Daily Globe.

VOL. VIII. ST. PAUL, FRIDAY MORNING, APRIL 9, 1886. NO. 99

THE RULE OF ERIN.

Gladstone Gives to the World His Home-Rule Scheme,

In Which He Promises Ireland a Domestic Parliament,

To Be of Dual Character With a Mutual Veto,

And to Continue for Not More Than Five Years.

The Office of Viceroy to be Divorced From Politics.

Fiscal Unity of the Realm to be Maintained,

But Irish Money to Go to the Irish Exchequer.

Mr. Gladstone Receives an Unparalleled Ovation.

Opinions of the Press--Views of St. Paul Irishmen.

Gladstone's Greatest Effort.

LONDON, April 8.—The crowd began to assemble outside the palace yard about 7 o'clock this morning. It amused itself for a while watching the members who came early to secure seats. At this time the greater number in the crowd were Irishmen. They cheered every Parnellite who came along. As the day avanced the assemblage increased till it filled up all the thoroughfares and open spaces. The ground in the neighborhood as far as Downing street at 4 o'clock, was an entire mass of people, the largest collected in one body in London for many years. The entire throng was thickly dotted with individuals wearing the Irish collars and National league emblems. Of course in a crowd so immense there was a great deal of noise and pushing about, but as a whole good order was preserved. No police interference at any time was required. Gladstone left his residence, in Downing street, for the house of commons precisely at 4:20 this afternoon, accompanied by Mrs. Gladstone. At this time every inch of roadway, except the path kept open by the police for the premier's carriage, and every inch of sideway, besides all points of vantage afforded by the doorsteps, windows, and roofs from Downing street to Westminster were covered by people. The crowd swarming over Westminster bridge excluded all locomotion by vehicles. Rain now became steady and penetrating, but there was no break in the crowds till Gladstone's carriage passed. The tremendous and

CONTINUED CHEERING

with which he was greeted during the whole of his progress was accompanied by groans every here and there, but the ill feeling was not manifested with sufficient strength either to irritate the majority of the crowd or attract Gladstone's attention. When the premier disappeared within the parliament buildings the crowd melted in the rain and it had disappeared entirely within half an hour after he began his speech. At this time all outside was bereft of excitement, while the chambers of the house were in a perfect quiver. Before the speaker entered the floor of the house the lobbies, stairways and galleries were all in possession of a scattered mob of gentle and aristocratic people, struggling for places to hear and see the orator of the day. There were fifty times as many persons engaged in the struggle as could possibly be accommodated and in the surge, bishops, peers and plenipotentiaries ran foul of commoners, reporters and people of every sort. In one group were seen at one time the Greek ambassador, the Minister Sickles, Cardinal Manning, Editor Burnand of Punch, the Japanese ambassador and Michael Davitt. These six were jammed in their struggle about the door of the speaker's gallery. They were rescued, and after being marched and countermarched about the lobby into the outer lobby and back again were finally enabled to get to places secured for them by another door. Several score of noblemen asserted their privileges too boisterously and had to be checked by policemen on duty. The tall form of Earl Spencer, ex-Irish viceroy, towering

ABOVE THE POLICE

and the diminutive figure of the Marquis of Ripon nestling close to him as if for protection, was conspicuous in the lobby rushes. Such was the pressure for accommodation that the authorities tolerated and winked at the revolutionary innovation of placing two rows of chairs on the floor space in front of the speaker's desk, transforming the familiar and venerable aspect hitherto sacred as the tramping ground of orators, into the spectacle of a place put to good modern use. Every square foot of space in the galleries held a human being. The Prince of Wales, his son, Prince Albert Victor, Duke of Cambridge, Prince Christian and Minister Phelps occupied seats during the speech in the front row of the peer's gallery, Phelps sitting beside Prince Christian. A large number of the members of the house of commons, unable, because of its inadequate capacity to accommodate the whole membership, to obtain places on the floor, helped jam the galleries. The ladies' gallery was screened from open view from the main floor by a delicate fret-work in wood, but the sparkling diamonds and the flash of colors through this lattice showed that this favorite eyrie bore a greater freight of beauty and good clothes to-day than ever before in history. As well-known members entered the house they were greeted with cheers. Sometimes the cheers were genuine and hearty; sometimes given in apparent mocking. John Bright, who entered with feeble gait, was greeted with ringing and approving cheers. Parnellites gave Parnell and Morley a hearty reception, but welcomed Goschen with derisive shouts.

