The Indiana State Sentinel.

VOL. XXXII--NO. 19. INDIANAPOLIS, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 9, 1886. WHOLE NO. 1,629

MORE CABINET TALK.

Ex-Senator Davis Suggested as Mr. Manning's Successor.

Mr. Wheeler's Extended, But Not Delivered, Speech Arouses Mr. Kelly—Mr. Peddle Expects the Republicans to Get Beaten in New Jersey—General News.

Special to the Sentinel.

WASHINGTON, June 7.—While President Cleveland has been sojourning in the quiet nooks and shades of Deer Park, in the Alleghenies, he did not forget to take his books and accounts along for a rainy day. It was publicly announced by the cautious Dan Lamont that the President had given a pledge not to burden his mind with executive care while enjoying the rest and quiet of a few days with his new bride, but since his arrival in Deer Park his mind has been as much given to political thoughts as to his own happiness with his bride.

Near his cottage is the home of ex-Senator Henry G. Davis, who is likely to figure before long as a member of the President's Cabinet. The resignation of Mr. Manning as Secretary of the Treasury, which the President has not accepted for the present, has given rise to some speculation as to his successor. Mr. Davis is an old, shrewd, far-sighted politician who has amassed a fortune of many millions by lumber, coal and railroad transactions. He is an admirer of Mr. Cleveland, and is popular in the district in which he lives. For twelve years he was United States Senator, and already he has been talked of as the successor of Daniel Manning. This choice has been suggested to the President by not a few of the prominent men of the Democratic party. Among Mr. Davis' intimate friends are such men as Thurman, Stephenson, of Kentucky; Harrison, of Indiana; Bayard, Voorhees and Cameron. Mr. Davis has an excellent record in the Senate, though he lays no claim to leadership in debate. He is conversant with the business interests of the country, and is believed to be a suitable successor of Mr. Manning. His attack in 1876 upon the system of bookkeeping in the Treasury Department called forth the enmity of Republican and hearty endorsement of his brother Democratic Senators. By some it is urged that ex-Senator Davis is in league with the silver men, and that his appointment as Secretary of the Treasury would be a victory for the friends of silver.

M'DONALD IN THE CABINET.

Conjectures That He Will Succeed Garland as Attorney General.

Special to the Sentinel.

WASHINGTON, June 6.—The following is from to-day's Republic:

The arrival at the Riggs House Friday afternoon of ex-Senator Joseph E. McDonald and wife has a deep significance, and politically means much. A reporter of the Republic was at the Capital, yesterday, and gathered the opinions of many prominent Democrats regarding "Old Saddlebags'" visit just at this time. Said a Southern member, who is well-known for his political foresight: "I can tell you what McDonald is here for. It is to be measured for Attorney General Garland's seat. I understand that when the Pan-Electric Committee makes its report to the House, which, by the way, will be very soon, Garland will, after his vindication by the majority, tender his resignation to relieve the President of embarrassment arising from his presence in the Cabinet, and McDonald has a strong backing for the place. Beside, if you remember, he came mighty near capturing the nomination, and after Cleveland's election was urged for a Cabinet position."

Another report was that the President intended to ask McDonald to accept the Treasury portifolio during Manning's illness, and to relinquish it at any time Manning should declare himself able to fulfill the duties required.

Congressman Brown, of Ohio, said that on the Democratic side of the House, McDonald's visit was fully discussed and the opinion prevailed that he would succeed Garland.

THE APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Importance of Their Consideration and Passage Before July 1.

Special to the Sentinel.

WASHINGTON, June 6.—There will be another effort to bring up the legislative, judicial and executive bill to-morrow. The importance of an early passage of the bill is seen from the fact that if it is not considered and becomes a law before the 1st of July the appropriations for the next fiscal year will be the same as the present. As the bill contemplates a number of changes and many needed reforms, it is imperative that the bill should be passed by the House, that the State Department may take action upon the same and the President sign before the 1st of July.

Every member who is interested in a private bill of any kind will seek every opportunity to get up his bill, no matter what may become of the bills which are of the utmost importance.

The Pacific Railroads Committee hope to get Tuesday for the consideration of its bill, but Mr. Holman, who has in charge the appropriation bill, does not think there will be friends enough to take up the railroad bill against the appropriation bill, which will have the right of way, and nothing else can come up except by majority vote of the House. An early passage of the appropriation bills will mean an early adjournment, and that is what the Democratic leaders desire, while the Republicans want to prolong the session as far into the summer months as possible.

Judge Holman's Chances.

Special to the Sentinel.

WASHINGTON, June 6.—In Judge Holman's district there is already a majority of the delegates instructed for him which would indicate his nomination on the first ballot. It will take sixty-eight to nominate, while those instructed for Mr. Holman number almost 100.

WASHINGTON MISCELLANY.

Senator Hoar Informs a Constituent How He May Know Senator Blair.

Special to the Sentinel.

