MR. MORLEY AND THE CASE FOR IRELAND.

Montrose, Monday Night.

At the conclusion of his speech this evening to his constituents, in the Burgh Hall,

Mr. John Morley said—There has been a bad dream that we were done with the Irish question—that we should have no more embarrassment in that quarter. We, Liberals, used to have a majority over the Tories, plus the Irish. We were to die rather than depend on the Irish vote. That was the talk which I heard to-day. I listened to that kind of talk in London, rather slightly, but, I hope, with decent composure. (Laughter.) And

I will tell you. My reading of the history of Irish relations to English and Scotch is this—that Ireland has been a great piece in our party programmes. She has not led the dose. What is the present case? It is remarkable. Really I don't know what to do for dwelling on this. What is the present case? Three or four months ago in this room I spoke of the Irish question. I spoke of the Irish as harsh as I, in my long years of Parliamentary experience, have heard. Now what has happened? Ireland is transformed, and we have before us in the House of Commons, and has been a great deal about it before you to-day.

THE BUYING OUT IRISH LANDLORDS

Speak of an immense draft upon the Exchequer of the United Kingdom. As Mr. Balfour describes it—a Bill which, without a penny for its avowed object the ruin of landlordism in Ireland, and the transfer to the Irish people the soil which they are dispossessed. Now, don't be surprised

A Bill is a Parliamentary name for the historian will look back upon this and a great chapter in Irish history. What does the introduction of this Bill mean? Shaking landlordism in Ireland mean? It has for its avowed object the ruin of landlordism in Ireland, and the transfer to the Irish people the soil which they are dispossessed. Now, don't be surprised

A Bill is a Parliamentary name for the historian will look back upon this and a great chapter in Irish history. What does the introduction of this Bill mean? Shaking landlordism in Ireland mean? Shaking the Union? Shaking the Unionist Government? I remind seventeen years ago that if I could give them twenty years of firm and fearless—(laughter)—firm and fearless—I could settle the Irish question; the Unionist which made that promise, which [illegible] seventeen of these twenty years—[illegible] great Coercion Act of 1887, and which used that Act pretty sharply and [illegible] pretty harshly; the Government which only [illegible] months had half a dozen [illegible] score—I do not remember—Irish members under lock [illegible] that Government—I do not [illegible] by the production of this [illegible] measure, that the whole thing for [illegible] 17 years—the whole of their policy in Ireland—has failed, no object that we [illegible] millions and millions to get on to a completely new track. I want that fact, that [illegible] to be known to reach the [illegible] thinking men of both and [illegible] parties. What I have said to you [illegible] truth of the situation. There [illegible] more as 20 years of resolute Government and all will be well." See, they have [illegible] years, and nothing has come of it [illegible] of which I may say a word or two in a moment. What language has the Irish Secretary to say of this Bill? He says it is [illegible] with this Irish question. That is much wiser language than was used by some friends of mine. That was

MR. GLADSTONE'S POLICY IN 1886—

that peddle with it. What else does Mr. Wyndham say? He says that the Nationalists are put in possession. They will incur an enormous debt to the National Exchequer, and some one say, "Oh, they will repudiate." No, says Mr. Wyndham, "repudiation is impossible—it is impossible. The Irish do not repudiate their obligations in other quarters. Why, then, in the name of commonsense, should they strike against that which is most acceptable to them? I will not so wrong the honour of what is a chivalrous race. I will not that say that—it is Mr. Wyndham, the Chief Secretary of the Unionist Government; and I read the words with sympathy and delight; and do I not recall 1886, and the nights of 1886, when the Home Rule policy was before Parliament—do I not recall those 82 sittings on the Irish Bill of 1893, when, as Mr. Gladstone said, the argument that we had to deal with was that the Irish Bill "a dotting of original sin, and they had nothing human but the form." (Laughter.) The deformed, is he not transformed? (Cheers.) They are a chivalrous race. I hope of you not to think I am taunting the Government with this change. I do more taunt them with the change than I blame them for the change