

THE CATHOLIC RECORD

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AT
333 RICHMOND ST.
LONDON, ONTARIO.

REV. JOHN J. COFFEY, M.A., LL.D., EDITOR.
THOMAS COFFEY, PROP. AND PRIN.

GENERAL AGENTS:
Messrs. Donohoe and Lusk King,
OTTAWA, ONTARIO.

S. J. Coffey, General Agent, 74 George St.,
HAMILTON, ONTARIO.

REPRINTS FOR SALE.—One copy, 6d.;
five copies, 2s. 6d.; ten copies, 5s. 6d. Pay-
able in every case in advance.

Advertisements.—25s. per line
each insertion.

Approved by the Bishop of London, and
the Bishops of Ottawa, Hamilton,
Quebec, and Toronto, and leading Cath-
olic Clergymen throughout the Dominion.

All correspondence addressed to the Pub-
lisher will receive prompt attention.

Advertisements must be paid in full before the
copy can be sent.

Persons writing for a change of address
should invariably send us the name of their
former post office.

Catholic Record.

London, Sat., Aug. 13th, 1897.

A PROPHECY.

The immortal Curran, addressing the
Irish Commons in 1798 in favor of Catho-
lic emancipation, employed words of
prophecy in reference to the political
situation in Ireland at that time.
"A disunited people cannot long subsist.
With infinite regret must any man look
forward to the alienation of three mil-
lions of our people, and to a degree of
subserviency and corruption in a fourth.
I am sorry to think that it is so very
easy to conceive that in case of such an
event the inevitable consequence would
be a union with Great Britain. And if
any one desires to know what that would
be, I will tell him. It would be the
emigration of every man of consequence
from Ireland; it would be the participa-
tion of British taxes without British
trade; it would be the extinction of the
Irish name as a people. We should
become a wretched colony, perhaps
leased out to a company of Jews, as was
formerly in contemplation, and governed
by a few tax gatherers and excisemen,
unless possibly you may add fifteen or
twenty couples of Irish members, who may
be found every session sleeping in their
collars under the manager of the British
minister." These prophetic words were
in great part realized after the Union had
been accomplished. There were emigra-
tion, taxation, corruption, impoverishment
and political servitude. For many years
after that event the Irish people took no
interest in Parliamentary elections, and
100 nobles for years slept in their col-
lars at Westminster under the manager of
the British minister, voting freely for every
measure binding their country, of
which they were said to be repre-
sentatives, in heavier chains. Curran's
prophecy of utter and irrevocable
ruin had long since been realized but for
O'Connell, Butt and Parnell. Irish
affairs have now reached an acute crisis.
And though there is for the moment in
power in Britain a ministry pledged to
maintain the hateful, infamous and ex-
ecrated Union of 1801, the time is, we
believe, at hand when there will be once
more a Parliament sitting in Ireland,
to make laws for its good government.
The British Parliament has long since
shown its inability to deal with
Ireland, and the British people have
now realized the truth
of the warnings and predictions of the
Grattans, the Currans and the other
eminent Irish statesmen of old—men
more honestly devoted to connection with
Britain than the servile place-hunters
who sold Ireland and disgraced England.
Mr. Gladstone lately alluded to the
present grave condition of affairs in Par-
liament in these terms. Said he:

We cannot even for a moment conceive
that there is a single member of the
Salisbury Cabinet who believes it can be
a success. We are sorry to think that
the sole purpose of the measure is to
drive the Irish into armed resistance in
order to justify massacre and disfran-
chisement. Salisbury has given evidence
of a brutal and sanguinary disposition.
He has besides placed himself, so far as
Ireland is concerned, altogether in the
hands of the Orange garrison there—
proof sufficient that he favors the ex-
tinguishment of Irish freedom in the
blood of the Irish people. Recent
events conclusively show that in such
sentiments he is not sustained by the
British masses. We believe that the
British democracy will, under Mr. Glad-
stone's lead, soon release Parliament
from its present "deplorable and dis-
graceful dilemma."

AN OLD ORY REVIVED.