WASHINGTON, June 7.—Ever since Senator Blair accused Senator Hoar of unpardonable ignorance concerning certain matters before the Senate the two statesmen have not loved one another. A few days since a rural constituent informed Senator Hoar that he would like to hear Senator Blair speak. He was told there would be no difficulty about that, as Senator Blair was usually speaking. "Well, will you make some sign to me in the gallery so that I will know he is speaking?" said he to the Senator. "Oh, yes," responded the Senator, "when you see me get up to leave the Chamber you may know that Senator Blair is about to speak.

Congressman Peddle on New Jersey Politics.

Special to the Sentinel.

WASHINGTON, June 7.--I am a Republican myself, said ex Congressman Peddle, of New Jersey, yesterday. But I believe the Prohibition movement in my State is going to hurt us more than it will the Democrats. We don't like it at all. William Walter Phelps is our candidate for Governor, but I don't think he wants the position. He is doing more good in his present place in Congress. I think one of the Democratic candidates, of whom the strongest is Beadle, will be our Governor. The fiercest fight will be in the Legislature this fall when it comes to elect a United States Senator in the place of Mr. Sewell. I believe he wants to come back, but scarcely think he will succeed. Mr. Phelps would have a better show.

Exciting Times Expected.

Special to the Sentinel.

WASHINGTON, June 7. — Some exciting scenes are promised for to-morrow in the House. Mr. Kelly, of Pennsylvania, has given out that he will arraign Representative Wheeler, of Alabama, for having so traduced the memory of the late Edwin M. Stanton, Lincoln's Secretary of War, by trespassing upon the privilege granted him by the House. In extending his remarks in the record to that portion of the speech which was "extended but not delivered" was the objectionable matter which Mr. Kelley will ask to have expunged from the record. Mr. Wheeler, it is said, will stand by the record, and this makes it the very interesting part, as both men belong to the old class of chevalier statesman.

Prodigal Railroad Managers.

Special to the Sentinel.

WASHINGTON, June 7.—The friends of the Pacific Railroad bill will attempt to get it up to-morrow, and upon this question some lively times are expected. It is said to-night the railroad managers have spent a quarter of a million dollars to secure the passage of the bill.

Senator Kenna Accepts the Chairmanship.

WASHINGTON, June 7.—At the meeting of the Democratic Congressional Committee this morning Senator Kenna formally accepted the chairmanship of the committee. He said he was influenced to some extent by the publication of a statement that his reluctance arose from an apprehension of defeat for the party. His personal affairs were such that it would require a sacrifice on his part to assume and discharge the duties of the chairmanship, but he had certainly not been influenced to decline them by any apprehension of Democratic defeat. He would, in obedience to the wishes to his colleagues of the committee, accept the office, and, thanking them for the honor conferred upon him, discharge its duties to the best of his ability.

Bill to Prohibit the Importation of Aliens.

WASHINGTON, June 7.—Representative O'Neil, of Missouri, to-day introduced a bill in the House to amend the act prohibiting the importation of foreigners and aliens under contract or agreement to perform labor in the United States. The bill empowers the Secretary of the Treasury to enter into contracts with State Emigration Commissioners, delegating to them the right to examine into the condition of passengers arriving in any ship or vessel by personal investigation of the vessel. They are required to report to the Collector of the Port when any person is found to be included in the provision of the act, and such person shall not be permitted to land, but shall be returned to the nation whence he came, at the expense of the owners of the vessel in which he came. The bill was referred to the Committee on Labor.

MURDER.

A Political Discussion Leads to Fatal Results.

Special to the Sentinel.

EVANSVILLE, Ind., June 4.—A bloody murder was committed yesterday at Stevensport, a small town of Warrick County. John L. Gentry killed Dr. Agee by cutting his throat. The quarrel originated in the heat of political discussion, during which Gentry drew a bowie knife and cut Agee's throat from ear to ear, the victim living only about five minutes. The murderer managed in some way to escape. The neighborhood is greatly excited over the affair, and parties are scouring the country in all directions in search of him. It is probable that if caught he will be lynched without further ceremony. The killing is one of the most dastardly in the annals of Warrick County, and the citizens are determined to bring the guilty wretch to ustice. The parties are both prominent people. Gentry has always been considered a hard case, and the deed is not a surprise to those who know him best. His victim, Dr. Agee, was one of the most skillful physicians in the county and was always looked upon as an inoffensive man.

Suicide.

Special to the Sentinel.

COLUMBUS, Ind., June 4.—Henry Dickman, a prosperous farmer, residing near St. Louis Crossing, in this county, committed suicide this morning by hanging himself in an outhouse. When found he had been dead some time. He married a widow a few months ago, and it is thought his married life was not a happy one.

GLADSTONE DEFEATED.

The Home-Rule Bill Beaten by Thirty Votes on Second Reading.

Goschen Speaks in Opposition—The Vote Results 311 for to 341 Against—Parliament Adjourns Until Thursday—A Cabinet Meeting to be Held To-Day.

