorious Glad.

THE GRAND OLD MAN STILL TRUE
TO BRITISH HONOR AND IRISH
FREEDOM.

He Demolishes the Foe by Unanswer-
able Argument.

THE LESSONS OF THE ELECTION.

The satisfactory adjustment of the
Irish question will now, I apprehend, be
the supreme object of every member of
the Liberal party who has embraced its
prevailing sentiment at the present crisis.
I shall, therefore, principally seek to
draw attention to the bearings of the late
election on that question.
But I will first endeavor to dispose of
an important, though secondary point.
Every Liberal politician will feel a reason-
able anxiety to estimate aright both the
immediate effects of the election upon his
party, and the lessons which it teaches
as to the real strength and eventual pros-
pects of that party; inasmuch as it and
no other, has been, during the last half
century, the principal feeder of the politi-
cal thought of the nation, and the main
organ of its activity. In the remarks
which follow, I intend no sort of re-
proach.

It has this year, unhappily, been
divided throughout Great Britain into a
main body, and a seceding or dissentient
wing, of which the energy has of neces-
sity been developed in directly opposing
the candidates who belonged to the main
body of the party, on the ground of the
paramount importance attaching to the
Irish question. The result has, of course,
for the party, been disastrous, as a very
large share of its energies have been
spent in a suicidal conflict. Out of 292
contests in Great Britain, no less than 114
have been fought between candidates pro-
fessedly Liberal. Every one of these
was for a seat which was essentially Lib-
eral. The result, therefore, does not ex-
hibit nominally a deduction from the total
roll of the party. But there have been,
also contests between Liberals or Dis-
sentient Liberals and Tories. Where
Tory and Dissentient have fought, the
Dissentient has probably suffered from
inability to marshal the full Liberal force.

In the far more numerous cases, where
Tory and Liberal have fought, the Liberal
has commonly suffered from the defection
of all the Dissentients; most of these ab-
staining from the poll, but some, in con-

formity with the advice of Lord Harting-
ton, and, I think of Mr. Chamberlain,
actually transferring their votes to the
Tory Candidate.

The Liberal party as a whole has been,
since the Reform Act, the stronger of the
two parties in the constituencies. The
measure of its preponderance has sensibly
increased with the extension of the fran-
chise. From 1834 to 1868, the Tory party
was rarely under, and frequently
over, 300 strong. In 1841 it gained a
majority of eighty in straight fighting.
Since the establishment of household suf-
frage in the towns, it has never had a
majority; except in 1874, when the Home
Rule party, finally breaking away from
the Liberals with whom they most com-
monly had counted, took definite form as
a separate section of the House of Com-
mons. The majority of Tories, over
Liberals alone, then amounted to fifty-
nine; and it was known to be due partly
to class interests, cultivated of late years
so assiduously by the Tories, but mainly
to discontent, and consequent slackness
and abstention in the Liberal ranks. In
1868, 1880 and 1885, the Tory strength
never approached three hundred, but fell
much below its old standard. The Lib-
eral strength, on the other hand, in the
Parliament, averaged nearly one hun-
dred. On the whole it might probably
be a fair though a rough statement of the
comparative strength of the two parties
in the country, if we were to set down
the Liberals as represented, on the aver-
age, by four-sevenths, and the Tories by
three-sevenths of the electoral body.

What, then, was the less of Liberal
strength at the late election in consequence
of the schism? The test previously sup-
plied by voting in the House of Commons
is definite so far as it goes. Two hundred
and twenty-eight Liberals voted for the
Irish Government Bill, and ninety-three
against it. This test exhibits the strength
of the schism as greatly exceeding one-
fourth of the whole. It very slightly ex-
ceeds two-sevenths, at which I take it for
present purposes.

It is distributed, however, with very
great inequality among classes. It has
hitherto commanded, I fear, not less than
five-sixths of the Liberal Peers. If we go
to the Liberal working men, I do not
believe it has touched a fraction higher
than one-twentieth. But I now refer to
independent working men. If we take
the portion of the Liberal party through-
out the country, composed of those who
may be termed employers, or who are
socially in a position to draw with them
the votes of others, it would, I fear, be a
moderate computation to conjecture that
fourth of the important and leading section
of Liberals, four-fifths at least, were num-
bered among the Dissentients; and these
drew with them large numbers of de-
pendent, though, I doubt not, as a rule
perfectly willing voters.