The union of 1801 was, we all know,
carried through the Irish Parliament, by
means of the open purchase of mem-
bers of Parliament and of Parliamen-
tary constituencies. Not a dozen of the
majority for the union in either House,
voted from honest conviction. But for
appearance sake, the govern-
ment had to advance some plea of
justification for the abominable measure.
The Irish public were told that the union
was necessary to the perpetuation of British
connection, the Irish Protestant was
assured that it was essential to the main-
tenance of Protestant ascendancy forever,
while to Catholic prelates it was whispered
that they and their flocks would, under
the union, soon obtain relief from their
civil disabilities. Nothing, however, that
ministers could say, or do, or promise,
could popularize the odious measure.
When at length it became law, no man
could have pronounced himself against it
without being termed a rebel and a traitor.
He was at once set down as an enemy
of the Crown and of British connection.
Ireland was then crushed, helpless and
bleeding from every pore. But she failed
not to protest, even in the feeble tones
of her command, against the iniquitous act
which robbed her of her Parliament. The
Protestant saw himself reduced to pro-
vincial insignificance—the Catholic saw
the chains of his servitude drawn more
closely about him than ever before. To
the credit of the latter he is said, that he
was willing to bear those chains still
longer, if his bearing of them could facili-
tate the restoration of Ireland's Parliamen-
tary independence. Daniel O'Connell
eloquently voiced Irish sentiment when
in 1813—twelve years after the union was
put in force, and sixteen before Catholic
emancipation—he spoke in Dublin in fiery
denunciation of the abolition of Ireland's
legislative independence. "Your enemies,"
said the Liberator, "accuse me of a
desire for the independence of Ireland.
I admit the charge, and let
them make the most of it. I have seen
Ireland a kingdom. I reproach myself
with having lived to behold her a pro-
vince! Yes, I confess it, I will ever be
candid upon the subject; I have an ul-
terior object—the repeal of the union and
the restoration to old Ireland of her in-
dependence. I am told that it is indis-
cree to avow this intention. It may
be so, but in public affairs discretion
may easily pass for dissimulation, and I
will not be guilty of it. And if to repeal
the union be the first service that can be
rendered to Ireland, as it clearly is, I for
one most readily and heartily offer
to postpone our emancipation, in order
to promote the cause of our country."

Mr. O'Connell on the same occasion
also said: "Your enemies say, and let
them say it, that I wish for a separation
between England and Ireland. The
charge is false; it is, to use a modern
quotation, as 'false as hell.' And the
men who originated, and those who
seek to inculcate it, know it
to be a falsehood. There lives
not a man less desirous of a separa-
tion between the two countries—there
lives not a man more deeply convinced
that the connection between them upon
the basis of one king and separate Par-
liaments would be of the utmost value
to the peace and happiness of both
countries, and to the liberties of the
civilized world."

The very same cry, the very same
accusation has been raised against Mr.
Gladstone, but with, of course, much
less success than against Mr. O'Connell.
We find a singular and extraordinary
similarity between Mr. Gladstone's recent
utterances on the subject of Home Rule
and the views of the Liberator just cited.
The ex-Premier lately declared at Swan-
sea:

"There was on one of the banners that
we saw to day a phrase that I referred
to in addressing our friends outside, and
which made a deep impression on me—
'What is your union with Ireland now?'
It is a union of manacles and not of
hearts. It is force that attaches Ireland
to you. What said Mr. Bright? Why,
that if Ireland were towed out two
thousand miles into the Atlantic your
relations with Ireland would be at an
end. We want you to substitute for
a union of force a union of hearts.
We want that Ireland shall be as united
to England as Wales is united to Eng-

land, as Scotland is united to
England; not that they are
dead to their own national interests and
concerns, but that they desire to pursue
them and promote them as members
of a family knit and compacted
Empire. And we have a state of things,
gentlemen, in which if we do not lose
our golden opportunity, those same ends
will be gained. While Ireland, in con-
sonance with her history and traditions,
and I might say in consonance with
those physical circumstances which have
divided her from us by the Channel, and
which greatly operate upon the mind
and actions of men, while she desires
the management of her own affairs, she
is solidly disposed to union with you,
to serve you, to contribute to your objects,
to be one with you in everything that
concerns the greatness of the Empire."