THE MARQUIS OF HARTINGTON

drew a ringing volley of cheers from both sides of the house. During a momentary lull in the confusion of cheers, the house was suddenly startled by a wild cry. It came from the throats of those who were first to catch sight of Gladstone gliding toward his seat from behind the speaker's chair. The Irish members sprang to their feet as one man, and for several minutes the uproar of applause continued. The full-throated Irish cheer that T. P. O'Connor had feared the interloping Tories might deprive of half its power was repeated till the whole building seemed to reverberate with its triumphant peals. Gladstone seated himself between Morley and Sir William Vernon Harcourt. He looked very pale, paler even than usual. The lines on his forehead appeared to have deepened since his recent illness, but his step as he entered was elastic, and his bearing indicated he felt felt full confidence in the success of his forthcoming speech. It has transpired that as Gladstone was driving from Downing street to the house his carriage came very near being upset by the presence of the crowd. The carriage was escorted by six mounted policemen, but they were unable to prevent the mass of people from pressing forward and stopping the progress of the vehicle for some minutes. Gladstone was both pleased and agitated by this extraordinary enthusiasm of the populace. The rule which practically excludes ladies from public sight in the house, and which on occasions like that of to-day, inexcusably

SEPARATE HUSBAND AND WIFE,

who are fortunate enough to secure seats among the spectators, compelled Mrs. Gladstone to hide herself behind a screen. The venerable lady was the most interested of all the spectators there. She met the Prince of Wales, whose royal blood could not secure for her the privilege of sitting beside her husband in the house any more than the prime minister's wife's claim could gain for her the boon of witnessing well the noblest effort of her great husband's career. With the Princess of Wales were Prince Henry of Battenburg, Princess Beatrice, Duchess of St. Albans, the Countess of Rosberry and Spencer and a host of other ladies of noble blood. It was 4:35 o'clock when the speaker called upon Gladstone to take the floor. Gladstone rose and was met with the most prolonged outburst of cheering ever heard in the house of commons. He was evidently deeply impressed by the reception. When he finally was permitted to speak his first words were inaudible to the reporters. His voice, it was feared, was not equal to the great task before the orator, but it was that Gladstone was in a state of amazement, caused no doubt by the unexpected character of his welcome. This, however, quickly disappeared, and when he had spoken a few sentences, he "found his voice." Until then the serious and settled melancholy characteristic of the man's appearance, his age, and his undoubted physical weakness tended to give a very much exaggerated idea of the

HOARSENESS OF HIS VOICE,

and the hearers' sympathies being with the venerable orator, his voice grated on their ears, but as soon as Gladstone steadied himself to his task his voice grew even, clear, strong and eventually penetrating, ringing, sonorous and captivating. Listening to him without seeing or knowing him in the middle of his speech a stranger would easily suppose his voice was the voice of a sound, impassioned man in the full vigor of the prime of life. Even the natural stiffness of old age—Gladstone is 76—gradually gave way to flexiblenessin movement, animation in manner, energy and fire of utterance that are amazing in themselves, but which do not strike the auditor as anything but matters of course, so gradually and imperceptibly do the fires of the grand old man's elequence light him up. During the progress of his statement of the features of his bill there was little or no demonstration of friendship or hostility from either part of the house. This part of his oration was admirably cold, precise, methodical and instructive. Occasionally, however, the Parnellites gave a vigorous cheer when a sentiment was expressed which they could re-echo now and then. Likewise half-audible

SIGNS OF DISSENT

came from the Conservative benches. But for the most part his arguments were heard in silence. By persons who heard Gladstone on former great occasions, comparing his speech to-night with his other great speeches, it is generally admitted that in lucidity of statement and argumentative power, his speech to-night was quite the equal of any of his finest previous orations. The partial failure of his voice, however, renders comparison of to-night's effort with previous speeches satisfactory from a purely rhetorical point of view. After Gladstone's speech the house rapidly thinned out, and for the next two hours the contrast was striking. During Trevellyan's speech the house gradually filled up again. Trevellyan's speech was received by all sides in silence, broken only by an occasional outburst of derisive cheers by the Parnellites. Parnell, on the other hand, was listened to with rapt attention, and his speech left upon the auditors the impression that he was ready to accept the leading proposals of Gladstone's bill. The Parnellites warmly applauded him when he referred to Gladstone as the one English statesman living who was lending his voice in favor of poor, helpless Ireland.

GLADSTONE'S GREAT SPEECH,

In Which He Outlines His Irish Policy.

Mr. Gladstone said:

I could wish that it had been possible to expound to the house the whole policy and intentions of the government with reference to Ireland. Although the questions of reform in the tenure of land and Irish government are so closely and inseparably connected, it is yet impossible to undertake to elucidate the questions together. I do not know of any previous task laid upon me involving so diversified an exposition. In contemplating the magnitude of this task I am filled with painful mistrust, but that mistrust is absorbed in a feeling of the responsibility that will be upon me if I should fail to bring home to the public mind the magnitude and the various aspects of the question. We should no longer fence or skirmish with this question. [Loud cheers.] We should come to close quarters with it. [Cheers.] We should get at the root of it. We should take means not merely intended for the wants of to-day or to-morrow, but should look into the distant future. We have arrived at a stage in our political transactions with Ireland when the two roads part, one from the other, not soon, probably, to meet again.

