

been taken back as 'care-takers' of the house and farm from which they had been formally and legally expelled. But this is the best proof of the reality and depth of the distress among the tenant-farmers. Mr. Gladstone's land law gave every tenant an 'estate' in the soil he cultivated, which he could only lose by failing to pay his statutory rent. It is this failure which the landlords are using to put their tenants entirely outside the benefits of the land-laws, and thus to reduce them to the old footing as 'tenants at will' under rack-rents, under the name of 'care-takers.' Nothing but the direct necessity could lead the tenants to fail in a payment, upon which so much depended for themselves and their children. And all the arguments which moved England to pass the law of 1881 should weigh against allowing the body of the Irish tenants to be driven back into the slough of tenancy-at-will."

We trust that no such period of bitter trial and relentless persecution is really in store for Ireland during the coming winter. But if the predictions of economists prove true, if the fears of patriotic Irishmen all over the world be realized in this regard, the Irish race will, we hope and trust, be found a unit in meeting the trial and overcoming the difficulty. However strained the situation during the ensuing month, the Irish must, while united and determined, be prudent and moderate. Prudence and moderation win greater victories than ever violence could achieve.

THE CAUSE OF IRELAND.

A POWERFUL RESTATMENT OF A WORLD-KNOWN QUESTION, BY A FAMOUS IRISHMAN OF TO-DAY—LECTURE IN THE ACADEMY OF MUSIC, NEW YORK, BY MR. JUSTIN MCCARTHY, M. P.

The following stenographic report of Mr. Justin McCarthy's excellent lecture in the Academy of Music, New York, is from the *Tribe*.

The net proceeds of the lecture were devoted to the relief of Charleston, S. C.

MR. MCCARTHY ADDRESS.

When the outburst of cheering with which Mr. McCarthy was greeted was over he spoke as follows:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN.—You will, I am sure, believe me when I say that I feel all too unable to acknowledge as I deserve the magnificent reception you have so kindly extended to me here to-night. I am very glad indeed that the result of this demonstration is to be practically in favor of so charitable and beneficent a purpose as the relief of those who have lately suffered by a convulsion of nature in Charleston. (Applause.) I regard that as a happy evidence of the genuine feeling in this country of harmony between the North and the South, of that brotherly feeling between all classes in this great Republic. I remember well during the time of the famine in Ireland in 1846-47, when assistance was needed for the starving peasantry of Ireland, there came beautiful offerings from the people of this Republic and from Charleston and many other cities in the Southern States. I am glad, therefore, to have the chance of speaking here in favor of suffering people so far away, and showing that the representatives of the Irish people as well as people themselves can remember and return an act of kindness.

Now I have come here for the purpose of explaining what is meant by the national cause of Ireland. I know very well that, speaking in the Academy of Music in New York, I address an assembly who are supposed to be already thoroughly in sympathy with the national cause of Ireland. For the moment I would almost prefer to believe that I am talking to an audience not converted to that cause, and would be thereby impelled more vigorously to use my efforts in bringing them around to believe in the justice of that cause, in its fair claim to success, and in the almost certainty of its providing the conditions of its gaining glory and triumph. (Applause.) What is the national cause of Ireland? What is it the Irish people ask at the hands of those who now rule them by sheer force of majority? Do they ask anything unreasonable? Do they ask anything opposed to the principles of justice? Do they ask anything out of keeping with the usage of other nations and other communities? Do they ask anything different from that great principle which binds the people of this country together, and which holds even in old-fashioned Europe some of the strongest communities bound together in union and strength? What is it that a people marked out as a distinct nation by geographical limits by custom and by the severance of the sea, shall be regarded as a nationality having authority over its own local and domestic affairs, and to administer these affairs in the way that to it shall seem meet and just. Is that an unreasonable proposition or an irrational demand? That is a demand of every people worthy the name of a nation since ever the principles of a civilized life came to be established on the earth. On that principle, and on that alone, your American Republic stands, and has won its way to a magnificent and an enduring success. We ask, not that the Irish people shall interfere with the rights of Englandmen, or Scotchmen, or Welshmen, we ask only and solely that the Irish people, within the circle of their seas, shall govern their national affairs for themselves. (Applause.) Now that is a demand that century after century the Irish people have been making and making, so far, in vain from the English majority, into whose forcible possession they have come.