This noble declaration was made in
presence of a gathering of Welshmen—
to whom the great old man had just
previously said—speaking at the expression
of every sentiment the genuine Celtic
enthusiasm of that noble people:

I am not going to compare the history
of the relations between England and
Wales with the deplorable, disgraceful,
shocking, and revolting history of the
relations between England and Ireland;
but the object of all I declare that I feel
to be nearest my heart, being an English-
man by birth, having lived in England,
having fought and labored for England
with all my might, through a long life—
anxious as I am to put an end to the sor-
rows of Ireland and to bring her people
to live in a formal and regular
state if possible, I am yet more anxious
to live to see the day, if God should grant
me the enormous favour, that the deepest
stain that lies on the English character
and reputation should be removed by the
final work of doing justice to Ireland's
grievances.

The enemies of Ireland may call Mr.
Gladstone's followers separatists and dis-
unionists. They are truly the real friends
of the connection between both countries.
They are the genuine advocates of a per-
petuation of that connection—for injus-
tice, infamy and iniquity have no endur-
ing power and the attempt to maintain the
enormities of the Union of 1801 must, if
persisted in, terminate in violence, disorder
and disruption.

THE ASSUMPTION OF THE
BLESSED VIRGIN.

To the believer in the sublime mystery
of Redemption, the fact which we are
called upon to contemplate on the feast
of the Assumption, August 15th, wonder-
ful as it is, and beyond the ordinary
course of events, presents no real diffi-
culty. The whole life of Christ on earth
is a miracle of divine grace. It is a
miracle that for four thousand years He
was looked for by the people of God
with anxious expectancy, and was fore-
told by the prophets, and that the prin-
ciple events of His life were described by
them with admirable minuteness of
detail; so that by Jacob and Daniel,
Malachi and Aggeus the very time of
his earthly life was predicted with pre-
cision. By miracles his birth was made
known to the shepherds feeding their
flocks on the mountains of Judea, and
to the wise men of the East, to whom
was given the gift of understanding the
lesson of the mysterious star which
announced that God had become man,
and that the life of the Messiah on earth
had begun.

It is not necessary to enumerate the
miracles which spread our Saviour's
fame throughout Syria and even distant
countries, culminating in His resurrec-
tion, that great miracle which forms the
basis of Christian faith and hope.

In the life of the Blessed Virgin, too,
the special interposition of divine Provi-
dence is an ordinary occurrence. Her
preservation from the stain of original
sin from the first moment of her life is
an article of faith, and it is implied in
the first promise of a Redeemer made to
our first parents, after the fall, when
Almighty God couples together the
"woman," Mary, and "her seed," Christ,
in the crushing of the serpent's
head; in the perpetual enmity
which exists between the woman
and her seed on the one hand, and the
serpent, the devil, on the other. It is
further implied in the prophecy of Isaiah,
who gives as a sign from God that a
virgin shall conceive and bear a son
whose name shall be called, Emmanuel,
or God with us. The Hebrew article
prefixed to the word virgin here signifies
the eminence of virginity. It is implied
in the address of the Angel Gabriel when
the announcement is made to her of
Christ's birth: "Hail, full of grace, the
Lord is with thee: Blessed are thou
amongst women"—that is, by the Hebrew
idiom, most blessed of all women. It is
implied in her triumph over Satan related
in Apoc. xii.

And a great sign appeared in heaven:
A woman clothed with the sun, and on
her head a crown of 12 stars. . . and the
dragon persecuted the woman who brought
forth the man child. . . and the serpent cast
out of his mouth after the woman, water
as it were a river, that he might cause
her to be carried away by the river. And
the earth helped the woman, and the
earth opened her mouth, and swallowed
up the river which the dragon cast out
of his mouth. And the dragon was angry
against the woman and went to make
war with the rest of her seed, who keep

the commandments of God and have the
testimony of Jesus Christ.

Her life was marked with many other
wonders. The visit of the Archangel,
sent by the adorable Trinity to honor
her, the inspiration by the Holy Ghost,
by which she uttered the sublime can-
ticle of the Magnificat, in which she
proclaims "He that is mighty hath done
great things to me, and holy is his
name." (St. Luke, ii.) It is no great
matter of surprise that her death also
should be marked by proofs of the
special favor in which she was held by
Almighty God.