THE TIME HAS COME

when it is incumbent on the duty and the honor of parliament to come to some decisive resolution on this matter. Our intention is, therefore, to propose to the commons that which, if happily accepted, will, we think, liberate parliament from the restraints under which of late years it has ineffectually struggled to perform the business of the country, and will restore British legislation to its natural, ancient, unimpeded course, and also establish harmonious relations between Great Britain and Ireland (hear! hear!) in the free institutions to which Englishmen, Scotchmen and Irishmen alike are unalterably attached. [Loud cheers, prolonged by the home rule members.] After reviewing the condition and crime existing in Ireland since 1833, Mr. Gladstone described the coercive legislation enforced during the same period as not exceptional, but habitual. He compared Ireland during all this period to a man trying to find sustenance in medicine only meant for cure. Coercion, however, had, he said, proved no cure. Serious disaffection continued to prevail in Ireland and if England and Scotland had suffered similar hardships, he believed the people of those countries would resort to means similar to those the Irish had used to ventilate their grievances. [Parnellite cheers.]

COERCION A FAILURE.

Coercion was admitted to have been a failure for the past fifty-three years, only two of which had been wholly free from repressive legislation. No! Coercion, unless stern and unbending and under an autocratic government, must always fail. Such coercion England should never resort to until every other means had failed. The basis of the whole mischief was the fact that the law was discredited in Ireland. It came to the Irish people with a foreign aspect, and their alternative to coercion was to strip the law of its foreign character and invest it with a domestic character. [Loud Irish cheers.] Ireland, though represented in parliament numerically equal with England or Scotland, was really not in the same position politically. England made her own laws. Scotland had been encouraged to make her own laws as effectually as if she had six times her present representation. The consequence was that the mainspring of the law in England and Scotland was felt to be the English or the Scotch. The mainspring of the law in Ireland was not felt by the people to be with the Irish. He therefore deemed it little less than mockery to hold that the state of law which he had described conduced to the real unity of this great

NOBLE WORLD-WIDE EMPIRE.

Something must be done. Something is imperatively demanded from us to restore in Ireland the first conditions of civil life, the free course of law, the liberty of every individual in the exercise of every legal right, their confidence in the law and their sympathy with the law, apart from which no country can be called a civilized country. What then was the problem before him? It was this: Not to reconcile imperial unity with diversity of legislatures. Mr. Grattan held that those purposes were reconciliable. More than that, he demanded a severance of the parliaments, with a view to the continuity and everlasting unity of the empire. Was that an audacious paradox. Other countries had solved the problem and under much more difficult circumstances. We ourselves might be said to have solved it with respect to Ireland during the time that Ireland had a seperate parliament. Did it destroy the unity of the British empire. [Cheers]. Mr. Gladstone then pointed to the case of Norway and Sweden, which countries, he said, united upon a footing of strict legislative independence and equality. Then there was the case of Austria and Hungary, and with regard to these countries he asked whether the condition of Austria at the present moment was not more perfectly solid,

SECURE AND HARMONIOUS

than it was prior to the existing condition between that country and Hungary. It could not be questioned that its condition was one of solidity and safety, compared with that of the time when Hungary was making war upon her. The claim of Ireland to make laws for herself was never denied until the reign of George II. The parliament of Grattan was as independent in point of authority as it could be. They (the government) were not about to propose repeal of the union. It was impossible to propose the repeal of the union until they had settled, what was the essence of the union. He defined the essence of the union to be the fact that whereas before the union, there were two seperate and independent parliaments, after the union there was but one. To speak of the dismemberment of the empire was in this century a misnomer and an absurdity. The fault of the administrative system of Ireland was that its spring and source of action was English (cheers). The government therefore felt that the settlement of the question was to be found by establishing

A PARLIAMENT IN DUBLIN

(Irish cheers) for the conduct of business of both a legislative and administrative nature. The political economy of the three countries must be reconciled. There should be an equitable distribution of imperial burdens. Next, there must be reasonable safeguards for the minority, and why could not this minority in Ireland take care of itself? He had no doubt of its ability to do that, when we have passed through the present critical period and been disarmed of the jealousies with which any change was approached, but for the present, there were three classes of people whom they were bound to consider: First, the class connected with the land; second, the civil servants and the officers of the government in Ireland; third, the Protestant minority. The speaker could not admit the claim of the Protestant minority in Ulster or elsewhere to rule on questions which are for the whole of Ireland. Several schemes for the separate government of Ulster had been submitted to him. One was that Ulster province should be excluded from the operations of the present bill. Another was that a separate autonomy should be provided for Ulster, and a third suggested that certain rights should be reserved and placed under provincial councils. No one of these proposals had appeared to the government to be so completely justified by its merits or by the weight of public opinion in its favor as to warrant the government in including it in their bill. However, they deserved