I want to ask whether, that being our national demand, we have ever allowed it to lapse or to fall into silence and obscurity by any lack of energy or of force upon our part? Have we ever once acquiesced in the English demand to rule over us as over a conquered and a subject and a willingly subjected people? (Cries of "Never.") I contend we never have during one hour of our history allowed our national demand to fall. During all the centuries that England has ruled over Ireland by force we have been again and again urging our

demand for national and local independence. Further, that demand has been heard and pleaded, and fought out on battlefields after battlefields, during insurrection after insurrection. Through the centuries it has gone on down to '89 and down to '48, you find Irishmen coming forward and appearing in arms in the field as advocates of Ireland's claim to the right to make laws for herself. (Applause.) When the time of insurrection passed we find the people learning by experience and testing constitutional and peaceful agitation for the accomplishment of those designs which they had tried to obtain by force, but could not. We have through several generations been asserting our claim to legislative independence through the means of parliamentary warfare. I point out all this to you only to answer some people who, perhaps, would have the hardihood to contend that the Irish people have, at some time or other, bowed down and accepted the supremacy of England (Cries of "never" and applause.) I say we never have done aught but deny that claim of the English majority to crush our people (applause), so long, at least, as there is in Ireland, in America or in Australia, or anywhere over the world one single group of Irishmen, nay, I would say one single Irishman alive. (Applause.) Any English statesman trying to make us accept English rule uncomplainingly would have set before him a very serious and a very troublesome task. (Laughter.) Before England could accomplish that she would have to exterminate the Irish race all over the world. (Prolonged applause.)

NOT A SELFISH OR LOCAL STRUGGLE.

That being our case, I would like to ask you whether you deem it after all merely a selfish and local struggle. I have said every nation of men worthy of being called and considered a nation has always stood up for this right to manage its local and domestic affairs entirely according to its own lines and according to its own judgment. In the case of Ireland I contend that we have even a broader and better claim than that which rests upon our own national demand. We make no claim for national self-government not alone in behalf of the suffering Irish people, but in behalf of the suffering masses of the English democracy as well. (Applause.) Have you Americans any correct idea of what that system is by which English statesmanship attempts to govern a class of nations which are supposed to be represented in the Imperial Parliament at Westminster. In that Parliament we undertake to manage not alone Imperial affairs, corresponding to those which your Congress at Washington arranges, but we take upon ourselves to manage the domestic, the local, the provincial, the municipal affairs of all the communities of England, Ireland and Scotland and Wales. We arrange for every local gas bill, water bill, sewage bill, railroad bill for the two islands which make up the State of Great Britain. Our Imperial affairs are managed as best we can—for, during the past few sessions, the party to which I belong has had something to say in relation to Irish affairs (laughter), because we had grown rather impatient at having our great national concerns—our land question, our education question, our Home Rule question—mixed up with a gas bill for Stoke Pogis and a water bill for Little Fiddlington. (Laughter and applause.)