Again the strength of the schism was
unequally distributed, as is that of the
party, in constituencies as well as classes.
In very many constituencies Liberal and
Tory strength are nearly balanced. In
these a deduction of one-fifth, or one-
tenth, or even less, from the normal
strength, transfers the seat as matter of
course. It is impossible to estimate with
precision the loss of Liberal strength
through the schism; but it must have
been greater than either of these fractions
would represent. In this ruinous state
of facts the results have been as follows:
The party, as a whole, has been reduced
from 333 in the last Parliament to 269,
or by less than one-fifth. The Liberals of
the main body have reduced from about
235 to 196, or about one-sixth. The
smallness of the aggregate poll as com-
pared with 1885, even on the Conserva-
tive side, is worthy of notice, and appears
to show that a fraction of the electors,
not inconsiderable, still holds its judgment
in suspense.

Again the total poll in Great Britain
was—

For Liberals..... 1,344,000
For Dissentient Liberals..... 379,000
For Tories..... 1,041,000
For Tories and Dissentients..... 1,420,000

Thus the Liberals of the main body
came within 76,000, or only four per
cent of the united strength of the Tories
and the schism. Considering that the
aggregate party had suffered a loss which
cannot be taken at less than twenty or
thirty per cent, this is a remarkable re-
sult.

Now is there any obvious levity or pre-
sumption in saying that, to all appear-
ances at the first moment when Liberalism
is again united, it must again become predom-
inant in Parliament. But our anticipations
of its real strength in the future grow
more and more confident when we con-
sider how much it is that Toryism, under
circumstances of unprecedented advan-
tage, has been able to achieve. It now
takes 316 members of Parliament.
That is to say, as against the rest of the
House, it is in a minority of thirty-eight;
and it is less by nineteen than the Liberal
numbers returned to the last Parliament.
It has failed to win from our shattered
and disunited party the same moderate
amount of success which we obtained
against it in November last, when it had
the important accidental advantage of the
Irish vote. If, with that advantage, it
hardly touched the number of 250, and if
it cannot obtain a majority of the House
when Liberalism is divided against itself
in a manner unknown for nearly a cen-
tury, the inevitable inference, not de-
monstrable but very highly probable,
seems to be that Toryism can never by
its own resources win, under the existing
laws, a majority of the House of Com-
mons, unless and until the tendencies and
temper of the British nation shall have
undergone some novel and considerable
change.

II.—THE LESSONS OF THE ELECTION AS
THEY REGARD IRELAND.

There is nothing in the recent defeat to
abate the hopes or to modify the anti-
cipations of those who desire to meet the
wants and wishes of Ireland.
Let us look first at the result of the

election as it is exhibited in the total
return of members to the House of Com-
mons.

The Liberal and the Irish supporters of
the policy of the late Government, taken
together, amount to 280. The opponents
of that policy are 390, showing a majority
of 110—a large number without doubt.
It has been bravely stated by the Prime
Minister that this is an irrevocable ver-
dict. It is certainly a verdict without any in-
stant appeal. But the authority which
gives such verdicts has power to revoke
them, and is in the practice of revoking
them; and, moreover, has seen and may
see them disobeyed by the representatives
whom it has empowered not merely or
mainly to repeat a formula, but to delib-
erate upon and to follow the exigencies
of public affairs.

In order to estimate truly the value of
such majorities, let us refer to recent his-
tory; bearing in mind especially that the
session of 1886 was the first and only
session in which the adoption of the
policy was clearly and unequivocally de-
manded by the Irish nation, and the first
and only session, also, in which it had
the support of a British party or a British
ministry.

In 1841 the election turned mainly on
the Corn Law. The proposal to repeal it
had been, since the Reform Act of 1832,
frequently, and of late almost annually,
debated; and the country had had unusual
opportunities of mastering the question,
through the energetic action of the anti-
Corn Law League. Nevertheless, the
people returned in 1841 a Parliament
which by a majority of ninety-one op-
posed the Corn Law. And, considering
that many Whigs, who would not join in
rejecting the Whig Government were
friendly to the Corn Law, we may state
without apprehension that the majority
returned to support that law in 1841
was even larger than that now returned
in 1886, to oppose the Irish policy of the
late Government.

Yet this very Parliament of 1841, by a
majority of 98, repealed the Corn Law in
1846.