FAIR CONSIDERATION

and the discussion that would follow the introduction of the present bill might lead to the discovery of one plan which had a predominating amount of support, and the government would do their best to adopt the plan that seemed likely to give general satisfaction. Referring to the great settlement of 1782, Mr. Gladstone said: It was not a real settlement, and why? Was it Ireland that prevented a real settlement being made? [Irish cheers.] No; it was a mistaken policy of England, listening to the pernicious voice and claims of ascendency. The Irish parliament labored under great disadvantages, yet it had in it a spark of the spirit of freedom, and it emancipated the Roman Catholics in Ireland when the Roman Catholics in England were still unemancipated. It received Lord Fitz William with open arms, and when after a brief career he was recalled to England, the Irish parliament registered their confidence in him by passing a resolution desiring that he should still administer the government. Lord Fitz William had promoted the admission of Roman Catholics into the Irish parliament, and there was a spirit in that parliament which, if it had had free scope, could have done noble work, and would probably have solved all the Irish problems and have saved this government infinite trouble. The speaker said he would now pass to

THE PLAN

how to give Ireland a legislature to deal with the Irish as distinguished from imperial affairs. He was confronted at the outset with what he felt to be a formidable dilemma. Ireland was to have a domestic legislature for Irish affairs. That was his postulate, from which he set out. Were the Irish members and the Irish representative peers in either house to continue to form part of the representative assemblies? The speaker thought it would be perfectly clear that if Ireland was to have a domestic legislature, the Irish peers and the Irish representatives could not come to parliament to control English and Scotch affairs. [Cheers.] Then, with regard to the question whether Irish representatives should come to the house of commons for the settlement of imperial affairs, he thought that could not be done. He had, therefore, arrived at the conclusion that Irish members and Irish peers ought not to sit in the palace of Westminster. [Oh! oh! and cheers.] If Irish members were not to sit in the house of commons, Irish peers ought not to sit in the other house of parliament. [Hear! hear! and oh!] How were the Irish people to be taxed if they had legislators in both countries. He believed that Great Britain would never impose upon Ireland taxation without representation and added: If we were to have taxation without representation then there would come another question which would raise a practical difficulty, and that is: Are we to give up that

FISCAL UNITY

of the empire? He did not think that by giving up the fiscal unity of the empire, they were giving up the unity of the empire. He, however, stood upon the substantial ground that to give up the fiscal unity of the empire would be a public inconvenience and misfortune. It would be a great misfortune for Great Britain and a greater misfortune for Ireland. He conceived that one escape from that dilemma would be such an arrangement as would give the imperial government authority to levy customs duties and such excise duties as were immediately connected with the customs. The conditions of such an arrangement were, first, that the general power of taxation over and above those particular duties should pass into the hands of a domestic legislature in Ireland; second, that the proceeds of the customs and excise should be held for the benefit of Ireland and for the discharge of the obligations of Ireland, and the balance, after these obligations were discharged, should be entered into the Irish exchequer, and to be for the free disposal of the Irish legislative body. The government bill provided for this, and the bill then provided that representatives of Ireland should no longer sit in the house of commons or Irish peers in the house of lords, but at the same they would have the right of addressing the crown, and so possess all the constitutional rights they held now. [Oh! and cheers.] It would, therefore, relieve Irish members from

ATTENDANCE AT WESTMINSTER.

Mr. Gladstone said he had several reasons why this should be the case. Even if it was possible for them to attend, as they had a parliament of their own, it would be very difficult to have two classes of members in the British house, one class who could vote on all questions connected with the business of the country and another which could only vote on special and particular questions which are brought before parliament. Again it would be very difficult for gentlemen in Ireland to decide who should go to Westminster or who should remain in Ireland, and at the same time to maintain the fiscal unity of the nation. There is another point with regard to the powers of the legislature. Two courses might have been taken. One was to endow this legislative body with particular legislative powers. The other was to except from the sphere of its action those subjects which the government thought ought to be excepted and to leave it to any other power. The duration of the proposed legislative body should not exceed five years. The functions which it was proposed to withdraw from the cognizance of the legislative body were three grand and

PRINCIPAL FUNCTIONS, VIZ:

Everything which related to the crown, all that which belonged to the defense, the army, the navy, the entire organization of the armed forces, and our foreign and colonial relations. It would not be competent to pass laws for the establishment or endowment of any particular religion [cheers]. As to trade and navigation, it would be a misfortune to Ireland to be separated from England. The Irish parliament would have nothing to do with coinage or the creation of legal tender. The subject of the postoffice would be left to the judgment of parliament, though the government is inclined to the belief that it would be more convenient to leave postoffice matters in the hands of the postmaster general. Quarantine and one or two other subjects were left in the same category. The next subject he had to approach was that of the composition of the proposed legislative body. The bill proposed to introduce two orders, who would sit and deliberate together with the right of voting separately on any occasion, and on the demand of either body, which should be able to introduce a veto upon any measure for a limited time, either until the dissolution or for three years. The orders would be constituted as follows: First—There were the twenty-eight representative peers, who could not continue to sit in the house of lords after the representatives of the Irish people left the house of commons. They would have the option of sitting as a portion of

