

The Catholic Record.

"CHRISTIANUS MIHI NOMEN EST, CATHOLICUS VERO COGNOMEN."—"CHRISTIAN IS MY NAME, BUT CATHOLIC MY SURNAME."—St. Pacian, 4th Century.

VOLUME 9.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, JANUARY 29, 1887.

NO. 433.

NICHOLAS WILSON & CO
126 Dundas Street,
Tailors and Gents' Furnishers.
FINE AND MEDIUM WOOLLENS A SPECIALTY.

INSPECTION INVITED.
PARALL THE SILENT.

An English Impression of Chas Stuart Parnell, "The Mystery Man of Modern Politics."

MR. GLADSTONE'S HIGH TRIBUTE TO THE IRISH LEADER'S ZEAL AND EARNESTNESS.

Parnell is an inscrutable, incomprehensible, and mysterious being to the average Englishman. The following character sketch of the Irish leader, drawn by the *Pall Mall Gazette*, will amuse and interest our readers:

Mr. Parnell is the mystery man of modern politics. He is the one man of that windy palace house at Westminster who has risen to the front rank by holding his tongue. He speaks seldom, and when he does not exactly know what to say remains silent. Hence a reputation gained largely by the simple method which led the ancients to select the owl as the bird of the goddess of wisdom. To him almost alone among Parliament men silence has been golden. Nor is that by any means his only peculiarity. He has dwelt and dwells a part. For many years it was said that he was the only member of the House of Commons who had no postal address. In former years he used to disappear mysteriously from the haunts of men, and for days no one knew where to find him. Then he would re-appear; and so great is the awe that he inspires among his associates that no one ventured to ask him where he had been. This mystery and reserve, maintained studiously for eleven years of the part of a young man in the heart of the greatest gossiping shop of all England, is a phenomenon almost without precedent. It has added greatly to his power, and it has enormously increased his influence among the impressionable, superstitious people who have placed their destinies in his hands. Whether he has adopted this attitude from calculation, or whether it is the natural outcome of a suspicious, furtive disposition, interesting itself and therefore distrusting every one else, it is difficult to say. But it has had its effect. The impenetrable mystery of the man has served his purpose as well as the veil, the silver veil of the prophet chief, the Great Mikanna, who occupied

That throne which the blind believer of millions raised him.

But in this case the veil is not of silver so much as of impenetrable brass. This apartment has often been referred to, but seldom has it been more graphically described than by Dr. Schneider, one of the few ambassadors of the press whom German journalism maintains in London. Describing "this engine in the shape of a human being," Dr. Schneider says:

Parnell watches his mind as if it were a fortress, and no one is allowed to look through the windows of his eyes. His companions are as strange to him to-day as they were when they met for the first time. They are numbers, powers; he knows where to make use of them in his Parliamentary attacks, and beyond that all relations are broken off. In loneliness and silence he goes his way, creating around him a desert, at the edge of which his followers are patiently awaiting his behest.

The awe in which he is held by his followers, even by those who have been in jail with him, is very noticeable. He is the head of the Irish Sept—he must not be spoken of with light irreverence, as if he were but a mortal. His is a sacred name, which it is not better not to use. For behind the veil of mystery there is a jealousy even as that of offended Juno, and woe be to the man who gives the Irish chieftain cause to suspect of rivalry or of lack of supreme devotion to the supreme chief.

There have been those who argue that the leader of the Irish democracy is in reality *non compos mentis*, and they maintain that this moodiness and the semi-morose fashion in which he holds mankind at arm's length are traits of an hereditary complaint which affects more or less all the Parnells. But the theory, although taking enough, seems to rest upon slender foundations. Miss Parnell, who died recently in the States, had a craze for collecting rubbish, which she imagined to be valuable bric-a-brac. Mrs. Parnell, who is now nursing her son at the Easton Hotel, displays occasionally extraordinary fertility of imagination, which perplexes her friends, but that is capable of a more prosaic explanation than the theory of hereditary lunacy. There is a brother Parnell somewhere in Italy, learned in Latin, but ignorant of arithmetic, who periodically retires with loathing from the society of his species. But all these eccentricities, even in one person taken together, would be insufficient to justify the most reckless of mad doctors in signing a certificate of lunacy. As for the evidence which is afforded by Mr. Parnell's public career, all that need be said is to quote the saying attributed to Lord Wolseley. Some one was saying, as fools were always saying in those days, that "Gordon was mad." Lord Wolseley remarked, "I wish, then, that he would bite some of our generals." If Mr. Parnell is mad, there are few Parliament men who would not be better for a biting from stern and silent squire of Avondale, whose unwavering resolution and iron will have placed him on a pinnacle of power higher than that occupied by any leader his nation has produced.