There are many elements, beside that
of number, which go to determine the
prospects of an opinion or a policy. A
policy which is affirmative, which is de-
finite, which is complete, which rallies its
adherents on one and the same ground,
has standing advantages over a combina-
tion which agrees only in negotiations,
whose ideas advance to day and recede to-
morrow, which proposes no definite settle-
ment, and waits upon the chapter of
accidents. Especially is it a mighty ad-
vantage to have a nation at our back;
for a nation never dies. In this case we
have more even than a nation. Few
indeed, so far as I know, of our oppo-
nents are bold enough to deny that we
have with us, in a degree hard to match,
the general opinion of the widely ex-
tended British race; not to say of the
civilized world beyond the confines of
England, isolated on this occasion alike
from her sisters and her children, from
her rivals and her allies.

At the outset of the American Civil
War, the friends to the abolition of
slavery were not even a party; there
were no more than a section or a group.
But, because they saw that time and
events must needs work with them, they
were content to abide their time. It
came, and came speedily. In two years
the irrevocable word of freedom was
spoken from the lips of authority. We
may well be content to abide our time;
for we see that time and events are
working, and must work, on our side.
Nor is this the only solace. What may
be termed the potential language, to
which hot and passionate tempers have
been occasionally treated, is now heard
no more. No longer is the idea of hold-
ing Ireland by force, illustrated by the
supposed parallel of an attempt to govern
by attachment, instead of by the popular
population of London. No more is the
proposal of self-government for Ireland
compared with a proposal of self-govern-
ment for Hottentots. No more is heard
the loud demand for measures of repres-
sion, which produced the policy named
by the present leader of the House of
Commons the policy of the 20th of
January. Yet the agrarian crimes re-
ported by the constabulary were (in-
clusive of threatening letters) in the 62
days of December and January, 1885; in the 61
days of June and July, 1884; and, while
in two years preceding there was but one
agrarian murder, in the twelve latest
months there have been ten.

What is weightier still, no more do we
hear of the famous twenty years, during
which Parliament was to grant special
powers for firm government in Ireland,
and at the end of which, in a larger or
less degree, coercive laws might be re-
pealed, and measures of local self-govern-
ment entertained.

It is, then, evident, even amidst the
shouts of victory, that the Tory adver-
saries of Ireland have had a severe, per-
haps an irreparable loss; they have lost
the courage of their opinions. On the
other hand, the Dissentient Liberals gen-
erally, and their leader, seem now to be
pledged to immediate and large concession;
many of them on such a scale that they
give to their idea the name of Home
Rule, declaring themselves favorable to
its principles, and only opposed to the
awkward and perverse manner in which
it was handled by the late Administration.
So that, while a large majority of the
present House was elected to oppose the
measures of the bygone Ministry, a much
less large, but still a decided majority, has
bound itself not less strongly to liberal
measures of self-government for Ireland.
The seceding Liberals, added to the main
body of the party and to the Nationalists,
make a total of not less than 354. Even
if the Ministerialists, some have declared
themselves favorable to large concession.
These professions of individuals might be
drowned in the strong stream of party
feeling. Without reckoning, then, on
any sort of Tory help, we seem to have

in this anti-Home Rule Parliament a real
majority ready to act in the direction her-
etofore least of Irish wishes, and to run the
risk of seeing the grant of a portion used as a
lever to obtain the residue.

So that, look at the question which
way we will, the cause of Irish self-gov-
ernment lives and moves, and can hardly
fall to receive more life and more pro-
motion, from the hands of those who
have been its successful opponents in one
of its particular forms. It will arise, as a
wounded warrior sometimes arises on the
field of battle, and stab the heart some
soldier of the victorious army, who has
been exulting over him.

So much for the case of Ireland within
the walls: it is full of hope and comfort.
When we go beyond the walls and con-
sider either the points of vantage gained,
or the general progress which has been
accomplished, it is yet more, and by far
more favorable.

Let us now take some account of the
results of the elections, as they are ex-
hibited, not in a gross total, but in differ-
ent quarters of the country.

The fact that Wales has been from the
first under an incorporating union, has
blinded us to the fact that there are,
within the United Kingdom, no less than
four nationalities. Of these four national-
ities, three have spoken for Irish
autonomy in a tone yet more decided
than the tone in which the fourth has
forbidden it. Scotland has approved our
Irish policy by three to two, Ireland her-
self by four and a half to one, and gallant
Wales by five to one. In the aggregate
they have returned more than 150 sup-
porters of the policy, and rather above
fifty against it; or three to one in its
favor.