As even Christ died, it was not to be
excepted that His mother should be
removed from this, the common lot
of mankind. Hence the Blessed Virgin
Mary died also. But Christ rose from
the dead glorious and triumphant, and
forty days afterwards, on Ascension day,
He ascended into heaven. It was fitting
to the reverence due to his mother, whom
He so revered on earth, that on her
death she should be taken also to heaven
as well bodily as in her soul, to enjoy at
once that blessedness which is not
attained by mankind in general, and will
not be until the day of general judgment.

It is not of faith that the Blessed
Virgin was so assumed into heaven;
nevertheless there is strong evidence
that this is the case.

It has been asserted by some oppo-
nents of this tradition that it was unknown
in the 5th century. St. Gregory of Tours
gives testimony that in his time it was
received as a well-authenticated fact.
The following is his account of it:

"When the Blessed Mary had come
near the end of her mortal career, all the
Apostles assembled at her house from all
parts of the world, and learning that she
was to be taken away, watched with her.
The Lord Jesus then, accompanied by
His angels, appeared to them, and,
taking his mother's soul, entrusted it to
the Archangel Michael. The vision then
disappeared. In the morning the apostles
near the monument awaiting a second
appearance of our Lord. In fact, Jesus
returned, and taking the sacred body of
His Mother, bore it to paradise on a
bright cloud, where, united with her
glorious soul, she reigns in glory amidst
the elect rejecting for all eternity, in its
splendors."

This history so minutely related is
evidently not the mere invention of the
illustrious Bishop of Tours, but the ex-
pression of the faith of the Church of
France. This is the more evident, as
the French liturgy of that same age con-
tains an office of the Assumption of
Mary, wherein the same facts are related,
in almost the same words which are em-
ployed by St. Gregory.

The Mozarabic liturgy, used in Spain,
also declares that Mary merited "to be
borne to heaven in a manner not given
to any other," because "Christ wished
His mother to reign there."

That the doctrine dates from a much
earlier period even than this is evident
from St. Cyril's life of Euthymius written
about the year 420. Here it is stated that
an ancient church is situated East of Jeru-
salem dedicated under the title of the
Holy Assumption. St. Cyril was Bishop
of Jerusalem. He, therefore, wrote with
full knowledge of the facts, and it follows
that the belief in the Assumption of the
Blessed Virgin Mary was held in the East
as well as the West. This Church is
proved to have been built in the reign of
Constantine the Great, at the beginning of
the fourth century. Earlier still, St.
Dionysius the Areopagite speaks of it in
addressing Timothy, as of a fact well
known and remembered by this
high Bishop. St. Dionysius was the
contemporary of our Saviour and of
His Apostles, so that the history of the
Assumption is thus traced to the Apo-
stolic age. The feast of the Assumption
was established in the West under the Pon-
tificate of Pope Leo IV. in the first half of
the 9th century, but in the East it was
observed at a much earlier period.

Andrew of Crete attests its observance
in many churches in his time, the seventh
century, and it was undoubtedly
observed under the empire of Maurice
in sixth century.

The Church, as we remarked above, has
not declared the Assumption to be of
faith, but she has given sanction to the
pious belief therein by authorizing the
celebration of the feast throughout the
world. In the office proper to the day
these ejaculatory sentiments of praise
occur:

"Mary has been assumed into heaven;
the angels rejoice and bless God with
praises. The Virgin Mary hath been
assumed to the heavenly mansion, where
the King of kings sitteth on His throne
studied with stars."

Also the words of St. John of Damas-
cus are recited from his sermon on the
"sleep (dormitio) of the Blessed Mary."

"This day the sacred ark of the living
God who conceived her Creator rests in
the temple of her Lord not built with
hands. This day the Immaculate Virgin,
unusually by earthly affections, but filled
with thoughts of heaven, is placed in the
heavenly dwelling places. How could
death devour her who conceived the Son
of God, who conceived herself to God?
How could hell receive her? How could
life itself be borne? For her a way to
heaven was prepared, straight, smooth
and easy."

SIGNIFICANT FACTS.