THE FIRST ORDER

in the Irish parliament with the power of sitting for life. Some people thought that option was not likely to be used, but the speaker was not of that number. He proposed that with the twenty-eight peers now in the house of lords there should sit seventy-five representatives elected by the Irish people. With regard to the powers of election the constituency would be composed of occupiers of the value or £25 and upwards and they would be elected for ten years. The property qualification of these representatives would be £200 annual value on a capital value of £4,000. Mr. Gladstone said he proposed that the 101 Irish members in the house of commons should be members of the Irish parliament, and whilst the first order of the legislative body would consist of 103 members, the second order would consist of 206. It was proposed to retain the viceroy, but he would not be the representative of a party, or quit office with an outgoing government. The queen would be empowered to delegate to him any prerogatives she now enjoyed or would enjoy. The religious disability now existing which makes Roman Catholics ineligible to the office would be removed. With regard to the judges who had been concerned in the administration of the criminal law in Ireland, her majesty might, if she saw cause, by order in council, antedate the pensions of these particular judges. In future the judges would be appointed by the Irish government, be paid out of the consolidated fund and be removable only by the joint address of the two orders.

THE CONSTABULARY

would remain under their present term of service and under their present authority. The charge for the constabulary was now £1,500,000 per annum, and the speaker felt confident the charge would be reduced, but, for the present, he proposed to relieve the Irish legislative body of all expenditure for the constabulary in excess of £1,000,000 per annum. The government had no desire to exempt the peace of Ireland in reference to its final position from the ultimate control of the Irish legislative body. The speaker had no jealousy upon that subject, as the care of providing for the ordinary security of life and property was the first duty of a local government. With respect to the civil service, the government did not think their case was the same as the constabulary, and the transfer of the civil service to the legislative body would effect a great economy. He therefore though it would be wise to authorize the civil servants now serving, to claim the pensions that would be due to them upon the abolition of their offices, provided they served two years, in order to prevent inconvenience from a rapid transition of the service, and at the close of that time both parties should be free to negotiate afresh. That was all, Mr. Gladstone stated, that he had to say on the subject of the new Irish constitution. The proportion of the

IMPERIAL BURDENS

which he had to propose that Ireland should bear was as one to fourteen. He thought that the new Irish parliament ought to start with a balance to its credit, but the only fund that it would have, if left alone, would be the solitary £20,000 from the Irish church fund. He knew no way of providing the necessary money, except by carrying it out of this year's budget, and he proposed that in the future Ireland should pay one-fifteenth towards the imperial expenditure. He went on to speak of how much Ireland would gain by exporting spirits to Great Britain, and how much Great Britain would lose to Ireland by the flow of money from one to the other. As the result of careful inquiry he stated with confidence, not as any actual demonstration, but as a matter of certainty with regard to the far greater portion, that the Irish receipts would gain from Great Britian a sum that would amount to £1,400,000 per annum. He then entered into an elaborate calculation of the total income and expenditure of Ireland, in the course of which he stated that the total charge to Ireland, as an imperial contribution, be put at £3,242,000 per annum. He stated, as an instance of the intense demoralization of the Irish administration, that while the postoffice in England showed a large surplus in Ireland, it just paid its expenses. He estimated

THE TOTAL EXPENDITURE

of Ireland, including a payment as a sinking fund for the Irish portion of the national debt at £7,946,000 per annum. Against that there was a total income of £8,350,000, or a surplus to the government of £404,000. It has naturally been said in England and Scotland, that for a great many years past we have been struggling to pass good laws for Ireland, and that we have sacrificed our time, neglected our interests and paid our money, and we have done all this in the endeavor to give Ireland good laws. That is quite true with regard to the general course of legislation since 1849. Many of these laws have been passed under an influence which I can hardly describe other than as the influence of fear. With regard to the history of the land question no man could know that until he had followed it from year to year, begining with the Devon commission, the appointment of which, in the speaker's opinion, did the highest honor to the memory of Sir Robert Peele [cheers], and then to examine the mode in which the whole labor of the commission had been frustrated by the domination of selfish interest [Parnellite cheers]. He did not deny the good intention of the British parliament to pass good laws for Ireland, but he said, in order to work out the purposes of government, there is something more in this world occasionally required than the passing of good laws. [Hear! Hear!] It is sometimes necessary not only that good laws should be passed, but also that they should be passed by

THE PROPER PERSONS.