In England I might dwell on some re-
markable exceptions to the prevailing
opinion, such as those of Yorkshire and
Northumberland; portions of the country
commonly supposed to be above, and not
below, the average in intelligence and
force of character. But for the present
purpose we must deal with England as a
whole, and we find that she has decided
against Ireland by returning 336 oppo-
nents of our Irish policy, against 129 who
support it.

This is not, then, a partnership of three
kingdoms, or of four nationalities, upon
equal terms. The vast preponderance in
strength of one among them enables her
to overbear the other three, and to re-
verse their combined judgment. The
case may be even carried a little further.
The minority adverse to Ireland in Scot-
land, Ireland and Wales, taken together,
is twenty-five per cent. of the whole.
The minority favorable to Ireland in the
English return, though a small minority,
reaches twenty-eight per cent. of the
whole. So, then, England speaking by
much less than three-fourths of her
whole number of members, can give
against Scotland, Ireland and Wales,
speaking conjointly by three-fourths of
their members, an absolute majority on
the aggregate return of no less than 110.
Let us illustrate the state of facts by a
supposed case. Whenever the people of
England think one way in the proportion
of two to one, they can outvote in Par-
liament the united force of Scotland,
Ireland and Wales, although they should
think the other way in the proportion of
five to one. And if England thinks one
way in the proportion of three to one,
she can outvote Scotland, Ireland and
Wales together, although they were each
and all to return the whole of their mem-
bers to vote against her. There are,
therefore, reasons of a very intelligible
kind why England should, at the first
blush take a favorable view of the advan-
tages of incorporating unions.

But the question of majority and
minority does not rule the whole case.
Ireland, with the minority of 280 in her
favor, and carrying out of that aggregate
minority large majorities in three out of
the four nationalities, stands far more
lilian she would stand were that minority
proportionately diffused in four, or even
in three of them: were our opponents
able to say that England, Scotland and
Wales were all against her.

The figures stand thus:

England has members . . . 465
Scotland . . . 72
Ireland . . . 103
Wales . . . 30

Case 1.— $\frac{1}{2}$ of 465 = 232
 $\frac{1}{6}$ of 205 = 34

But $\frac{1}{2}$ of 465 = 232
 $\frac{1}{6}$ of 205 = 34

Majority . . . 18

Case 2. 465—116 = 349
The rest of the House 321

Majority . . . 28

The recent contest has been fought upon
the question of nationality; upon the
title of Ireland to some recognition (in
Lord Carnarvon's phrase) of her national
loyalty, disclaims in the most emphatic
and binding way, by the mouth of its
authorized representatives, the idea of
separation. The opponent of Home Rule
might say, "I take you at your word: I
am convinced you do not mean Separation;
but I will show you that, by certain
consequences, this mischievous Bill in-
volves it." That I call the humane
method of argument.

Parliament is, and must probably always
be, an adjustment which does the full
justice to what is separate and specific
in their several populations. Scotland,
which for a century and a quarter after
her union was refused all taste of a real
representative system, may begin to feel
herself whether, if at the first she felt
something of an unreasoning antipathy,
she may not latterly have drifted into a
superstitious worship, and an irre-
flexive acquiescence. Of two things I feel
assured. First, whatever practical claims
either of these countries may make on
their own behalf will be entertained and
disposed of without stirring up the cruel
animosities, the unworthy appeals to sel-
fishness, the systematic misrepresentations,
which have told so fearfully against Ire-
land. And, secondly, that the desire for
Federation, in the minds of many, has
had an unexpected ally in the Irish
policy of 1885, and that, if the thing,
which that term implies, contains within
itself possibilities of practical good, the
chance of bringing such possibilities to
bear fruit has been unexpectedly and
largely improved.