As a speaker Mr. Parnell is dry, clear and direct. He is not an orator. Of eloquence there is no trace in any of his speeches; but he possesses one great gift, to which Mr. Gladstone publicly paid a high tribute in the days when he and Mr. Parnell were in the opposite camps. "The hon. gentleman," he once told the House of Commons, "is not in the habit of using words in this house which he has not well weighed. No man as far as I can judge, is more successful than the hon. member in doing that which it is commonly supposed all speakers do, and which in my opinion few really do—and I do not include myself among those few—namely in saying what he means to say." He is a cold and frigid speaker, but his words are to the point. He speaks as he sees, and the clearness of his vision gives precision to his utterances. He never makes an epigram, and probably never indulges in the luxury of a trope. But just as the few pregnant sayings of the taciturn Grant became the watchword of a nation in the throes of a great crisis, so some of Mr. Parnell's words have played a prominent part in the Irish campaign of liberation. Few sayings are more familiar than his famous avowal in regard to the land agitation: "I would not have taken off my coat and gone to this work if I had not known that we were laying the foundation of this movement for the regeneration of this legislative independence." It was he who invented the famous phrase about "prairie value," and he who alluded with sinister emphasis to the fact that the value of the land in Ireland had not yet "touched bottom."

But although Mr. Parnell has invented apt phrases, he can hardly be said to be a man of much originality. The land agitation was Davitt's work, not his. In the Home Rule movement he but succeeded Mr. Butt and Mr. Shaw. He had been, as he himself phrased it, the jockey rather than the creator of the Irish movement. It was not an easy riding. His party consisted of patriots of all classes. He had to ride not only one steed, but several; and it was no easy task to keep them together. That he succeeded in accomplishing his all but impossible task was due largely to the conviction universal among all Irish patriots that "Parnell hated England." They hated England, and they trusted him. That has been the lodestar of his career. He has hated England as the oppressor of his country and the great obstacle in the way of the recognition of Irish nationality. There is also something of an American addition to his Irishman's animosity, which in no way moderates its rancour.

Mr. Parnell is the great idol of our time. Mahmood the idol breaker was nothing to Parnell the blocker of Parliaments. Before his time the faith in parliamentary government was with most Englishmen a superstition of the most extraordinary kind. To give a country parliamentary institutions was, in the opinion of the British public, to give it a fair start on the road to paradise. To depose a Parliament was clear proof of lunacy or of the blackest evil, of which only Tzars and their satellites could be guilty. And the House of Commons, the mother of all Parliaments, was held in peculiar reverence. It was the very Ark of the Covenant, radiant with the glories of the constitutional Sheehelah. That was only a dozen years ago in point of time; but what a gulf yawns between where we stand to-day and the archaic simplicity of the Parliamentary worship of that time. And it is all Mr. Parnell's doing. It is he who by his coldly calculated policy of Obstruction has dispelled the glamour round Parliamentary worship, and compelled us sorrowfully to admit that constitutionalism is but a fetish like other fetishes, and that, of all modes of governing an empire, government by a paralyzed mob at St. Stephen's may be one of the worst. Let us sacred arena entered this young man—he was but 31 when first elected for Meath—and boldly laid impious hands on the palladium of our liberties. Instead of being smitten down like the unfortunate Uzzah, this intruder threw amain. As the power of Parliament waned the power of Mr. Parnell grew, until at last the scoffing Obstructionists, pointing to the Houses of Parliament in scorn, might well exclaim: "These be thy gods, O England! Eyes have they, but they see not; ears have they, but they hear not; neither is there understanding in their midst." Whether Mr. Parnell invented Obstruction himself or was only the apt pupil of Mr. Biggar, who bettered the instruction of his master, is not quite clear. But the policy was laid down by him as far back as 1878, and since then has been resolutely adhered to. He saw from the very first that England was most vulnerable in the House of Commons, and that if he struck her there, the blow would tell. It was to punish England he adopted it; and he predicted with confidence that England would very soon get afraid of "the policy of punishment." He foresaw also that this punishment would lead to a policy of expulsion; and he probably wonders that the prediction he made in 1878 has not been fulfilled before 1887.

HEALY IN GLASGOW.
HE MAKES A THOROUGH HOME RULE IMPRESSION ON THE SCOTCHMEN.