Therefore we said, in substance, "We don't want this Imperial system of legislation at all; we want to manage our own affairs at home with ourselves; we want to give you no trouble whatever about our Irish concerns. If you wish to mismanage the affairs of England, of Scotland, of Wales, that is your affair, not ours." (Laughter and applause.) We say to the representatives of these several nationalities in the House of Commons: "If your business is mislaid and mismanaged, we are very sorry for you, but really we want to see that Irish business is not neglected." (Applause.) Consequently, we always take upon ourselves the duty of forcing Irish business to the front. (Renewed applause.) We insist that if Englishmen, Scotchmen and Welshmen wish the old system in Parliament they must recognize the fact that the Irishmen are not content with it; that the people of Ireland are determined, so long as they have a voice in Parliament at all, to make the English listen to the Irish demand. (Prolonged applause.) They find disagreeable names in the English Parliament for anything they do not quite like, and so, they call the Irish National policy a policy of obstruction. (Laughter.) We have not been in the least degree dismayed by the name—we said, call it by any name you like, obstruction, destruction, anything at all you please, for we mean to be faithful to that policy which the Irish people approve and recommend, and we say that until you listen to our demand, and make ready to concede it, the demand and the policy will continue. (Applause.) If the occasion arises again to have recourse to that policy—and I hope occasion may not arise—we are ready to have recourse to it with as much energy and with as great successes finally as we have won in the past. (Applause.) Are we, in acting thus, only striving for the cause of the suffering people of Ireland? Nothing of the sort. We are striving for the cause of the suffering English working classes. You have no idea how questions of the most vital moment for the welfare of the masses are neglected in the English Parliament, because attention cannot be given to them owing to the persistent refusal to meet the demand of the Irish people in a just and generous way. Nothing real or solid can be done for the English people for the English peasant, for the English artisan in towns while the English Parliament remains as at present constituted. I can remember measures affecting the welfare of English seamen for instance, that great class upon whom England's commercial prosperity so much depends, having been brought in session after session, and session after session allowed to drop, because there was no time to have these measures embodied in legislation. I am astonished at the patience of the English people who put up with this.

I have pictured to myself sometimes an English statesman brought face to face with some poor woman whose husband had been drowned at sea, or some poor starving family in a London garret, the one asking in vain for her husband and the other asking what was being done for the starving thousands in the great metropolis. To the query of the second person I should imagine this reply: "My friend, we have been trying to benefit the working classes during the past forty or fifty years, but we never had the time to get through with the work; but it must soothe you somewhat to know that we have passed within that period some fifty coercion acts for Ireland." (Laughter.) To the poor woman whose husband was lost at sea, I should imagine the same statesman to reply: "My dear madam, my heart is overflowing with sympathy for you, and the hearts of my colleagues too." (Laughter.) There was a bill up last session, which if passed, might probably have saved your husband's life; but we attended to this Irish business, you know, and it must at least be a source of consolation to you to recall the fact that we have locked up Mr. Parnell in Kilmainham jail." (Laughter.) This case is typical.

You see, therefore, that ours is not a selfish demand; on the contrary it is a demand which ought to have the support of the toiling millions in England, and after these misguided people who voted against justice to Ireland the last time hear once more the arguments in favor of Home Rule, and see that it is as much an advantage to them as it is to Ireland, they will vote and vote as one man in favor of legislative independence for our country. It is sometimes asked whether, after all, our people are capable of managing their own affairs. Well, I know they are (applause), and any one who has read any history of Ireland at all that pretends to accuracy, must know that from 1783 to 1800, when Ireland had her own Parliament in Dublin, the country made strides such as no other country ever made within a similar period, like conditions being given. (Applause.)

IRISH CAPACITY FOR GOVERNMENT.

I believe, in this community, the Irishmen who have settled here have not shown themselves altogether deficient in the art of government. I believe in Australia, where Irishmen have settled they have shown the same capacity for the management of affairs, local as well as National. In every European country where a career has been fairly open to the talents of the man, we find that the Irishman has cleaved his way and has made his mark. (Applause.) There has not been a great army on the Continent of Europe in which the name of some illustrious Irishman has not been in a foremost place. (Applause.) I do not think the Irish Members of the English House of Commons have shown themselves altogether incapable of holding their own and of making their mark. When there were but seven or eight resolute and determined followers of Mr. Parnell (long-continued applause) we showed ourselves capable of holding at bay the whole force of the 630 English, Scotch and Irish Members who at that time, with one rare exception, were ranged against us. When we rose to be some twenty resolute Irish Members we were able to fight off two Coercion measures introduced by the Government, and the contest occupied weeks and even months of most persevering and determined struggle. We have held our own in debate the eighty-eight, and I do not think the eighty-six men will show themselves less capable or less earnest than the handful of men out of whose small beginning there came such great results. (Great applause.)