LONDON, June 7.—Mr. Gladstone entered the House of Commons at 4:55 o'clock this afternoon, and proceeded straight to his seat. When his presence was noticed he was greeted with tremendous cheering. The Premier wore a white rose in his lapel. The House of Commons was crowded to its utmost capacity at the hour of opening the session.

Right Hon. George J. Goschen (Liberal) resumed the debate on the Home Rule bill. He said the bill was to be a message of peace to Ireland, which the Premier said would be torn to fragments forthwith after its second reading. The sovereignty of the Imperial Parliament depended on a clause which it was highly probable the majority of the House would never consent to. If the bill passed a tremendous struggle would be inaugurated by the Catholic clergy of Ireland for the control of education in that country.

Regarding the question whether the bill would prove to be a final settlement of the Irish difficulty or lead to everlasting separation, Mr. Goschen said he did not think it would prove a finality. That would depend entirely upon the assurances given by Irish members. The Premier at one time was supposed to have given a pledge to reconstruct the bill, but he subsequently indignantly repudiated that assumption.

Mr. Gladstone (interrupting)—That is a gross error. What the gentleman thinks looked like indignation was a cool statement that I had resolved to reconstruct the bill.

Mr. Goschen, resuming, said he saw a distinction, but was unable to see how the Premeir could avoid the difficulty. The House was now informed that the bill was not to be reconstructed. [Cries, Oh, Oh, and cheers, amidst which Mr. Gladstone expressed signs of dissent.] Was the Government going to stand by the bill or not? [Loud opposition cheers.] This state of doubt came from voting, not on the bill, but on explanations first given at the Foreign Office and amplified and explained away on the Friday following.

It has been shown that the British Parliament is not inclined to consider Parnell its dictator. [Loud cheers.] "During recess," said Mr. Goschen, "I heard one (now a minister of the Crown) say he was certain Parnell would be the dictator in the coming session. I think, however, Parnell's followers will now acknowledge that there are limits whereat they see many who were prepared to grant some legislative autonomy to Ireland would draw the line.

Continuing, Mr. Goschen said: "The presence of Irish members of Westminster is incompatible with a separate Irish Parliament. It will be impossible to include Ulster in the Dublin Parliament. [Parnellite cries "No, no."] The clauses relating to taxation and finance, also continued Goschen, are "inherent defects in the bill." He asked if the Home Rule bill was inseparably tied up with the land purchase scheme. [Oh, oh, cheers.] He had seen some correspondence in which the Premier stated that the subjects were inseparable in the minds of the Government. At the moment the word inseparable did not convey anything clear or definite. The speaker was entitled to know whether, if the Home Rule bill is returned in the autumn it will be accompanied by the land purchase bill, whereto it had been said to be inseparably tied. No hope has been tendered that clause 24 will be dropped. This meant the disappearance permanently of the Irish members from the Imperial Parliament. The Premier said that the foreign office saw a way to adjust the difficulty, but never said what that plan was. If the House was to hear it, it would be only before the conclusion of the debate, when they would not have time carefully to consider it. [Cheers.] This is important, as the plan intended to affect votes. Irish representation in the House of Commons led directly to the question of sovereignty of Parliament, which, if not destroyed, would be impaired and weakened. He was unable to see what protection will be given to minorities. He did not believe the protestants would be persecuted. He believed the Irish members were sincerely anxious to prevent the clerical ascendency aimed at [Irish cries of "no, no"] by the priesthood of every church. [Cheers and cries of "no, no."] The clergy of all churches aimed at educational ascendency. The Irish members find themselves embarked in a tremduous struggle with the Catholic priesthood. Until now it required the Imperial Parliament's moderating influence to deter protestants and Catholics from making extreme demands. They were unable to ignore differences of creed, class and race. A neutral hand was necessary to deal with the rival sections, as in the case of the recent difficulty in Belfast. The bill contained the elements of commercial, financial and legislative friction. The establishment of a separate executive would lead to friction and separation. Difficulties would rise under the foreign enlistment act, and in cases like that of the Alabama. The Imperial Parliament would be responsible for the acts of the Irish Executive, yet be powerless to control the executive. Suppose discontent arose, culminating in agitation and ultimate separation. The members must not forget Morley's warning, that if discontent arose in Ireland, the Irish members would place material resources at Ireland's command. If Parliament parted with its executive power in Ireland, alienate its friends, made them bitter foes, placed the executive power in new and untried hands, how would they meet this difficulty?

The opponents of the bill wanted the two countries held together. The Premier would not admit it their duty to keep the two countries together. [Gladstone expressed dissent.]

He protested against the Premier's statement that the bill was opposed by a class and its dependents, which was described by the newspapers as the "swaggering class." He did not think Chamberlain and Spurgeon came within this description. [Cries, "Oh, oh!"] He said he saw his allusions created discontent, but the matter was important. The Premier kindled a serious fire to get up enough steam to pass the bill.