Towards the close of December Mr. Timothy M. Healy addressed a large gathering of Scotchmen in the great city on the Clyde. Subjoined is a portion of his speech. He declared that after another six months of government by nobodies, the people would find that to turn out Mr. Gladstone did not pay, and would pay, and the cost of the agent's fees, after all the money was collected the landlord would be quite free to take it, but he would not take it. That was what they (the people) complained of. It was because he refused it they were obliged to invest the money abroad. If the landlord would take the money it was there for him at any time, all they wanted from him was a clear receipt. But it was said:

"You fix the rent yourself." They did not want to do anything of the kind. They were willing to leave it to any honest tribunal, but not to the landlord—they did not think he was an honest tribunal. John Bright once said, "Take away the improvements the Irish tenants has made in the soil and it would be as poor and naked as an American prairie." The Irish tenants were willing to give the Irish landlords as much as John Bright said they ought to have, and when the landlord claimed to fix rent on his property, they said, "It is not your property—it is our property," and the tenants of Ireland, with legislative sanction, declared that these improvements were their own, and that rent was not to be put on the land without their having a say on it. Let the writers in Unionist and landlord papers and the authors of such phrases as "organized embezzlement" be good enough to recollect that the land act makes the tenants practically the owners of the soil. When the Irish leaders saw their people being driven out of their homes without a refuge were they to stand by for fear of incurring the criticisms of the ignoramuses of England and Scotland who wrote against them? Besides the landlord there was another minority against the rule—the Orangemen. Their objection was a religious one, but, as facts showed,

THEY HAD NOTHING TO FEAR from their Catholic fellow countrymen. It was only in Belfast churches were sacked, and they were Catholic churches. If ever they got Home Rule one of the first things they would do was to amusey and release the Belfast Orange rioters, although, unfortunately, at the time they would not have the inclination to put in the original authors of the riot, Lord Randolph Churchill. Nearly every one of the Irish leaders had been Protestants. As to the fear of separation, the speaker said the Irish people wanted no separation. The Irish people had helped to make the empire, and they wanted some of the good things of it. In conclusion, the speaker referred to the assistance the Scotch could give the Irish people in their struggle. The ballot paper, a vote marked in blue ink, would affect the lives and fortunes of the peasants in Connacht. The cross they made might be the salvation of the entire people. The democracy had now the power of the aristocracy of old. The Irish were a forgiving people. Hitherto the world had been against them. They had now a statesman pleading for them, for reconciliation and consideration. Unhappily they had repudiated their part in his demand, and they asked that in the future these two nations may be reconciled and strife banished from amongst them, and where in the past there were only passion and bloodshed, wash and division, there may shine the sun of prosperity and peace.

THE PLAN OF CAMPAIGN.
SPEECH OF MR. O'BRIEN.

At Fairymount, between Roscommon and Mayo, on Sunday, Mr. O'Brien addressed a meeting of the tenantry of Lord de Fyne, Lord Dillon, and Mr. J. C. Murphy. In the course of his speech he said: I do not shrink speaking of the plan of campaign, even after the proclamation of His Most Serene Highness the German Emperor (cheers and laughter). The plan of campaign has now been over two months in full working order through the country. It has been assailed by the landlords, and by the Government who have done their worst, and I ask you, has the plan of campaign stood the test? (cries "it has.") There never was a moment when I for one felt more confident than I do at this hour that the plan of campaign has a power within it which will smash every track renter's eye, and that it is a plan of campaign which takes a fall with it (cheers). When the landlords talk about putting the tenants into bankruptcy I tell them here to-day that if they want to make a Bankruptcy Court the battle will meet them there too. I warn these Irish rack renters that if once they enter into the Bankruptcy Court they will never leave it except as rascals and bankrupts themselves—(cheers)—and that their estates will be sold off in the public market for whatever their tenants choose to bid for them (cheers). It is because they are baffled and because their spirit is broken that the Government has come to the rescue and is trying to wrestle with us itself. I want to know how the Government like the wrestle up to the present. Have they crushed the plan of campaign? (No). The Government are suffering at the present moment from a very dangerous internal disorder. They have got what I may call a rush of Lord Randolph Churchill to the head (laughter). I do not think they are long for this world (laughter). The Chief Secretary made a speech at Dublin Castle the other day which sounded for all the world

LIKE A LITANT FOR THE DYING (loud laughter). I would just like to ask Sir Michael Hicks-Beach how or in what fashion he thinks to cripple us and the plan of campaign. Was it by the proclamation of the Shigo meeting? Was it by the little bit of thievery done at Louisa? Or is it by sending policemen froling all over the country on outside cars

blunderbuss over their heads had to agree. As to the plan of campaign, it was said that it was invented for the purpose of taking away the tenants' money, who would otherwise pay to the landlords. That was his number one, because what the plan of campaign did was this, it saved the landlord the trouble of collecting the money and the cost of the agent's fees. After all the money was collected the landlord would be quite free to take it, but he would not take it. That was what they (the people) complained of. It was because he refused it they were obliged to invest the money abroad. If the landlord would take the money it was there for him at any time, all they wanted from him was a clear receipt. But it was said:

"You fix the rent yourself." They did not want to do anything of the kind. They were willing to leave it to any honest tribunal, but not to the landlord—they did not think he was an honest tribunal. John Bright once said, "Take away the improvements the Irish tenants has made in the soil and it would be as poor and naked as an American prairie." The Irish tenants were willing to give the Irish landlords as much as John Bright said they ought to have, and when the landlord claimed to fix rent on his property, they said, "It is not your property—it is our property," and the tenants of Ireland, with legislative sanction, declared that these improvements were their own, and that rent was not to be put on the land without their having a say on it. Let the writers in Unionist and landlord papers and the authors of such phrases as "organized embezzlement" be good enough to recollect that the land act makes the tenants practically the owners of the soil. When the Irish leaders saw their people being driven out of their homes without a refuge were they to stand by for fear of incurring the criticisms of the ignoramuses of England and Scotland who wrote against them? Besides the landlord there was another minority against the rule—the Orangemen. Their objection was a religious one, but, as facts showed,

THEY HAD NOTHING TO FEAR from their Catholic fellow countrymen. It was only in Belfast churches were sacked, and they were Catholic churches. If ever they got Home Rule one of the first things they would do was to amusey and release the Belfast Orange rioters, although, unfortunately, at the time they would not have the inclination to put in the original authors of the riot, Lord Randolph Churchill. Nearly every one of the Irish leaders had been Protestants. As to the fear of separation, the speaker said the Irish people wanted no separation. The Irish people had helped to make the empire, and they wanted some of the good things of it. In conclusion, the speaker referred to the assistance the Scotch could give the Irish people in their struggle. The ballot paper, a vote marked in blue ink, would affect the lives and fortunes of the peasants in Connacht. The cross they made might be the salvation of the entire people. The democracy had now the power of the aristocracy of old. The Irish were a forgiving people. Hitherto the world had been against them. They had now a statesman pleading for them, for reconciliation and consideration. Unhappily they had repudiated their part in his demand, and they asked that in the future these two nations may be reconciled and strife banished from amongst them, and where in the past there were only passion and bloodshed, wash and division, there may shine the sun of prosperity and peace.

WITHOUT A CARE OR THOUGHT
of the people from whom they drew it, except that the moment that they fall short of it they were ordered to be expelled from their houses. They had armed the landlords with all the power of the law, had placed an alien church, police men by the thousands, and soldiers by tens of thousands over the people; they crushed out every manufacture and industry in the country, so that the country was reduced to nothing but the work of agriculture; and when he stated these facts could they wonder at crime, when for more than one hundred years men were driven out of the country to America like vermin, or hunted to Scotland and England to reduce the wages in these countries. He desired to state that he was presenting matters to the audience in the mildest form. Then the magistrates on the bench, and the members of the grand jury were of the landlord party. When they had such a system of government as existed in Ireland, the wonder was, not that there was crime, the wonder would be that there would be no crime. But it was said the Irish people were idle and would not work, and that when they had a fair tribunal to fix their rents they would adopt the Plan of Campaign. Whatever attempts they made to redress the grievances of the Irish people, the landlord party raised the cry of the people and there had been their being dishonest, and that their being dishonest was a reason for refusing home rule, as being outside the pale of civilization. Those who saw Irishmen in England and Scotland working in foundries, in the brickfields, the harvest fields, or on the railways would not call them idle; and those who saw the Irish at home, saw the mountains cultivated on top four or five thousand feet above the level of the sea, would not call them idle. Up till

THE LAND ACT OF 1881, the peasant was liable to be evicted and his improvements confiscated at the beck of the landlord. By the land act the people were not, however, even then protected from the exactions of the landlords, and it gave them no "fair tribunal" for fixing fair rents. Out of the 600,000 holders of land in Ireland there had been fair rents fixed in only 90,000 instances, and there had been 80,000 agreements. The 5000 leaseholders were not admitted to the benefit of the act as to the rents fixed by the court. The court nullified the act as to the tenants' improvements and the agreement cases were those of tenants who could not manage to pay a whole year's rent at one time, and had to come to agree with their landlords as those who stopped on the highway by robbers with a

blunderbuss over their heads had to agree. As to the plan of campaign, it was said that it was invented for the purpose of taking away the tenants' money, who would otherwise pay to the landlords. That was his number one, because what the plan of campaign did was this, it saved the landlord the trouble of collecting the money and the cost of the agent's fees. After all the money was collected the landlord would be quite free to take it, but he would not take it. That was what they (the people) complained of. It was because he refused it they were obliged to invest the money abroad. If the landlord would take the money it was there for him at any time, all they wanted from him was a clear receipt. But it was said:

"You fix the rent yourself." They did not want to do anything of the kind. They were willing to leave it to any honest tribunal, but not to the landlord—they did not think he was an honest tribunal. John Bright once said, "Take away the improvements the Irish tenants has made in the soil and it would be as poor and naked as an American prairie." The Irish tenants were willing to give the Irish landlords as much as John Bright said they ought to have, and when the landlord claimed to fix rent on his property, they said, "It is not your property—it is our property," and the tenants of Ireland, with legislative sanction, declared that these improvements were their own, and that rent was not to be put on the land without their having a say on it. Let the writers in Unionist and landlord papers and the authors of such phrases as "organized embezzlement" be good enough to recollect that the land act makes the tenants practically the owners of the soil. When the Irish leaders saw their people being driven out of their homes without a refuge were they to stand by for fear of incurring the criticisms of the ignoramuses of England and Scotland who wrote against them? Besides the landlord there was another minority against the rule—the Orangemen. Their objection was a religious one, but, as facts showed,

THEY HAD NOTHING TO FEAR from their Catholic fellow countrymen. It was only in Belfast churches were sacked, and they were Catholic churches. If ever they got Home Rule one of the first things they would do was to amusey and release the Belfast Orange rioters, although, unfortunately, at the time they would not have the inclination to put in the original authors of the riot, Lord Randolph Churchill. Nearly every one of the Irish leaders had been Protestants. As to the fear of separation, the speaker said the Irish people wanted no separation. The Irish people had helped to make the empire, and they wanted some of the good things of it. In conclusion, the speaker referred to the assistance the Scotch could give the Irish people in their struggle. The ballot paper, a vote marked in blue ink, would affect the lives and fortunes of the peasants in Connacht. The cross they made might be the salvation of the entire people. The democracy had now the power of the aristocracy of old. The Irish were a forgiving people. Hitherto the world had been against them. They had now a statesman pleading for them, for reconciliation and consideration. Unhappily they had repudiated their part in his demand, and they asked that in the future these two nations may be reconciled and strife banished from amongst them, and where in the past there were only passion and bloodshed, wash and division, there may shine the sun of prosperity and peace.

WITHOUT A CARE OR THOUGHT
of the people from whom they drew it, except that the moment that they fall short of it they were ordered to be expelled from their houses. They had armed the landlords with all the power of the law, had placed an alien church, police men by the thousands, and soldiers by tens of thousands over the people; they crushed out every manufacture and industry in the country, so that the country was reduced to nothing but the work of agriculture; and when he stated these facts could they wonder at crime, when for more than one hundred years men were driven out of the country to America like vermin, or hunted to Scotland and England to reduce the wages in these countries. He desired to state that he was presenting matters to the audience in the mildest form. Then the magistrates on the bench, and the members of the grand jury were of the landlord party. When they had such a system of government as existed in Ireland, the wonder was, not that there was crime, the wonder would be that there would be no crime. But it was said the Irish people were idle and would not work, and that when they had a fair tribunal to fix their rents they would adopt the Plan of Campaign. Whatever attempts they made to redress the grievances of the Irish people, the landlord party raised the cry of the people and there had been their being dishonest, and that their being dishonest was a reason for refusing home rule, as being outside the pale of civilization. Those who saw Irishmen in England and Scotland working in foundries, in the brickfields, the harvest fields, or on the railways would not call them idle; and those who saw the Irish at home, saw the mountains cultivated on top four or five thousand feet above the level of the sea, would not call them idle. Up till

THE LAND ACT OF 1881, the peasant was liable to be evicted and his improvements confiscated at the beck of the landlord. By the land act the people were not, however, even then protected from the exactions of the landlords, and it gave them no "fair tribunal" for fixing fair rents. Out of the 600,000 holders of land in Ireland there had been fair rents fixed in only 90,000 instances, and there had been 80,000 agreements. The 5000 leaseholders were not admitted to the benefit of the act as to the rents fixed by the court. The court nullified the act as to the tenants' improvements and the agreement cases were those of tenants who could not manage to pay a whole year's rent at one time, and had to come to agree with their landlords as those who stopped on the highway by robbers with a

blunderbuss over their heads had to agree. As to the plan of campaign, it was said that it was invented for the purpose of taking away the tenants' money, who would otherwise pay to the landlords. That was his number one, because what the plan of campaign did was this, it saved the landlord the trouble of collecting the money and the cost of the agent's fees. After all the money was collected the landlord would be quite free to take it, but he would not take it. That was what they (the people) complained of. It was because he refused it they were obliged to invest the money abroad. If the landlord would take the money it was there for him at any time, all they wanted from him was a clear receipt. But it was said:

"You fix the rent yourself." They did not want to do anything of the kind. They were willing to leave it to any honest tribunal, but not to the landlord—they did not think he was an honest tribunal. John Bright once said, "Take away the improvements the Irish tenants has made in the soil and it would be as poor and naked as an American prairie." The Irish tenants were willing to give the Irish landlords as much as John Bright said they ought to have, and when the landlord claimed to fix rent on his property, they said, "It is not your property—it is our property," and the tenants of Ireland, with legislative sanction, declared that these improvements were their own, and that rent was not to be put on the land without their having a say on it. Let the writers in Unionist and landlord papers and the authors of such phrases as "organized embezzlement" be good enough to recollect that the land act makes the tenants practically the owners of the soil. When the Irish leaders saw their people being driven out of their homes without a refuge were they to stand by for fear of incurring the criticisms of the ignoramuses of England and Scotland who wrote against them? Besides the landlord there was another minority against the rule—the Orangemen. Their objection was a religious one, but, as facts showed,