The passing of many good laws is not enough in cases where the strong instincts of the people, distinct marks of character and history, require not only that these laws should be good, but that they should proceed from congenial and native sources, and that besides being good laws they should be their own laws. [Irish cheers.] At times I doubted whether this necessity had been fully developed, and especially with respect to Ireland. If doubts could be entertained before the last general election, they cannot now be entertained. The principle I have laid down I am not laying down for Ireland exceptionally. It is the very principle upon which, within my recollection, to the immense advantage of the country, parliament has not only altered but revolutionized our method of government. When I held office at the colonial office fifty years ago, the colonies were governed from Downing street. The result was that the home government was always in conflict with those countries which had legislative assemblies. We had continual shocks with the colonies then. But all that has been changed. The British parliament tried to pass good laws for the colonies, but the colonies said, "We don't want your good laws; we want our own good laws," and parliament at length admitted the reasonableness of this principle. This principle has now come home to us from across the seas, and the house has now to consider whether it is applicable to the case of Ireland. We now stand face to face with what is termed

IRISH NATIONALITY,

venting itself in a demand for general self-government in Irish, not in imperial affairs. I hold that there is such a thing as local patriotism, which in itself is not bad, but good. [Cheers]. The Welchman is full of local patriotism. The Scotchman is full of local patriotism. No, Scotch nationality is as strong as it ever was, and if the need were to arise I believe it would be as ready to assert itself as it was in the days of Bannockburn. [Cheers]. If I read Irish history aright misfortune and calamity have wedded her sons to their soil with an embrace yet closer than is known elsewhere, and the Irishman is still more profoundly Irish, but it does not follow that because his local patriotism is strong he should be incapable of an imperial patriotism. There are two modes of presenting the subject which I have argued. One of them is to present what we now recommend as good and the other is to present it as a choice of evils and as the least among the varied evils with which as possibilities we are confronted. Well I have argued the matter as if it had been a choice of evils. I have recognized as facts and as entitled to attention jealousies which I myself do not share or feel. I have argued it on that ground as the only ground on which it can be recommended, not only to a mixed auditory, but the public mind of the country that cannot give

MINUTE INVESTIGATION

to all portions of this complicated question. I do not know whether it may appear too bold, but in my own heart I cherish the hope that this is not merely a choice of lesser evil, but that it may be proved to be ere long a good in itself. [Loud cheers.] There is I know, an answer to this, and what is the answer? The answer is only found in the view which rests upon a basis of despair, of absolute condemnation of Ireland and Irishmen, as exceptions to these beneficial provisions which have made in general, Europeans in particular, Englishmen and Americans capable of self government; that an Irishman is a lusus naturæ, that justice, common sense, moderation, natural prosperity, have no meaning for him, that all that he can understand and all that he can appreciate is strife and perpetual dissensions. Now, sir, I am not going to argue in this house whether this view, this monstrous view [Irish cheers.] is a correct one. I say an Irishman is as capable of loyalty as any other man. [Renewed Irish cheers.] But if his loyalty has been checked, why it is because the laws by which he is governed do not present themselves to him as they do to us in England or Scotland, with a native and congenial element. I have no right to say that Ireland through her constitutionally elected members will accept the measure I propose. I hope they will, but I have no right to assume it, nor have I any

POWER TO ENFORCE

it upon the people of England and Scotland, but I rely on the patriotism and the sagacity of this house, on free and full discussion, and more than all, upon the justice and generous sentiments of the two British nations, and looking forward I ask the house, believing that no trivial motive could have driven us to assist in the work we have undertaken (work which we believe will restore parliament to its dignity and legislation to its free and unimpeded course), I ask them to stay the waste of the public treasure under the present system of government and administration in Ireland, which is not waste only, but waste which demoralizes while it exhausts. I ask them to show to Europe and America that we too can face the political problems which America had to face twenty years ago, and which many countries in Europe have been called on to face and have not feared to deal with. I ask that we shall practice as we have very often preached, and that in our own case we should be firm and fearless in applying the doctrines we have often inculcated on others, that the concession of

LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT

is not the way to sap and impair, but to strengthen and consolidate unity. I ask that we should learn to rely less on mere written stipulations, and more on these better stipulations written on the heart and mind of man. I ask that we should apply to Ireland the happy experience we have gained in England and Scotland, where a course of generations has now taught us, not as a dream or a theory, but as a matter of practice and of life, that the best and surest foundation we can find to build on is the foundation afforded by the affections and convictions and will of man, and that it is thus by the decree of the Almighty, that far more than by any other method we may be enabled to secure at once the social happiness, the power and the permanence of the empire.

Mr. Gladstone resumed his seat amid bursts of enthusiastic cheers, which were sustained for several minutes. Mr. Gladstone's speech was three hours and twenty-five minutes in duration. He finished at 8 o'clock.

PARNELL PLEASED,

Although He Finds Some Fault With the Measure.

At the conclusion of Mr. Trevellyan's speech Mr. Parnell arose and was received with cheers by the Irish members.