He urged the members not to maim the constitution, of which they were only life trustees. No country, he said, ever had a Parliament like the British Parliament. As life trustees, they were bound to hand over their glorious possession without detriment to those coming after them. In conclusion, he said: "I implore the House by the tradition of which we are heirs, by the obligations of duty and honor, by our hopes of the future of our empire, by our duty to the Queen, to look to it that those who shall come after us may bear witness we have not betrayed our trust." [Loud cheers.]

At the conclusion of Mr. Goschen's address, Charles Stewart Parnell addressed the House, and was followed by Sir Michael Hicks-Beach against it. Mr. Gladstone followed. On arising he was loudly cheered.

GLADSTONE'S SPEECH.

He expressed his pleasure at having listened to the masterly exposition—"I can not call it less—of the member from Cork. [Loud cheers and opposition laughter]. I feel a strong conviction that speeches couched in a tene marked alike by sound statesmanship and far-seeing moderation will never fail to produce a lasting effect upon the minds and convictions of the people of England and Scotlaud. With respect to the personal question that has arisen between Mr. Parnell and Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, I think it no part of my duty to interfere. [Lord Randolph Churchill—"Hear, hear."] I shall avoid in the discussion of this question as far as I can all matters of a purely polemical character between party and party. I presume the subject will be carried further. [Parnellite cheers.] I understand a distinct allegation to be made by Mr. Parnell in regard to some person whose name he has not given, one of a limited body, and I conclude it will not be difficult to procure, if it can be given a denial. I presume a distinct allegation has been made to some person whose name he does not give. This will open out a matter of public interest, and the gentleman opposite will do me the justice to admit that I have not sought before taking office to make an attack upon the conduct they pursue. If they do not like to do me justice, I shall not ask it. Mr. Beach began by stating in series what he succinctly described as simple facts. I will not say that his simple facts are pure fiction. But Mr. Beach declares, though I do not see that it has much to do with the matter, that this is the bill of one man. Well, I am amazed to hear my opponents speak as if they had been at my elbow all day throughout the winter. Mr. Chamberlain could only speak within the compass of his knowledge, and if he said it was a bill of one man he would know no more about it than a measure opposite. But, sir, long before that time the leading details of the bill had been a matter of anxious consideration between me and my nearest political friends. The noble Lord's arithmetic is still more defective. A party of 335 is, I apprehend, by 85 votes larger than a party of 250. [Renewed laughter.] Then, the right honorable gentleman says that excepting one point, the customs and excise duties, no change was made in the bill after it was submitted to the Cabinet. He has no means of knowing that it were true and it happens to be entirely untrue. [Laughter.] This is a matter of great importance, though it is one that has never been seen by Mr. Chamberlain. He took exception to certain provisions of the bill without being acquainted with the whole case. That is a fact. Mr. Beach is entirely wrong also in this one of his simple facts. Then Mr. Beach says that I announced to the House that the bill was not to be reconstructed. I said nothing of the kind. [Cries of "Oh!" "Oh!" and cheers.] I announced that I had not promised that it should be reconstructed, and there are gentlemen opposite who think it a matter of laughter [cries of "Oh!" "Oh!"] who see no distinction between promising that the bill shall not be reconstructed and not having promised that it shall be reconstructed. [Laughter.] A person who has promised that a bill shall be reconstructed is bound to reconstruct it, [cheers] and is that true? [Liberal cheers.] A person who has not promised is free to reconstruct it without promising. [Cheers.] I am glad to see that the laughter of the opposition has now ceased. [Cheers and laughter.] Well, sir, I can not help observing that I was struck with an observation of Mr. Beach. He says the bill will be rejected whatever else happens by a vote of a majority of the Scotch and English members [opposition cheers], and in that observation he was cheered by those who teach us that they are above all anxious fear for the maintenance of the United Kingdom Parliament, in which Irish members are in all respects to be assimilated to the English and Scotch members. [Cheers and counter cheers.]

Well, Sir Michael talks about dissolution, and I am glad to find that upon that point he and I are more nearly associated than upon almost any other point of this controversy. [Loud ministerial cheers.] After what Mr. Beach has said and the acquaintance he has shown with the history of the bill, and after all that was said by Mr. Goschen, I must again refer to the exact position in which some of the members stand with regard to the bill. In the first place, I take it to be absolutely beyond disputes upon broad high Parliamentary grounds that that which is to be voted upon to-night is the principle of the oil as distinct from the particulars of the bill. [Cheers.] What may be the principle of the bill I grant that I have no authority to determine, but it is our duty to give our own construction of the principle of the bill. I think I drew a confirmation of construction from the speech of Mr. Beach, because he himself said that this was a bill for the purpose of establishing a legislative body in Ireland for the management of Irish affairs. I apprehend it to be beyond all question that the members voting for the principle of the bill are entirely and absolutely free [cheers], and that if they think there is any set of provisions by means of which a better and fuller effort may be given to the principles of the bill, they are at liberty to displace all the details. [Cheers.] That does not admit of doubt. Well, the Government have taken certain engagements. They have taken an engagement as to taxation for the intervention of the Irish to the terms of which I need not now refer.