THEY HAD NOTHING TO FEAR from their Catholic fellow countrymen. It was only in Belfast churches were sacked, and they were Catholic churches. If ever they got Home Rule one of the first things they would do was to amusey and release the Belfast Orange rioters, although, unfortunately, at the time they would not have the inclination to put in the original authors of the riot, Lord Randolph Churchill. Nearly every one of the Irish leaders had been Protestants. As to the fear of separation, the speaker said the Irish people wanted no separation. The Irish people had helped to make the empire, and they wanted some of the good things of it. In conclusion, the speaker referred to the assistance the Scotch could give the Irish people in their struggle. The ballot paper, a vote marked in blue ink, would affect the lives and fortunes of the peasants in Connacht. The cross they made might be the salvation of the entire people. The democracy had now the power of the aristocracy of old. The Irish were a forgiving people. Hitherto the world had been against them. They had now a statesman pleading for them, for reconciliation and consideration. Unhappily they had repudiated their part in his demand, and they asked that in the future these two nations may be reconciled and strife banished from amongst them, and where in the past there were only passion and bloodshed, wash and division, there may shine the sun of prosperity and peace.

WITHOUT A CARE OR THOUGHT
of the people from whom they drew it, except that the moment that they fall short of it they were ordered to be expelled from their houses. They had armed the landlords with all the power of the law, had placed an alien church, police men by the thousands, and soldiers by tens of thousands over the people; they crushed out every manufacture and industry in the country, so that the country was reduced to nothing but the work of agriculture; and when he stated these facts could they wonder at crime, when for more than one hundred years men were driven out of the country to America like vermin, or hunted to Scotland and England to reduce the wages in these countries. He desired to state that he was presenting matters to the audience in the mildest form. Then the magistrates on the bench, and the members of the grand jury were of the landlord party. When they had such a system of government as existed in Ireland, the wonder was, not that there was crime, the wonder would be that there would be no crime. But it was said the Irish people were idle and would not work, and that when they had a fair tribunal to fix their rents they would adopt the Plan of Campaign. Whatever attempts they made to redress the grievances of the Irish people, the landlord party raised the cry of the people and there had been their being dishonest, and that their being dishonest was a reason for refusing home rule, as being outside the pale of civilization. Those who saw Irishmen in England and Scotland working in foundries, in the brickfields, the harvest fields, or on the railways would not call them idle; and those who saw the Irish at home, saw the mountains cultivated on top four or five thousand feet above the level of the sea, would not call them idle. Up till

THE LAND ACT OF 1881, the peasant was liable to be evicted and his improvements confiscated at the beck of the landlord. By the land act the people were not, however, even then protected from the exactions of the landlords, and it gave them no "fair tribunal" for fixing fair rents. Out of the 600,000 holders of land in Ireland there had been fair rents fixed in only 90,000 instances, and there had been 80,000 agreements. The 5000 leaseholders were not admitted to the benefit of the act as to the rents fixed by the court. The court nullified the act as to the tenants' improvements and the agreement cases were those of tenants who could not manage to pay a whole year's rent at one time, and had to come to agree with their landlords as those who stopped on the highway by robbers with a

blunderbuss over their heads had to agree. As to the plan of campaign, it was said that it was invented for the purpose of taking away the tenants' money, who would otherwise pay to the landlords. That was his number one, because what the plan of campaign did was this, it saved the landlord the trouble of collecting the money and the cost of the agent's fees. After all the money was collected the landlord would be quite free to take it, but he would not take it. That was what they (the people) complained of. It was because he refused it they were obliged to invest the money abroad. If the landlord would take the money it was there for him at any time, all they wanted from him was a clear receipt. But it was said:

"You fix the rent yourself." They did not want to do anything of the kind. They were willing to leave it to any honest tribunal, but not to the landlord—they did not think he was an honest tribunal. John Bright once said, "Take away the improvements the Irish tenants has made in the soil and it would be as poor and naked as an American prairie." The Irish tenants were willing to give the Irish landlords as much as John Bright said they ought to have, and when the landlord claimed to fix rent on his property, they said, "It is not your property—it is our property," and the tenants of Ireland, with legislative sanction, declared that these improvements were their own, and that rent was not to be put on the land without their having a say on it. Let the writers in Unionist and landlord papers and the authors of such phrases as "organized embezzlement" be good enough to recollect that the land act makes the tenants practically the owners of the soil. When the Irish leaders saw their people being driven out of their homes without a refuge were they to stand by for fear of incurring the criticisms of the ignoramuses of England and Scotland who wrote against them? Besides the landlord there was another minority against the rule—the Orangemen. Their objection was a religious one, but, as facts showed,