He congratulated Mr. Trevellyan on having, like the French general who had unsuccessfully defended Paris, his own plan, a plan, however, which did not seem to awaken much enthusiasm in the house. Mr. Trevellyan, he said, had stated why he had left the government, but not why he had resigned his post as chief secretary [Cheers from the Irish benches.] Mr. Parnell then went on to justify his past utterances and actions, which had been impugned by Mr. Trevellyan. Speaking of America and the assassination literature which came from America, Mr. Parnell said that most of the literature was neither American nor Irish literature. If Mr. Trevellyan were to study the literature of America at this moment he would find that sympaty for the just settlement of the grievances of Ireland by the concession of a domestic legislature is shown by all classes, whether Irish or native born American, and more especially that native-born Americans are welcoming the efforts of Mr. Gladstone, in the belief that they will bring peace between England and Ireland, and more especially between Irish-Americans and England. It is a remarkable fact that the great meetings, now being held in favor of an Irish legislature, are mainly called together and organized by native-born Americans, by editors and conductors of Irish-American newspapers. We regard the fact that during the last five or six months we have succeeded in entirely gaining the sympathy of the two great

PARTIES IN AMERICA,

the Democrats and the Republicans, as a good omen for the future. [Cheers.] As to the bill before the house, while reserving his full expression of opinion until he had seen the bill, Mr. Parnell congratulated the house on the fact that there was still living an English statesman who could devote attention to this important matter, and begged to thank Mr. Gladstone for what would not only prove a beneficial move [cheers] from the Irish point of view, but which he (Parnell) believed would be found to be of equal benefit to England. The bill nevertheless contained blots which the Irish representatives would do their best to remove. One of these was to be found in the financial proposals of the bill, which he regarded as very unfavorable to Ireland, especially in regard to the Irish tribute to the imperial exchequer. He also complained of the proposition relative to the two orders intended to constitute the Irish parliament, on the ground that the first order consisting of peers not subject to the influence of the popular vote would have the power of hanging up measures demanded by the people and their representatives for two or three years. On the whole, however, apart from these defects, he believed the measure would be cheerfully accepted by the Irish people and their representatives, as a satisfactory solution of the long-standing dispute between the two countries and as tending to prosperity and peace in Ireland and to satisfaction in England. (Cheers.)

On motion of Mr. Chamberlain the debate was adjourned, Sir Wm. Harcourt, previously stating that Mr. Gladstone would move to-morrow to give the debate precedence on other matters. Mr. Gladstone left the house ten minutes after concluding his speech. He was affected by the reaction after the intense excitement of the day and was obliged to retire to rest immediately after dinner. The cabinet has been summoned to meet on Friday.

AS VIEWED BY THE PRESS.

A Mixture of Apprehension, Condemnation and Hope.

LONDON, April 9.—After the adjournment of the house of commons last night eighty of the Parnellite members met in conclave and discussed Mr. Gladstone's speech until 10 p. m. Advices from Dublin and Belfast say that there was considerable excitement in those cities on receipt of reports of the premier's speech. Great crowds gathered around the newspaper offices to learn the details of Mr. Gladstone's Irish scheme. The evening papers all published extra editions giving the speech in full. No disorders are reported. The morning Post (Conservative) admits that Mr. Gladstone's speech was a great oratorical effort, wanting none of the fire and but little of the vigor which in past times electrified parliament.

But," it continues, "friends and foes are alike astonished at the crudity of the plans, and we perhaps do not err if we say that, with the exception of the Parnellites there are not twenty members who are not bewildered as to how such a scheme could seriously be proposed. Fortunately there is not the remotest chance that any such scheme will receive the sanction of parliament."

THE DAILY NEWS SAYS:

If enthusiastic cheering ringing on both sides of the house is significant, Mr. Gladstone's scheme has already received the approval of the house of commons. The speech will rank as one of Mr. Gladstone's highest efforts. Experience, however, has shown that immediate triumph is sometimes followed by final disaster. How the scheme will fare in its progress through the commons it is difficult to forecast. It is full of controversial matters, no more especially in respect to the constitution of the proposed parliament and the financial arrangement between England and Ireand, but in its broad principles it is well calculated to allay fears excited, and will prepare the public mind for a calm and rational consideration of one of the greatest problems ever presented. More serious than the Conservative and Orange opposition is Mr. Trevelyan's attitude, which probably indicates the standpoint of Lord Hartington's Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Goschen. A grave responsibility rests upon these statesmen. A simple negative will not suffice. Something must be done for Ireland. The best and most patriotic thing for parliament to do is

Continued on Fourth Page.

SILVER IN THE HOUSE.

The Members Put the Seal of Disapproval on Both Suspension and Free Coinage,

Which Means That the Coinage Must Remain for Some Time Under the Present Law.

The Vote On Suspension 84 to 201, and On Free Coinage 126 to 163.

How the Minnesota Members Voted --The Senate Discusses Washington Territory.

The Free Silver Bill Killed.

Special to the Globe.