Now, what are the chances of our success? What is the probability of the Irish cause being carried within a reasonable time? I have said already that the constitutional agitation which the present Irish party are conducting, the co-operation and confidence and cordial assistance, and more than that, the patience of Irish people all over the globe. I have always said: "Let this game be fairly played. We already have the field. Let us continue to hold the field. Let us do our best. Give us every assistance, give us ample room and we are certain of success." But I have never thought, never been vain enough to think that the constitutional agitation could be maintained at its present effervescent point year after year and generation after generation. I know if I admit that if we cannot do anything like speedily, results, constitutional agitation cannot be maintained forever against the forces of opposing conditions. (Tremendous applause.) Therefore I am specially anxious to show you that this constitutional agitation is very near a final and complete success. (Renewed applause.) Not very many weeks ago at the close of the debate on the second reading of Mr. Gladstone's Bill (applause) I came through the lobby of the defeated company with a sympathetic English Member of Parliament, and he put his arm through mine, and as he walked along he said to me most kindly: "I do hope you are not cast down by what we know must be the result of this division to-night." I said to him: "Cast down? Why how could I be cast down? I walked through this lobby seven or eight years ago with six or seven men asserting this same claim for Home Rule; and now I go through this same lobby with three hundred and ten men, led by the greatest Englishman and orator of his time—led by Gladstone. (Great applause.) Talk to me of being cast down! Where has there been such a victory achieved by constitutional and peaceful means at any time within the history of politics, within the memory of man?" Go through all political history and you will find no such example of an idea, a mere idea having met with such majestic, magnificent progress in such a short space of time and with such apparently inadequate means. (Great applause.) Now, as you know, no great reform in England was

ever carried through at the first rush. The English people are not always ready for a change. The Englishman is somewhat slow on the trigger. He does not jump to a new idea with quite the readiness of a trout to a tempting fly. (Applause.) If you look back to the history of all great English reforms you will find that they were rejected and defeated in the first instance, but after a while the idea settles down into the minds of the English people, and when it settles down it takes firm hold and is certain to be carried into legislation. Now that will be the way with the Home Rule question. (Applause.) The English public at large have for years been taught by the newspaper press to regard Home Rule agitation as something seditious, something anarchical, something to do with the overturning of the throne, and with the rupturing of the family tie, and I do not know what other direful calamity. They were led for years to regard the Irish party as turbulent, revolutionary men, who had neither conscience nor feeling. We were painted one day by the newspapers as living in squalid London garrets in a miserable condition, and on the very next day we were denounced as cravens, as revelling in debauchery on the funds supplied by the National League, supported by money wrung from the too generous hands of American Irishmen and sewing maids. I have often felt inclined to ask the writers on the London newspapers to take the advice given by the cabman in "Pickwick" when the family he is driving gets into a wrangle as to the proposed door at which he is to drive up. "Ladies and gentlemen," he says, "settle among yourselves. If it is to be it all one to me." I have often wished to ask writers on the London papers to settle it among themselves whether we are deserving of the odium cast upon us as to our miserable condition or whether we are indulging in the luxuries accredited to us. But such has been the teaching in relation to this question as afforded by the daily papers of England, and you cannot be surprised that the Englishman who bases his opinion upon that advanced by his newspaper should look upon us in this light.

HARTINGTON AND CHAMBERLAIN.