THEY HAD NOTHING TO FEAR from their Catholic fellow countrymen. It was only in Belfast churches were sacked, and they were Catholic churches. If ever they got Home Rule one of the first things they would do was to amusey and release the Belfast Orange rioters, although, unfortunately, at the time they would not have the inclination to put in the original authors of the riot, Lord Randolph Churchill. Nearly every one of the Irish leaders had been Protestants. As to the fear of separation, the speaker said the Irish people wanted no separation. The Irish people had helped to make the empire, and they wanted some of the good things of it. In conclusion, the speaker referred to the assistance the Scotch could give the Irish people in their struggle. The ballot paper, a vote marked in blue ink, would affect the lives and fortunes of the peasants in Connacht. The cross they made might be the salvation of the entire people. The democracy had now the power of the aristocracy of old. The Irish were a forgiving people. Hitherto the world had been against them. They had now a statesman pleading for them, for reconciliation and consideration. Unhappily they had repudiated their part in his demand, and they asked that in the future these two nations may be reconciled and strife banished from amongst them, and where in the past there were only passion and bloodshed, wash and division, there may shine the sun of prosperity and peace.

WITHOUT A CARE OR THOUGHT
of the people from whom they drew it, except that the moment that they fall short of it they were ordered to be expelled from their houses. They had armed the landlords with all the power of the law, had placed an alien church, police men by the thousands, and soldiers by tens of thousands over the people; they crushed out every manufacture and industry in the country, so that the country was reduced to nothing but the work of agriculture; and when he stated these facts could they wonder at crime, when for more than one hundred years men were driven out of the country to America like vermin, or hunted to Scotland and England to reduce the wages in these countries. He desired to state that he was presenting matters to the audience in the mildest form. Then the magistrates on the bench, and the members of the grand jury were of the landlord party. When they had such a system of government as existed in Ireland, the wonder was, not that there was crime, the wonder would be that there would be no crime. But it was said the Irish people were idle and would not work, and that when they had a fair tribunal to fix their rents they would adopt the Plan of Campaign. Whatever attempts they made to redress the grievances of the Irish people, the landlord party raised the cry of the people and there had been their being dishonest, and that their being dishonest was a reason for refusing home rule, as being outside the pale of civilization. Those who saw Irishmen in England and Scotland working in foundries, in the brickfields, the harvest fields, or on the railways would not call them idle; and those who saw the Irish at home, saw the mountains cultivated on top four or five thousand feet above the level of the sea, would not call them idle. Up till

THE LAND ACT OF 1881, the peasant was liable to be evicted and his improvements confiscated at the beck of the landlord. By the land act the people were not, however, even then protected from the exactions of the landlords, and it gave them no "fair tribunal" for fixing fair rents. Out of the 600,000 holders of land in Ireland there had been fair rents fixed in only 90,000 instances, and there had been 80,000 agreements. The 5000 leaseholders were not admitted to the benefit of the act as to the rents fixed by the court. The court nullified the act as to the tenants' improvements and the agreement cases were those of tenants who could not manage to pay a whole year's rent at one time, and had to come to agree with their landlords as those who stopped on the highway by robbers with a

blunderbuss over their heads had to agree. As to the plan of campaign, it was said that it was invented for the purpose of taking away the tenants' money, who would otherwise pay to the landlords. That was his number one, because what the plan of campaign did was this, it saved the landlord the trouble of collecting the money and the cost of the agent's fees. After all the money was collected the landlord would be quite free to take it, but he would not take it. That was what they (the people) complained of. It was because he refused it they were obliged to invest the money abroad. If the landlord would take the money it was there for him at any time, all they wanted from him was a clear receipt. But it was said:

"You fix the rent yourself." They did not want to do anything of the kind. They were willing to leave it to any honest tribunal, but not to the landlord—they did not think he was an honest tribunal. John Bright once said, "Take away the improvements the Irish tenants has made in the soil and it would be as poor and naked as an American prairie." The Irish tenants were willing to give the Irish landlords as much as John Bright said they ought to have, and when the landlord claimed to fix rent on his property, they said, "It is not your property—it is our property," and the tenants of Ireland, with legislative sanction, declared that these improvements were their own, and that rent was not to be put on the land without their having a say on it. Let the writers in Unionist and landlord papers and the authors of such phrases as "organized embezzlement" be good enough to recollect that the land act makes the tenants practically the owners of the soil. When the Irish leaders saw their people being driven out of their homes without a refuge were they to stand by for fear of incurring the criticisms of the ignoramuses of England and Scotland who wrote against them? Besides the landlord there was another minority against the rule—the Orangemen. Their objection was a religious one, but, as facts showed,