One more question has been raised with respect to other amendments to the bill. Of course, as to the freedom of members to suggest other amendments, I say nothing, but in reference to our duty there can be no question at all that our duty, if an interval is granted us, if the circumstances of the present session require the withdrawal of the bill, if it is to be reintroduced with amendments at an early date in the autumn, of course it is our duty to amend our bill with every real amendment, every real improvement—with whatever is calculated to make it more effective and acceptable. [Cheers.]

For the attainment of its end we are perfectly free to deal with them, but it would be the meanest, basest act on the part of the Government to pretend that they have a plan of reconstruction ready before hand, cut and dried in their minds at a time when, from the very nature of the cause, it must be obvious that it is perfectly clear there can be no such thing. [Cheers]. Sir, so much, then, for the system and freedom of the members opposite to the bill. It is the duty of the Government to consider their amendment, do everything they can with a view to a fuller and better application of the bill, and to add to those fine grounds which have on a former occasion been so clearly explained, and from which there is no intention, in any sense, to recede. Mr. Beach has said that the question of Ulster is a question of principle, but I must say that with regard to the sentiments we have heard expressed on the subject, I can not say that any plan for the treatment of Ulster has made any serious or practical effect upon Major Saunderson, who is supposed to favor the separation of Ulster from the rest of Ireland. [Cheers.] I must say that Mr. Parnell has entered into a careful and elaborate argument upon the subject of "Ulsterland," dealing with her as a separate part of Ireland, in the course of this evening's debate, and I must say that that was a statement which requires an answer. [Cheers.]

Now, sir, I want to say one word on the subject of Irish loyalty; and in debates of this kind we have at times to use words and expressions that it is well should be a little better understood than they are. When I hear a speech from Mr. Johnston and some others it always appears to me that he is under the conviction that loyalty is inate in Irish politicians and disloyalty innate in some other persons. [Laughter.] I do believe that Mr. Johnston is under the impression that in all times, in long generations of Irish history, there has been this difference between persons who are Protestants and those who are not Protestants. [Cheers.] No? Well, it is a charge which has been made and ought to be met. Has Mr. Johnston inquired what was the state of loyalty in Ireland at the close of the Eighteenth century? As regards Roman Catholics, they had then hardly been born into political life. In his time Dean Swift spoke of their incapacity for politics, and it would be absurd to speak of them as being either loyal or disloyal. But as to the condition of Catholics at the close of the last century I will read what Burke has said upon the subject. The date of it is 1796. It is taken from a letter to Wyndham. He speaks on the subject of disaffection, and writes thus: "Disaffection has cast deep roots in the principals and habits of the majority of the lower and middle classes of the whole Protestent part of Ireland. [Parnellite laughter.] The Catholics who are intermingled with them are, more or less, tainted."

What has happened since? The Protestants not having grievances to complain of became loyal. These are words and ideas which show us what is the way in which we are to promote loyalty, and what is the way in which we can destroy it. Another subject upon which I will only dwell for a moment is that of federation. Many gentlemen in the House are greatly enamored of this idea, and the subject they have in view is a noble one. I will not admit to Mr. Beach the justice of the disparagement he cast upon the British empire. I do not consider that this is a purely compacted empire, but I admit that if means can be devised for establishing a more active union with our distant connections, that is the noblest object of man. It is a popular idea. I give no opinion upon it. I suspect it is beset with more difficulties than have yet been examined and brought to light.

But what I wish to observe, as far as this bill is concerned, is that this bill, whatever its rights or wrongs in other respects, is unquestionably a step, and an important step, in the direction of federation. [Cheers.] The balance of authority seems to have established clearly the elementary proposition that whether this Parliament be the Imperial Parliament or not the Imperial Parliament it is possessed now, as before the union and before the bill, before the time of Grattan's Parliament of a supremacy which is absolute and in the nature of things inalienable. It could not part with it if it would, and it would not if it could. (Cheers.) It is true that in constituting a Legislature in Ireland we do as we did when we constituted a Legislature in Canada and Australia. (Cheers.) That is a right which our opponents object to and that is the thing we desire.

It is obvious the question may be raised, How do you propose to deal with questions that may arise when the Imperial Government, notwithstanding this general division of affairs, may be by the obligations of Imperial rulers compelled to intervene? Well, my answer is that this question has received a far better solution from practical politics, from the experience of the last forty or fifty years than would ever have been given to it by the definitions of a lawyer, however eminent. When the Canadian Legislature was founded this difficulty arose. The question arose regarding the Canadian rebellion, and I myself and Lord Brougham were of the opinion—I know not now whether we were right or wrong—that the honor of the Crown had been invaded by a proposition to grant in Canada a vote for losses in the rebellion to those who had been rebels and had incurred losses as rebels. Lord Brougham made a motion in the House of Lords in 1844, and I made a motion in the House of Commons on the same subject. The important part of the debate consisted in the declarations drawn from the ministers of the Crown. Lord John Russell laid down what I conceive to be a true and sound declaration in terms which I believe may be fairly described as authoritative on the manner of dealing with this question. You will, however, allow me to read the passage, which is not a long one. Speaking in this House on the 14th of June, 1849, Lord Russell said: "I entirely agree with the right honorable gentleman. It is, indeed, in conformity with the sentiment I expressed in a dispatch I wrote a few years ago, that there were cases which must be left to the decision of the responsible Ministers of the crown. There are cases where the honor of the crown and the safety of the country are concerned, and in such cases it requires the utmost temper in the colonies and the utmost temper and firmness in this country. I fully admit that there are not such cases when the right honorable gentlemen goes on to say that Earl Elgin has received some instructions from the Government of this country by which he is debarred from asking the advice and decision of the crown on questions that affect the imperial policy and national honor. He is entirely mistaken in that assumption."