Well, I am glad to say the time for that kind of misconception is rapidly passing away. When Mr. Gladstone took up the cause of Home Rule in Ireland he appealed at once to the sentiment, to the confidence of a large mass of the English people. (Applause.) They were perfectly willing to believe that the cause he advocated must have justice to be supported, and they were willing to give him their trust and confidence and to go as far in the way of political progress with the Irish cause as he was willing to lead. Well he did not succeed in the first instance. There came a remarkable secession from what we understood to be the ranks of the Liberal party. One leader of the secession movement is the son of one of the greatest of English peers, the son of the Duke of Devonshire—the Marquis of Hartington. (Hisses.) I do not know really that we are called upon to hiss him. He has pursued a straightforward course. He had never professed the smallest sympathy whatever with the attempts of the Irish people. He never, so far as I know, gave one single utterance, one kindly word in behalf of the Irish tenant-farmer, or the Irish peasant. He has always held to his own opinion in his own solid way, caring nothing for Ireland but to do her injustice; never professing to care a single straw for Ireland. I have nothing to say against him; he has been consistent, he has been staid and has gone his own way, and I am proud to say he has carried few members of Parliament with him. (Applause.) But there is another man prominent in English politics, not the son of a great peer, not having anything to do with the landed interest, having nothing in the way of property, tradition or family feeling against the Irish people. I am now speaking of a man who springs from the very heart of the English working classes, from the very heart of the English democracy, who made a great fortune in trade, but whose sympathies were always supposed to be with the Radical party in England and with the Home Rule party in Ireland. I mean, of course, Mr. Joseph Chamberlain. (Hisses.) Now, Mr. Chamberlain has not been consistent. He has always postured and attitudinized as a Radical of the Radicals, as a man entirely in sympathy with Ireland and the Irish Parliamentary party, and in sympathy with the demand for Home Rule in Ireland. I remember well when the Irish Parliamentary party was a small minority in opposition to the Tory party then in power in the days before 1880. Mr. Chamberlain was, as some Tory enemies called him, the conspirator of the Irish party. Well, Mr. Chamberlain has changed his mind. He has within a very short time come around and become an ardent supporter of the first way, an opponent of what he calls the dismemberment of the Empire; the strongest, the bitterest enemy that the Irish cause has to meet with at the present moment. I do not pretend to know what may be the working power of Mr. Chamberlain's mind which brought about that strange and sudden change. Some people say—I do not mean to assert that they are right—but people will say all sorts of things—some people say that Mr. Chamberlain was ambitious for succession to the leadership of the Liberal party, and that he would have been not displeased if he could have pushed the Grand Old Man aside. Some people say, too, that Mr. Chamberlain, who, like all great men, has a very considerable opinion of himself, was rather displeased because he was not consulted before any one else by Mr. Gladstone when Mr. Gladstone made up his mind to introduce the bill for Home Rule in Ireland. However that may be, it is certain that Mr. Chamberlain has rebelled from his chief, has gone over to the opposition and has become an opponent of Home Rule in Ireland. I do not think that I care much for Mr. Chamberlain's opposition. Mr. Chamberlain was a great man while he was a member of the English Radical party, while he was in the line of succession as Prime Minister in the English Radical Party; but just watch for awhile Mr. Chamberlain he stands alone on his own platform and see whether he will be by any means the formidable person whom he fondly hopes

to make himself. He has cut himself off from the Liberal party, and has doomed himself, I venture to say, to political extinction. He cannot be taken into office by the Tories; they could not give him office, he could not take office from them. He is an ambitious man; some of his followers are ambitious men. He will not be taken back into the Liberal party. He will find that between the two stools he has fallen to the ground and that his treachery to his leader will be rewarded by his party passing him by in silence and disgrace. So pass away and so perish politically every one who having pledged himself to the Irish cause makes up his mind to desert. (Applause.)

I am told sometimes that the Tory Government are strong; that they have the House of Lords and a strong body of the English people behind them; that it is wholly in vain for a small Parliamentary party to struggle against them. Let us examine that suggestion by the light of the past. Six years ago the strongest Government ever set up in England was formed under Mr. Gladstone. The Irish Parliamentary party, those who followed Mr. Parnell, were only twenty strong. There were many other Irish members who had been pledged to support us, but these men turned against us, deserted us and in every great division voted in favor of our enemies. We had the strongest Government ever existing in any time arrayed against twenty men. That Government introduced a coercion bill for Ireland, and those twenty men fought the Government for years and years. We said to ourselves, in the words of Byron:

"There never yet was human power
Which could evade if unforgotten
The patient search and vigil long
Of him who treasures up a wrong."

We treasured up that wrong of the Coercion bill, and we waited for our time, and in the providence of heaven that time came, and we opposed that powerful Parliament; by our works and by our votes alone we opposed it, and we turned that triumphant Liberal party out of the treasury benches.

Well, then, I ask you, comparing Gladstone in his strength with Salisbury in his weakness is it likely that we shall allow our cause to be trampled on by a Tory Government? ["No no no!"] Shall we who pulled the lion down say the wolf howls? No, no; not likely. We pulled down the lion; we are not going to be devoured by the wolf. (Cheers and cries of "Good!")

