

on large capitals and complicated machinery." It was therefore a primary object with our English neighbors to keep Ireland poor, and to deprive her of the means of accumulating capital. Of all conceivable measures, a legislative union was incomparably the best calculated to effect this purpose. It at once, and effectively, gave supreme control over Ireland to a power whose perpetual hostility is a matter of undeniable history. Of course, we did much to pull up our losses under Grattan's system of free trade and free constitution. But a union was required to put a stop to our progress, and to place us in as bad, or a worse condition than we had occupied prior to the Volunteer movement. It created a new drain of revenue. It trebled the absentee drain. It created a drain of another kind, and of vast magnitude—namely, money sent out to the country for the purchase of English manufactures, which obtained a monopoly of our domestic markets by the ruin of our own. There are other minor drains; but the three I have named amount in the seventy-four years of union, on a very moderate computation (£5,000,000 a year) to £370,000,000. And this large sum by no means represents the whole loss on those three heads, for money judiciously expended fructifies; so that Ireland has lost not only the money taken out of her, but the profits that would have accrued at home from its expenditure among us. It requires capital and skill to establish and profitably work any branch of manufacture. Capital consists of savings from income, and Irish income is swept off in such vast sums that it cannot accumulate into national capital. Then as to skill, it is surely needless to say that hereditary skill is destroyed by the destruction of the manufacture on which it has been employed. In 1785 an Irish master manufacturer (Mr. Brooke) had invested £80,000 in the Irish cotton trade, and employed a multitude of hands. In 1780, as we learn from the Castlerough correspondence, the cotton trade at Belfast, Balbriggan, Dublin and Cork employed great numbers, and Mr. Hamilton, of Balbriggan, then stated that it retained in Ireland £250,000 per annum. Mr. Clarke set up the cotton business at Palmerstown in the county Dublin, with a capital of £20,000, and the employment his establishment gave afforded support to 1,000 men, women and children. Where is now the Irish cotton trade? Or rather let us ask, to what extent would it not have been laid prostrate by the English competition to which the Union gave fatal facility. Now, any Irishman who oppose Home Rule, declares

himself in favor of the absentee drain, and of the exportation of our surplus revenue. He declares himself in favor of drains which have reached, on a moderate estimate, £370,000,000 since the Union was effected. We are often told that we, the Home Rulers, are visionaries, that we are not practical men, and that in pursuit of a sentimental object we neglect the practical avenues to national wealth. I deny it. I say we are practical men. I say there cannot be a more practical object than to recover the practical control of our national concerns.

Again, it is sought to enlist the religious prepossessions of one side or the other. I was personally attacked—indeed the Home Rule Association was attacked *in globo*, in a very disgraceful manner about this time twelve months in Dublin, as being enemies to the Catholic religion—to Catholic education—that we sought to set aside the sacred cause of Catholic education and substitute for it the Home Rule movement. The gentlemen who circulated that calumny against us knew very well that they were wrong, and that we never intended such a step. Protestant prepossessions were also sought to be excited against us. Terrible things were said about what the Protestants would have to endure if left to the mercy of their Roman Catholic countrymen. As another proof of his argument the speaker instanced the case of Rev. Denis O'Donoghue, of whom he spoke in glowing terms, who, during the Kerry election, notwithstanding the pressure that was brought to bear on him, supported the Protestant candidate against a Catholic candidate. He proceeded—That is another one of the multitude of proofs I could give, strongly demonstrating that there never was a body of men so perfectly willing to place all religionists in Ireland on a platform of equality, disregarding all sectarian prepossessions, as the Catholics of Ireland. The London *Spectator*, in an article on Mr. John George MacCarthy's capital answer to Mr. Freeman, recently called attention to this matter, and seems to patronize both these contending views, for it says that Home Rule would leave the English Catholics at the mercy of the Irish Catholics. As to the terrible perils the Irish Protestants have to apprehend from their Catholic countrymen, I need do no more than remind you of the awful predictions to this effect that preceded Catholic Emancipation. Catholics, it was said, would never vote for a Protestant Mayor or a Protestant member of Parliament; Catholic judges would never give a Protestant litigant fair play when opposed by a