There are some features of the struggle
for Irish legislative independence which
deserve to be at all times borne in mind,
if we wish to appreciate the true strength
of the demand for Home Rule. At the
last general election (1886) there were 66
followers of Mr. Parnell elected in Ire-
land, without a contest. Three Irish
Tories only enjoyed the privilege of a
walk over. Of the 19 Home Rules sub-
jected to a contest, Mr. Arthur O'Connor
in East Donegal had a majority of 1,421,
Mr. O'Doherty in North Donegal 3,349,
and Mr. Kelly in the Southern division of
the same noble county 3,506. In South
Down Mr. McCartan's majority was 970,
and in South Dublin, Sir Thomas Assom-
dale's, 1,768. The Nationalists carried
North Fermanagh by 266; South Fer-
managh by 1,833; Lix, 3,122; Stephen's
Green 2,443; Mid-Tyrone, 1,987; East
Wicklow, 2,117; West Wicklow, 2,685.
In North Monaghan Mr. Patrick
O'Brien's majority was 1,471, and in the
South St. Joseph N. McKenna's 3,706! In
South Tyrone, the anti-Nationalist ma-
jority was only 99; in South Derry 138; and
in North Tyrone 452. The chances of re-
deeming these three constituencies at the
next election are really excellent. In
fact, were an appeal now made to the
Irish people Mr. Parnell would undoubt-
edly triumphantly carry 88 or 90 seats.
It is sometimes said that at the last
election the constituencies were terror-
ized into returning Parnellite members,
but this is not so. The fact is that in the
66 constituencies which returned Home
Rulers without a contest there is but a
handful of anti-Nationalists, insignificant
as to numbers and influence. We have
prepared a table showing the total vote
cast at the election of 1885, when the
"loyal minority" made a bitter fight
against the National party:

	Nat.	Anti Nat.
Ulster.....	17,112	34,053
Connacht.....	13,221	8,596
Leitrim.....	21,118	3,223
Sligo.....	11,473	25,364
Donegal.....	6,829	4,003
Fermanagh.....	9,525	11,162
Londonerry.....	8,790	3,648
Monaghan.....	15,345	1,779
Cavan.....	14,575	12,753
Tyrone.....	118,008	105,591

	CONNAUGHT.	
Leitrim.....	9,481	1,030
Sligo.....	9,826	1,813
Roscommon.....	12,135	604
Galway.....	25,182	517
Mayo.....	25,053	206
	81,667	3,670

	MUNSTER.	
Cork.....	42,503	3,167
Kerry.....	14,390	425
Clare.....	12,987	578
Limerick.....	15,400	440
Tipperary.....	16,230	821
Waterford.....	9,945	923
	113,515	6,334

	LEINSTER.	
Wicklow.....	7,106	1,871
Carlow.....	4,501	751
Dublin city.....	23,772	7,666
Dublin co.....	12,674	5,151
Kildare.....	8,238	467
Kilkenny.....	10,071	394
Lingco.....	6,108	1,083
Longford.....	5,595	484
Louth.....	17,731	—
Meath.....	12,976	—
Queen's co.....	7,699	800
Westmeath.....	7,256	455
Wexford.....	16,108	917
	134,135	20,039

	RECAPITULATION.	
Ulster.....	118,008	105,591
Connacht.....	81,667	3,670
Leinster.....	113,515	6,334
	144,135	20,039
	447,315	135,634

These figures clearly show the depth,
intensity and earnestness of the feeling
in Ireland for legislative independence.
While at the general election of 1885 there
were but 19, there were in 1886, 66
Nationalists elected by acclamation.
There was besides an awful falling off in
the popular vote cast for the anti-Nation-
alist, a falling off that should warn their
friends in England of their abject help-
lessness. They can speak for no consider-
able and certainly for no deserving por-
tion of the Irish nation which is, we may
say, now a unit in favor of the principles
of Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule bill of
1886.

THE BRITISH ARMY AND NAVY.