CHURCHILL AND SALISBURY.

The English Tory party, or at least some of them, were our allies not very long ago. There is one of the most conspicuous and prominent of the Tory party in the House of Commons who is now very bitterly against us. I mean, of course, Lord Randolph Churchill. (Loud and prolonged hisses.) Now, Lord Randolph Churchill is a man about whom I don't want to say anything unnecessarily harsh. I have had for many years some personal acquaintance with Lord Randolph Churchill. He is a man of great ability, of great energy, of great audacity, of high animal spirits, and of much force of character. He has all the joyous, reckless courage of a schoolboy. (Laughter.) If one looked at him from his worse side and from the most unfavorable point of view, one might say that he has a good deal of the unadorned acidity of the monkey. (Laughter and cheers.) He has up to this time leapt from tree to tree and from branch to branch of the political tree with an activity and an adroitness which might seem to justify the comparison I have ventured to use. But he is a good deal more than that. He is a very clever, thoughtful, dexterous, self-sufficing and wary person. He wants—and the desire does him no discredit—to rise in politics and to make a lasting mark on political history. His career is but a short one. He has indeed been for many years a member of the House of Commons, but he only began to be a prominent figure in the Parliament of 1880. He then intervened for himself a party of four, which was appropriately called the Fourth Party. There was the Liberal Government and its followers, one party; the Conservative opposition, the second party; the Irish Nationalists, the third party; and Lord Randolph Churchill and his brigade of three (laughter) the fourth party. (Cheers and laughter.) Well, the members of the Fourth Party did the very wisest thing they could do for a little group of men seeking to become distinguished and to obtain power and place; they made themselves a perfect nuisance. (Laughter.) Talk of the Irish party! Why, we were tranquil, we were quietest, we were docile, we were patient compared with the irrepressible Fourth Party, composed of four men. (Laughter.) A member of the House of Commons whom I know very well compared them to the heroes of Duma's great romance, "The Four Guardsmen—the three guardsmen and their ally." They were D'Arques, Fortes, Arques, and Athes. (Laughter.) They were the four of them. They took divisions at all possible times. They spoke on all conceivable topics. They put all manner of perplexing questions. They were constantly being called to order. They were constantly wrangling with the Speaker with the Prime Minister, with all the authorities of the House; and in fact you could not start any question or topic whatever without stirring up Lord Randolph Churchill and his three faithful and steady allies. (Laughter.) Just as certainly as the touch of the match to the barrel of gunpowder brings out the conflagration, so the raising of any question whatever in Parliament brought out Lord Randolph Churchill and his three devoted allies and followers.

Well just as they began to be, in their way, a sort of power they saw, when they were opposed to the Liberal Government, that they had a good chance and a good field by coming into a sort of open alliance with the Irish Parliamentary party. I am not here, on the open platform, going into any of the secrets of parliamentary warfare, but I will merely say that we used to have a good deal of communication now and then with Lord Randolph Churchill and his faithful henchmen of the Fourth Party, and we found that they were always willing to assist us on condition that we now and then in turn assisted them. I may perhaps say that we more than once planned—if you like it, coballed—to

gether. The time came around and the Tories came into office, and the Tories did not dare for their souls to reject or look over this restless, tormenting Fourth Party, and so they absorbed the whole of the Fourth Party at one stroke and the whole of the Fourth Party came at one moment into office together (laughter); and I believe in the history of English politics that is the one single instance in which a whole parliamentary party was transferred at one stroke from opposition into office. (Laughter.) But you see the man in office is a very different person from the man in opposition.

There is a story of a great English Duke, who, being once down in the country, was introduced to a wealthy manufacturer and made his acquaintance and talked with him on very familiar terms. Some time after the English Duke was passing down St. James's street in London, and there he met the wealthy manufacturer, and the manufacturer stopped the Duke and began talking to him in a familiar strain and endeavored to shake hands with him. The lordly Duke, however, drew back and put his hands behind him and looked with stony dignity at the man who had conversed with him and said nothing. The manufacturer said: "My lord Duke, don't you remember me? I was once very friendly with you down in the country." The Duke said: "Sir, I shall be very friendly with you when we meet again down in the country." (Laughter.)