That justice practically sets forth the mode in which this question, difficult in the abstract, will be settled as it has been settled. We have found it easy to reconcile the rights of Canada with the rights of the Imperial Parliament. It will be found not more difficult to reconcile the rights of Ireland with those of the Imperial Government. Constantly I hear the words "Unionists" and "Separatists," but what I want to know is who are the Unionists? [Cheers]. And who are the separatists? I see this bill in newspapers of great circulation and elsewhere, and described as the "Separation bill." [Cheers]. Members of the opposition adopt that style and make the description their own. I take no notice of these. I speak of other quarters out-of-doors. Speaking of this description alone, I say it is the merest slang of vulgar controversy. [Cheers] You think this bill tends to separation. Your argument and even your prefudices are worthy of all consideration and respect. But is it a fair mode of conducting a controversy to attach these hard names to measures on which we differ, or which you argue and desire to convince by argument? I will illustrate what I mean. I will go back to the time of Lord Grey's reform act. When that bill was introduced it was honestly believed by the great masses of intelligent men that the bill absolutely involved the destruction of the monarchy. The Duke of Wellington propounded a doctrine very much to that effect, but I don't think any one of those gentlemen or the newspapers that supported them ever descended so low in the weapon of their warfare as to brand it the "Monarchy Destruction Bill." [Cheers.]

This is merely begging the question. I must make a very large demand upon our patience and indulgence, for we conscientiously think there are unionists and disunionists, but we conscientiously think our conduct tends to union. [Cheers and laughter.] This involves a very large and deep historical question.

Let us try for a few moments to look at it historically. The arguments made from the other side appear to me to restore their principle in the main upon two suppositions—one the idea of the profound, original depravity or incompetence of the Irish people. But there is another; it is the conscientious conviction of the gentlemen opposite that when two countries associated, but not incorporated with each other are in disturbed sections with each other, the remedy is to create an absolute legislative incorporation. That I believe is the doctrine on the Irish side of the house, and they believe the dissolution of such incorporations is clearly the move to bring about a dissolution of the political relations between these two countries. [Opposition cheers.] I do not deny that where there is a legislative incorporation under the same Crown, where that Crown is absolute, a great country as it was in the case of France. But what I say is that this trouble, as proved by history, is this: That when there are disturbed relations between countries that are politically associated, but not incorporated the real remedy is to make provision for civil independence subject to imperial unity. [Cheers.] Gentlemen speak of tightening the tie between this country and Ireland, but tightening is not always the way to make it stronger. [Cheers.] It is true, as was said by Mr. Cowen, that the severance of Legislatures has often been the union of countries, and the union of Legislatures the severance of countries. [Cheers.] Can you give, in a single instance, from all your historical inquiries—and I wish they had been wider—where an acknowledgment of local self-government has been followed by the severance of countries. [A voice, "Turkey."] I was just going to refer to Servia, and to admit that where a third power has intervened and has given liberty to the subordinate state in defiance of the superior power, I make no claim; and if you are to wait until some third power intervenes in case of Ireland [Government and Parnell cheers] as they intervened in the case of America—Mr. Ashmead Bartlett: "We are not afraid."—Mr. Gladstone: I never asked the member whether he was afraid. [Laughter.] It does not matter very much whether he is or not. [Renewed laughter.] I should like him, however, to cultivate a little of that early and provident fear which, in the language of Burke, is the "mother of safety." I admit that in cases such as when France and Spain interfered in the case of America, you can expect nothing but severance, and severance with hostile feeling on both sides. [Hear, hear.] But that is not the case before us. I ask, for instance, where, apart from the intervention by France of a third power, the acknowledgment of local independence has been followed by severance. [Cheers.] In the case of Belgium and Holland the attempt to make the Belgians conform to the ways and institutions of Holland led to severance. In the case of Denmark the Duchies attempts to do what the gentlemen opposite wish to do in Ireland, namely, to force Danish institutions and ideas upon the Duchies, together with an insufficient acknowledgment of their ancient institutions, ended in the total loss of the Duchies to Denmark. They are now severed. But let us not look simply at the negative side where local independence has been acknowledged. The honorable member opposite has impudently interrupted me by calling out "Turkey." I will tell him that in the case of Turkey, with its imperfect organization, where there has not been a violent interference, and the matter has not been driven to the point of foreign interference, local autonomy has been tried with the best effects. In the case of Crete, which nearly twenty years appeared lost to Turkey, the lessening of the ties at Constantinople has immensely improved the relations between the two. There is no renewal of rebellion.