THEY HAD NOTHING TO FEAR from their Catholic fellow countrymen. It was only in Belfast churches were sacked, and they were Catholic churches. If ever they got Home Rule one of the first things they would do was to amusey and release the Belfast Orange rioters, although, unfortunately, at the time they would not have the inclination to put in the original authors of the riot, Lord Randolph Churchill. Nearly every one of the Irish leaders had been Protestants. As to the fear of separation, the speaker said the Irish people wanted no separation. The Irish people had helped to make the empire, and they wanted some of the good things of it. In conclusion, the speaker referred to the assistance the Scotch could give the Irish people in their struggle. The ballot paper, a vote marked in blue ink, would affect the lives and fortunes of the peasants in Connacht. The cross they made might be the salvation of the entire people. The democracy had now the power of the aristocracy of old. The Irish were a forgiving people. Hitherto the world had been against them. They had now a statesman pleading for them, for reconciliation and consideration. Unhappily they had repudiated their part in his demand, and they asked that in the future these two nations may be reconciled and strife banished from amongst them, and where in the past there were only passion and bloodshed, wash and division, there may shine the sun of prosperity and peace.

WITHOUT A CARE OR THOUGHT
of the people from whom they drew it, except that the moment that they fall short of it they were ordered to be expelled from their houses. They had armed the landlords with all the power of the law, had placed an alien church, police men by the thousands, and soldiers by tens of thousands over the people; they crushed out every manufacture and industry in the country, so that the country was reduced to nothing but the work of agriculture; and when he stated these facts could they wonder at crime, when for more than one hundred years men were driven out of the country to America like vermin, or hunted to Scotland and England to reduce the wages in these countries. He desired to state that he was presenting matters to the audience in the mildest form. Then the magistrates on the bench, and the members of the grand jury were of the landlord party. When they had such a system of government as existed in Ireland, the wonder was, not that there was crime, the wonder would be that there would be no crime. But it was said the Irish people were idle and would not work, and that when they had a fair tribunal to fix their rents they would adopt the Plan of Campaign. Whatever attempts they made to redress the grievances of the Irish people, the landlord party raised the cry of the people and there had been their being dishonest, and that their being dishonest was a reason for refusing home rule, as being outside the pale of civilization. Those who saw Irishmen in England and Scotland working in foundries, in the brickfields, the harvest fields, or on the railways would not call them idle; and those who saw the Irish at home, saw the mountains cultivated on top four or five thousand feet above the level of the sea, would not call them idle. Up till

THE LAND ACT OF 1881, the peasant was liable to be evicted and his improvements confiscated at the beck of the landlord. By the land act the people were not, however, even then protected from the exactions of the landlords, and it gave them no "fair tribunal" for fixing fair rents. Out of the 600,000 holders of land in Ireland there had been fair rents fixed in only 90,000 instances, and there had been 80,000 agreements. The 5000 leaseholders were not admitted to the benefit of the act as to the rents fixed by the court. The court nullified the act as to the tenants' improvements and the agreement cases were those of tenants who could not manage to pay a whole year's rent at one time, and had to come to agree with their landlords as those who stopped on the highway by robbers with a

blunderbuss over their heads had to agree. As to the plan of campaign, it was said that it was invented for the purpose of taking away the tenants' money, who would otherwise pay to the landlords. That was his number one, because what the plan of campaign did was this, it saved the landlord the trouble of collecting the money and the cost of the agent's fees. After all the money was collected the landlord would be quite free to take it, but he would not take it. That was what they (the people) complained of. It was because he refused it they were obliged to invest the money abroad. If the landlord would take the money it was there for him at any time, all they wanted from him was a clear receipt. But it was said:

"You fix the rent yourself." They did not want to do anything of the kind. They were willing to leave it to any honest tribunal, but not to the landlord—they did not think he was an honest tribunal. John Bright once said, "Take away the improvements the Irish tenants has made in the soil and it would be as poor and naked as an American prairie." The Irish tenants were willing to give the Irish landlords as much as John Bright said they ought to have, and when the landlord claimed to fix rent on his property, they said, "It is not your property—it is our property," and the tenants of Ireland, with legislative sanction, declared that these improvements were their own, and that rent was not to be put on the land without their having a say on it. Let the writers in Unionist and landlord papers and the authors of such phrases as "organized embezzlement" be good enough to recollect that the land act makes the tenants practically the owners of the soil. When the Irish leaders saw their people being driven out of their homes without a refuge were they to stand by for fear of incurring the criticisms of the ignoramuses of England and Scotland who wrote against them? Besides the landlord there was another minority against the rule—the Orangemen. Their objection was a religious one, but, as facts showed,

THEY HAD NOTHING TO FEAR from