"Well, that is the condition of Lord Randolph Churchill and his Fourth Party toward the Irish claims. When we were together in opposition against Mr. Gladstone they were very friendly and familiar with us; and if ever again we should be in opposition to Mr. Gladstone—which I trust we never shall be (loud and continued cheering)—oh, then, believe me, they will be as familiar and friendly with us; if we are only willing to accept their advances as ever they were before." (Cheers and laughter.)

But, now let me tell you what I believe will be done by the English Conservative party. They are led really by Lord Randolph Churchill, nominally by the Marquis of Salisbury. The Marquis of Salisbury is a man who, on the strength of an imposing presence and a great voice, and a fine, penetrating, rasping style of speech, passes for a strong man. But you know, after all, to make a really strong man it requires more than a commanding presence and a big, harsh voice, and Lord Salisbury is not a strong man, but has always shown himself in every great crisis a weak and flexible man, who is dominated by some intellect and some force of character stronger than his own. He fought for years and years against the leader of his party, Mr. Disraeli. He denounced him in magazines and reviews. He insulted him in the House of Commons. And yet the moment that Mr. Disraeli got him into office and got him under the power of his own strong will and his own force of character he made of Lord Salisbury the most supple and the most pliant tool that a statesman ever made of a statesman. (Applause.) Lord Salisbury is the real painted like the bar of iron. Lord Salisbury will be led or forced any way that the stronger and more daring spirit of his party chose to lead him and to force him.

WHAT THE TORIES WILL DO.

Well, now, I venture to predict that the Tory Government cannot possibly hold office unless they conciliate the Irish party and one way or another accede to the Irish National demand. (Loud and prolonged applause.) Lord Randolph is a very clever and a very adroit and a very ambitious man. He has ten times the force of character of Lord Salisbury. He has made his way to the front in the House of Commons by sheer energy and audacity and schoolboy recklessness. He is resolved to hold on and he will soon see the only way by which he and his party may continue in office. He is a strong Home Ruler one, and not very long ago, and he may, it is quite possible, become for his own purposes a strong Home Ruler again. (Laughter.) I should not wonder in the least if Lord Randolph Churchill were to assist Lord Chamberlain in that great work of educating English Tory squires up to the level of Home Rule. I came across lately in one of the steamers from Ireland to England with a noble lord who was and who is a member and a leading member of the English Conservative party. Our elections were over and we were going back defeated, and I got into friendly talk with him. Of course, as you will easily understand, politics in the House of Commons does not prevent men from having private and friendly associations. I said to him: "Of course your people, the Tories, are going into office?" He said: "Yes I suppose we shall go in." I said: "Then I presume after a while you will bring in what you call a genuine and a comprehensive measure of Home Rule for Ireland?" He said: "Well, perhaps we may see our way after a while to bring in a genuine and a comprehensive measure of local self-government for Ireland." (Applause and hisses.) Well, I shall not wonder at all if they some time did make up their minds to bring in a genuine and comprehensive measure which they will begin by calling local self-government by Ireland, but we shall end in constructing into a measure for the establishment of an Irish Parliament in Ireland. ("Hear," "hear" and applause.)

Personally, I would much rather that the English statesman, who risked power and popularity to introduce a measure of Home Rule for Ireland, were the English statesman to carry that measure to success. (Applause.) Much, indeed, would I prefer—much I am sure, would all my colleagues prefer—that Home Rule for Ireland should be accomplished by the genius of Mr. Gladstone. (Loud applause.) We would much rather that the Irish people should see the completion of that work which his patriotic purpose and his noble consciousness feeling first put into definite shape; and if years be spared him, it may well be that he shall see that entire and perfect consummation of his labors and of his hopes. Yet, of course, we Irishmen are solicitous for the Irish cause and we will take Home Rule from any party whatsoever which sees its way to grant us that justice which alone we

CONTINUED ON PAGE EIGHT.