WASHINGTON, April 8.—The house placed itself on record to-day as opposed, by a large majority, to changing the existing law in regard to silver. Before the debate closed this afternoon the members of the coinage committee had agreed among themselves that only one amendment might be offered berore thd vote was taken upon the passage of the bill, namely, that if no international agreement in regard to silver should be made before 1889, the complusory clause of the existing law in regard to the monthly coinage of silver dollars should be inoperative. This was rejected by 117 majority. Of the eighty-four who voted for conditional suspension after 1889, thirty were Democrats. Of the 201 voting against suspension 133 were Democrats and 68 Republicans. When the speaker announced the defeat of the Dibble amendment, Mr. Bland, Mr. Weaver of Iowa and Mr. Warner of Ohio looked happy and confident, apparently expecting that the free coinage bill would get through. When the vote on free coinage was taken there was a great deal of talking and moving about on the part of members who have heretofore been active on either side, and deep interest was manifested in the result. The score stood 126 for free coinage to 163 against it. Thirty Republicans and 96 Democrats voted for it, and 92 Republicans and 71 Democrats against it. Mr. Bland admits his disappointment at the defeat of his bill, but says he will bring forward free coinage again if any attempt is made to pass a suspension bill.

THE HOUSE'S DECISIVE VOTE.

WASHINGTON, April 8.—The house took up the silver bill and Mr. Dibble spoke in opposition to it. Mr. Herbert defended the administration. Mr. Bland asked leave to withdraw the motion entered by him yesterday to recommit the bill, but Mr. Morgan objected. Finally, however, Mr. Bland succeeded in getting unanimous consent of withdrawal. Mr. Dibble offered an amendment providing that, unless in the meantime through concurrent action of the nations of Europe with the United States silver be remonetized prior to July 1, 1889, then and thereafter so much of the act of Feb. 28, 1878, as authorized and directs the secretary of the treasury to purchase silver bullion, and cause the same to be coined, shall be suspended until further action by congress. The amendment was defeated—yeas 84, nays 201—as follows:

YEAS.

Adams (Ill.)	Findlay,*	Phelps,
Allen (Mass.)	Gallinger,	Pindar,*
Arnot*,	Gibson* (Md.)	Pulitzer,*
Atkinson,	Green* (N. J.)	Randall,*
Baker,	Grout,	Ranney,
Bayne,	Harmer,*	Reed,
Beach,*	Haynes,	Rockwell,
Belmont,*	Hemphill,*	Sawyer,
Bingham,	Hewitt,*	Scott,*
Bliss,*	Hiestand,	Scranton,
Bound,	Hires,	Seymour,*
Boutelle,	James,*	Shaw,*
Bunnell,	Johnson,	Sowden,*
Burleigh,	Ketcham,	Spooner,
Campbell*(NY)	Lehlbach,	Spriggs,*
Cole,* (Md)	Lindsley,	Stahlnecker,*
Collins,*	Long,	Stewart, (Vt.)
Davenport,	Mahoney,*	Stone (Mass.)
Davis,	McAdoo,*	Storm,*
Dibble,*	McComas,	Strait,
Dingley,	Merriman,*	Swope,*
Dowdney,*	Millard,	Viele,*
Dunham,	Milliken,	Wadsworth,
Ely,	Mitchell,*	Wait,
Ermentrout,*	Muller,*	Weber,
Evans,	O'Neill (Pa.)	West,
Everhart,	Parker,	Whiting—84.
Farquhar,	Payne,	

NAYS.

Anderson* (O.)	Glass,*	O'Hara,
Anderson(Kas)	Glover,*	O'Neill* (Mo.)
Ballentine,*	Goff,	Osborne,
Barbour,*	Green* (N. C.)	Outhwaite,*
Barksdale,*	Grosvenor,	Owen,
Burnes,*	Guenther,	Payson,
Berry,*	Hale,*	Peel,*
Bennett,*	Hall,*	Perkins,
Blanchard,*	Halsell, *	Perry,*
Bland,*	Hammond,*	Peters,
Blount,*	Hanback,	Plumb,
Boyle,*	Harris,*	Price,
Brady,	Hatch,*	Reagan,*
Br'kr'ge.*(Ak)	Heard,*	Reid,* (N. C.)
Br'kr'ge,* (Ky)	Henderson(Ia.)	Richardson,*
Browne,	Hend's'n* (NC)	Robertson *
Brown (Pa.)	Henderson (Ill)	Rogers,*
Brumm,	Henley,*	Romeis,
Buchanan,	Hepburn,	Rowell,
Bumes.*	Herbert,*	Ryan,
Burrows,	Herman,	Sayers,*
Butterworth,	Hill,*	Seney,*
Bynum,*	Hill,	Sessions,
Cabell,*	Holman,*	Singleton,*
Caldwell,*	Holles,	Skinner,*
Campbell* (O.)	Hopkins,	Smalls,
Candler,*	Houk,	Snyder,*
Cannon,	Howard,*	Springer,*
Carleton,*	Irion,*	Steele,
Catchings,*	Johnston (Ind.)	Stephenson,
Clardy,*	Johnston* (NC)	Stewart* (Tex)
Clements,*	Jones* (Tex.)	St. Martin,*
Cobb,*	King,*	Stone* (Mo.)
Comstock,*	Kleiner,*	Struble,
Conger,	Laffoon,*	Symes,
Cooper,	La Follette,	Tarsney,*
Cowles,*	Laird,	Taulbee,*
Cox,*