Churchill—There is a chronic revolution.

Gladstone—Chronic revolution. Give me a test of chronic revolution. Has Crete paid its tribute? Has it called for the armed forces of Turkey to put down revolution? [Cries of "Yes" and "Order."] I will take another case. Take Lebanon. About twenty-three or twenty-four years ago Lebanon was in Austria chronic revolution under the absolute sway of Constantinople. It was then placed under a system of practically local independence, and from that day to this it has never resumed its former condition. Still more remarkable is the case of the Island of Samos. It has enjoyed for a long time complete autonomy, and is now in a state of attachment to the Turkish Empire, while contentment with any political ties, and holds that country in tranquility. [Cheers.] So that even Turkey bears testimony to the principle of which I speak. There are numbers of other instances. There are Norway and Sweden. That is most remarkable because these are two countries which are completely separated, and yet a connection has been found practicable only by means of the largest autonomy and independence. The case of Denmark and Iceland [opposition laughter]. Laughter is a very common weapon, and it is very difficult for me to contend with it. It had been twenty or thirty or forty years ago, I could have contended with this interruption more easily. [Loud cheers.] If, as has been said, that the Parliament of Iceland has been dissolved, it has been dissolved, that there have been difficulties in Iceland that have been difficulties between the Parliament of Iceland and the Crown of Denmark, but the Crown of Denmark is unhappily in difficulties with the legislative bodies of Denmark, but between the Legislature of Denmark and the Legislature of Iceland there has been no difficulty whatever, but when a speaker quoted Iceland the gentlemen on the other side, with their usual mode of rebuke, laughed, some one, I think, endeavoring to dignify the laughter with an idea, called out, "Iceland is so distant." If Iceland is so distant, I apprehend that makes it a great deal more difficult for Denmark to hold her down by force, and, consequently, much more necessary for Denmark to choose the method best in itself for securing order.

There has been no great day of hope for Ireland, no day when you might hope completely and definitely to end the controversy now until after more than ninety years. The long period of time has at last run out and the star has again mounted up into the heavens. What Ireland was doing for herself in 1782, we at length have done. The Roman Catholics have been emancipated—emancipated after a woeful disregard of solemn promises through twenty-nine years; emancipated slowly, sullenly, not from good will, but from abject terror, with all the fruits and consequences that will follow that method of legislation. [Cheers.] The second problem has been also solved, and the representation of Ireland has been reformed, and I am thankful to say that the franchise was given to Ireland, together with the readjustment of last year, with a free and open hand. That gift of France it was the last act required to make the success of Ireland in her final effort absolutely sure. [Cheers.] We have given Ireland a voice, we must listen to what she says. We must all listen, both sides, both parties. I mean as there are divided on this question—divided—I am afraid by an almost immeasureable gap. [Cries of hear, hear.] I believe that there is in the breast of many a man who means to vote against us to-night a profound misgiving approaching even to conviction [opposition cries of "No," and Home Rule cheers], that the end will be as we foresee it and not as you do; that the ebbing tide is with you, and that the flowing tide is with us. [Ministerial cheers.] Ireland stands at your bar expectant, hopeful, almost suppliant. Her words are the words of truth and soberness. [Opposition laughter and home rule cheers.] She asks blessed oblivion of the past, and in that oblivion our interest is a deeper interest than hers. Go into the length and breadth of the world, ransack the literature of all countries and find, if you can, a single voice, a single book, and I would almost say, as much as a single newspaper article, in which the conduct of England towards Ireland is anywhere treated except with profound and bitter condemnation. Are these the traditions by which we are expected to stand. Oh they are a sad exception to the glory of our country. [Cheers.] They are more than a black blot upon the pages of its history. And what we want to do is to stand by the traditions of which we are the heirs in all matters except our relations with Ireland and to make our relations with Ireland conform to the other traditions of our country [cheers] so we treat our traditions; so we hail the demand of Ireland for what I call a blessed oblivion of the past. She asks, also, a boon for the future, and that boon for the future, unless we are much mistaken will be a boon to use in respect to honor no less than a boon to her in respect to happiness, prosperity and peace. [Cheers.] Think, I beseech you, think wisely, think not for the moment, but think for the years to come before you reject my plan. [Loud and enthusiastic cheering, during which Mr. Gladstone resumed his seat.]

Result of the Vote.

On the question the Government was defeated by a majority of thirty on the second reading of the Home Rule bill, the vote standing 311 for and 341 against. Parliament adjourned to Thursday. A Cabinet meeting will be held at noon to-morrow.

Paralyzed by Lightning.

Special to the Sentinel.