Let it not, however, be supposed for a
moment that England is to be regarded as
hostile to the claims of Ireland. What
we have before us is not really a refusal;
it is only a slower acknowledgment.
Whatever efforts may have been made
by individuals to bring the national mind
to the election of 1885 to a perception of
what was coming, it must be remembered
that a powerful party had at that time,
on account of the Irish vote, the very
strongest reasons for keeping the Irish
question out of view, and that they set up
other cries, such as the "Church of dan-
ger," which were known and familiar,
and which drew away attention from
what was real to what was imaginary. So
it is no great wonder or offence, if, when
the subject was novel, and when the
most powerful and best organized classes
in the country were resolutely bent on
arguments which darkened all its bear-
ings, it should have remained a little ob-
scure. But mark the progress that has
been made. A subject which, twelve
months ago, was almost as foreign to the
British mind as the differential calculus,
has been inscribed among the chief lessons
of all liberal teaching in every town and
county of the land, and is everywhere
supported by a large body of persons with
a warmth and earnestness equal to any
that is felt for any of the dearest and
the most familiar aims of public policy.

All the currents of the political atmos-
phere as between the two islands have
been cleaned and sweetened; for Ireland
now knows, what she has never, even
under her defeat, known before, that a
deeper rift of division runs all through the
English nation in her favor; that there
is not throughout the land a district, a
parish, or a village where there are not
hearts beating in unison with her heart,
and minds earnestly bent on the acknow-
ledgment and permanent establishment
of her claims to national existence.

She knows also that many, if not most,
of her adversaries have paid the highest
compliment to her claim for the adoption
of the measure of 1885, in adopting it.
It is to be presumed as a political neces-
sity, that the method of systematically misstat-
ing it. Because they conceive it to tend
to separation, they describe it as being in
itsself separation. Because they think it
would bring about a repeal of the union,
they describe it as being a repeal of the
union. That is, by reason of what they
think (most erroneously) that it would
produce, they habitually describe it
as being that which they know it not to
be. It is just as in an arithmetical sum;
the misstatement of the terms of the
problem, of course, if not detected, makes
the problem hopeless. It is without exam-
ple, so far as I know, in the political con-
troversies of the last half century. It estab-
lishes a precedent which may, with some
justification, be used hereafter against
its authors. It is a practice analogous to
hitting foul in pugilism, or using weapons
in war, which are prohibited by the laws
of war. It constitutes a proof of the
weakness in argument of a cause, driven
to supply by prohibited means its poverty
in legitimate resource.

Apart from this grave aspect of the case,
there is not something beyond the ordi-
nary licence of controversy in charging
upon the Irish people the idea and inten-
tion of Separation, in connection with
the present subject?

As the adversary believes the measure
involves by way of consequence the sepa-
ration of the countries, he is entirely
justified in pressing his argument; but he
should surely press it in the right way.
There are two methods of conducting
the argument, either of which it has been
open to him to follow, and which I will
call respectively the humane and the savage
method.

The Irish nation, while it is recovering
from its very natural estrangement, and
learning with a good heart the accents of
loyalty, disclaims in the most emphatic
and binding way, by the mouth of its
authorized representatives, the idea of
separation. The opponent of Home Rule
might say, "I take you at your word: I
am convinced you do not mean Separation;
but I will show you that, by certain
consequences, this mischievous Bill in-
volves it." That I call the humane
method of argument.

But the method generally adopted has
been to say, "You disclaim Separation,
but I do not believe you; and so I call
you, and all who aid and abet you, Separ-
ators." Is it too much to call this the
savage method?

At least it may be held that, when we
begin by giving the lie, there ought to be
in the essence of the thing that we impute
something of a nature to render our im-
putation probable. Is this the case with
Separation? What is there in Separation
that would tend to make it advance ge-
nerally to Ireland?

As a island with many hundreds of
miles of coast, with a weak marine, and
a people far more military than nautical in
its habits, of small population, and limited
overwhelming proportion as the present