THORNTOWN, Ind., June 4.—James Rankin and Mr. Van Eaton, while hauling logs along the road during a thunderstorm, took shelter under a sugar tree. The tree was struck by a heavy charge of lightning which prostrated both men. Van Eaton recovering consciousness, first examined Rankin and thinking him dead, took a horse from the team and reported to the neighbors. After a careful examination Rankin was found to be paralyzed in all his limbs except one arm. All the injured parts were burned to a blister, in strips about two inches broad, even to the bottoms of the feet. The clothes and hair were not burned. Mr. Rankin is conscious, but unable to have his body handled, which seems to be remarkably sensitive.

JOHN KELLY IS DEAD.

The Tammany Sachem Passes Away after a Long Illness.

No One Present at the Time of His Death But His Wife and Children—A Sketch of His Private and Political Life.

NEW YORK, June 1.—John Kelly died at 3:20 this afternoon. Mr. Kelly has been sick for several months. During the last few weeks he seemed to feel comparatively well, but on Thursday last he was taken with an attack of fainting and became weaker afterward. Monday he was worse, but this morning an improvement was apparent. At noon, however, he began to sink, and the approach of the end was realized. Mr. Kelly's death was painless, although he was conscious to the last. Only Mrs. Kelly and her two children were present when the patient passed away. Mrs. Kelly was prostrated by the blow, and is too ill to see anybody. No arrangements have as yet been made.

Late this evening Mr. Brennan announced that the funeral would take place on Saturday at the Cathedral. A solemn requiem mass will be celebrated over the remains. Archbishop Corrigan, who called at the house during the evening, will probably officiate.

John Kelly was born in the city of New York April 20, 1822. He was descended from the stalwart Irishmen of Tyrone County, who played an important part in the early history of the United States, and who gave us such illustrious names as Richard Montgomery, Alexander Porter, of Louisiana; Archbishop Hughes, General James Shields and others. As a boy, John was quiet, thoughtful and a good listener; a lad of spirit, however, who never flinched an antagonist on account of his superior size. His early schooling was of brief duration, but he was studious and made the most of his opportunities. Even after he left school and began the battle of life in earnest, he avoided the vices of young manhood, and devoted his leisure to the study of French, English, literature and science, and as the editor of the Utica Observer wrote of him in 1879: "If anbody has imbibed the impression that Mr. Kelly is an ignorant man, he does not want to continue that delusion with an actual examination of Mr. Kelly's acquirements. A Utica man who met him once in the presence of Professor Bonamy Price, of Oxford, says that he held his own in a discussion of political economy with England's foremost teacher of that science."

Passing over his earlier struggles, we find him at twenty-one a prosperous mechanic in business for himself, having a soapstone and grate factory with many influential people as customers. At this time he had not a thought of politics, although he was as fully a leader of the young men of the neighborhood where he first grew up as he became of Tammany at a later day. At the "Ivy Green," a great resort of politicians, he would sometimes call for a chat with such men as John Clancy, Peter B. Sweeny, Matthew Brennan and David C. Broderick. He was Captain of the Emmet Guards for several years, resigning when elected Alderman in 1853. He was a well-known figure in the old Volunteer Fire Department, which was then in its zenith, and his herculean strength and great courage were frequent talked of by the entire town. His fearlessness, later in life, served him in good stead on several occasions when his life was threatened by the hirelings of the Tweed Ring.

With the election of President Buchanan Mr. Kelly became one of the administration leaders in Congress. He was then thirty-four years of age, and it was about this time that he received through his unrelenting opposition to public jobbery and dishonesty of every description, the sobriquet, which has stuck to him ever since, of Honest John Kelly. His biographer tells the story thus:

"One day General Cass, Secretary of State, visited the Capitol, and in conversation with a friend, said: 'Look at John Kelly moving along quietly among the members. The man is full of latent power that he scarcely dreams of himself. He is equal to half a dozen of those fellows around him. Yes, by all odds, the biggest man among them all. The country will yet hear from Honest John Kelly.' Those words of General Cass, uttered in his imposing George-the-Third style of conversation, shortly after were repeated to old James Gordon Bennett, the friend of Kelly's boyhood, and the editor took early opportunity to mention Honest John Kelly in the Herald, and frequently afterward applied the same title to him. The appellation struck the public as appropriate, and soon passed into general use. The subject of this memoir has been called 'Honest John Kelly' from that day to this."

Coming down to a comparatively recent period, the biographer traverses ground familiar to the general reader. The election of Mr. Kelly as Sheriff, and the splendid record he made while in that office; his nomination for Mayor against A. Oakey Hall, and his subsequent withdrawal from the race by reason of a severe family affliction; his visit to Europe, his many charities, his relations with Mr Tilden and their co-operation in reforming Tammany and driving the Ring from power; his elevation to the Comptrollership—all these are matters within the memory of the readers of the Sentinel.

The biography from which we quote fitly closes with a general tribute by the most influential portions of the press of the country, and more especially of New York, to the honesty, ability and worth of John Kelly. In moments when partisan passions had abated, even his bitterest enemies in politics and on the press (socially he had no enemies) found time to do him justice, and