in her present resources, why should she
expose herself to the risks of invasion and
to the certainty of enormous cost in the
creation and maintenance of a
navy for her defence, rather than
remain under the shield of the greatest
maritime Power in the world, bound by
every consideration of honour and of in-
terest to guard her? Why should she be
supposed desirous to forego the advantage
of an absolute community of trade with
the greatest among all commercial coun-
tries, to become an alien to the market
which consumes (say) nine-tenths of her
produce, and instead of using the broad
and universal paths of enterprise now
open to her, to carve out for herself new and
narrow ways as a third-rate State? Why,
when her children have now, man by man,
the free run of the vast British Empire,
upon terms absolutely equal with every
native of Great Britain, should she be
deemed so blind as to intend cutting them
away from the greatest of all the marts
in the world for human enterprise, energy
and talent, and to doom them to be
strangers among nearly three hundred
million men, with whom they have now
a common citizenship? Why is she to be
inserted into all the indications of nature
herself has given of the destiny of Ireland
to be our partner in weal and woe, and
why should she be ready to enter upon a
desperate contest of strength with a people
of six times her number, of twelve times
her wealth, inferior to her in no single
element of courage or tenacity? This
people, to whom even justice itself has
never yet enabled her to offer an effective
military resistance, are now to be fright-
ened out of their property lest Ireland
should offer them violence, to tear her-
self away, unattracted to any foreign center
(for there is none), unwarmed by sympathy
beyond her shores (for she would have
none), unaided by Heaven, and quarrelling
suicidally with all that could minister
to her material or her political welfare?
No; the truth is, and history proves it,
England has been strong enough to be,
even through a course of generations, un-
just to Ireland; and now it is not want
of strength that will put a stop to such
injustice, but her better will,
her better knowledge, the action
of the nation substituted for the
action of the few, and an improved and
improving moral sense in public affairs.
What reason does indicate, history
proves; for never did Separation become a
substantive idea in Ireland, until the one
unhappy period when the warlike instincts
of France coincided with that infatuation
of the British Government, which in-
land raised tyranny and sanguinary
oppression, as well as the basest corrup-
tion, to their climax. Only superlative iniquity
led Ireland even for a moment to dream
of separating. Even then, the remedy
would have been worse than the disease.
None but the few fanatics of crime dream
now of such a thing, and they, who im-
pute it to the Irish nation, treat it as a
nation made up of men who are at once
and equally traitors, knaves, and fools.

III.—PURCHASE AND SALE OF LAND IN
IRELAND.

I do not propose to examine in detail
the causes of the signal defeat, which the
Irish policy of the late Government
has met with at the polls of Eng-
land, or rather of the middle and southern
parts of England. But, in my opinion,
the chief among those causes is not to be
found in chimerical fears of Separation,
or in aversion to the grant of self-govern-
ment to Ireland as a whole, or even in
want of time to understand the principles
and bearings of our measures. The most
powerful agent in bringing about this
result was, in my judgment, aversion to
the Bill for the Purchase and Sale of Land
in Ireland.

This aversion grew out of misapprehen-
sion, which was itself founded on (what I
think) misrepresentations, such as the
complexity of the subject, or the impos-
sibility of its removal. But, however ille-
gitimate may have been the means em-
ployed, the result is not to be denied, and
has to be taken into practical account.
The gigantic bribe which was detected in
an offer to pay to Irish landowners what
Parliament might deem to be the fair
market value of their rented lands; the
attempt to combine a large equity with
policy in an employment of British credit
warranted by such high calls, and in its
pecuniary results absolutely safe; the
daring attempt we made to carry to the
very utmost our service to the man
whom we knew to be as a class the bitter-
est and most implacable of our political
adversaries, by declaring our two Bills to
be, in our own mind, and for the exist-
ing juncture, inseparable; all these have
been swept ruthlessly off the field of
present action by the national verdict.
Not merely the verdict expressed by the
English majority; for the sentiment is
shared by many of the staunch supporters
of Irish autonomy, and has not been
hitherto repudiated by the Nationalists of
Ireland, who had given a somewhat
reluctant assent to proposals entailing so
heavy a liability on the whole public
sources of their country.

The two Bills, for the government of
Ireland and for the Purchase and Sale of
Land have been used at the Election to
destroy one another. The Land Bill had
many friends, chiefly among Tories and
Dissentient Liberals. But their love of
the Land Bill was not so strong as their
aversion to Home Rule, and they allowed
it to be pierced with a thousand gashes,
in order that through it the sinister mea-
sure of Home Rule might be witnessed. On
the other hand, the mass of the Liberals
throughout the country were fully pre-
pared for the grant of Irish autonomy,
but were in many cases adverse to the ill-
understood measure for the Purchase and
Sale of land, which they were taught to
believe could, under no circumstances, be
severed from it. Hence many a seat was
given to the Tories by Liberal abstentions,
and not a few to Liberal Dissentients, by
those who acquiesced in the destruction
of the one Bill for the sake of securing
the destruction of the other. So, then,
this Siamese twinship of the Bills, put to