Were we on our own authority to say
anything derogatory of the British
army and navy, we know what we
should be told. We would be very
plainly and with very marked emphasis
informed that we wrote from the stand-
point of Irish prejudice towards and
Irish hatred of England. We have in
this issue something to say of Britain's
military strength, but everything we
propose to say will be stated on the
authority of no less a personage, no less
known a Tory leader and Irish coercion
ist, than Lord Randolph Churchill.
Speaking at Wolverhampton on Friday,
June 3rd, the noble lord drew a rather
doleful picture of the present condition
and management of the British army
and navy. If ever comparisons are
odious it is when they are established
between great and proud nations as to
their respective military strength and

readiness for war. Well, Lord Randolph
indulged in a comparison which must
have been specially odious to his English
hearers, some of whom, no doubt,
believed that Britain either did,
or could, or should, own the whole of the
earth. He pointed out that the German
empire has a population of 47,000,000,
and spend £21,000,000 as ordinary
expenditure on her army and navy; that
the French republic has a population of
36,000,000, and expends £29,000,000
on the ordinary army and navy
account; while, on the other hand, the
United Kingdom has a population of
35,000,000, and her ordinary expen-
diture for army and navy amounts
to £31,000,000; besides which In-
dia pays £20,000,000 for the Indian
army, so that the British empire pays
£17,000,000 for ordinary naval and mil-
itary expenditure. Furthermore, Ger-
many could within a month put into the
field 1,500,000 men, without including
her reserves. France could do equally as
well. The German and French troops are
all fully armed, provisioned and main-
tained; they have the very best artillery,
rifles and weapons of every sort, with a
perfect system of transport, and munitions
of war that are simply overflowing. Thus
is France and Germany's money for war
purposes expended. What then, asks
Lord Randolph, can Britain do for her
£31,000,000? "Suppose we had to go to
war or defend ourselves, we might, after
a maddening delay and an incredible
pouring out of money like water, possibly put
in the field and maintain 150,000 men." This
statement created a veritable sensa-
tion among the noble lord's hearers.
But the sensation increased as he went
on. He told them that they had a
powerful fleet on paper—a fleet as
powerful as France and Germany com-
bined; but suppose, he added, England
had to defend India from Russian, or
Egypt from French attack, though there
are many fortresses in the United King-
dom and throughout the British empire
of strategic importance, there is not a
single fortress properly armed and pro-
visioned—while many places of strate-
gic importance are wholly unarmed
and unprovided. These, the noble
lord confessed, were strong statements,
but nothing he declared to what was to
follow. What followed? Reader, give
ear to the very words of one of Britain's
greatest statesmen. He said:

"You have not one single heavy gun
in reserve, you have no reserve whatever
of heavy projectiles for those guns.
Your horse artillery, of which the British
nation is so proud, is armed with what
Lord Walsley has called the worst gun
in Europe; your field artillery is armed
with the most inferior weapon; your
infantry are armed with rifles which
have been proved in action to be of the
most defective and inferior description,
and with bayonets which have been
proved to be utterly unreliable. Your
cavalry are armed with swords equally
bad manufacture; your sailors are armed
with cutlasses of the same worthless
description, and it is a fact that, though
at any time you might be called upon to
defend the empire, you have not got at
home, in spite of your vast expenditure
of thirty one millions, land transport for
20,000 men."

This being England's naval and mil-
itary condition, Lord Randolph thought
it the most utter and glowing folly to
talk about the ascendancy of Eng-
land in the councils of Europe or for an
English minister to dream of resisting
the advance of Russia in south eastern
Europe by military force. The blame
for the state of things did not rest upon
the English people or upon Parliament,
but upon the system of naval and mil-
itary expenditure and upon those respon-
sible for that system. Year after year
Parliament had cheerfully voted millions
for the support of the army and navy; in
fact, the House of Commons had never
refused to vote the sums asked by the
minister of the navy. "Under these
circumstances," added Lord
Randolph, "you will understand the
sort of system of expenditure of public
money against which I dashed myself, and
with which I utterly refused to be con-
nected either for a day or an hour, either
as a Minister or as Chancellor of the Ex-
chequer." The noble lord then proceeded
to relate some anecdotes to illustrate the
truth of his position as to England's de-
fective condition.

"The morning before the bombardment
of Alexandria the French fleet sailed away
from the harbour and left the English
fleet to do the work. After the bombard-
ment the Sultan and Alexandria had not
got on board ten rounds of heavy shell to
fire from their guns. The Sultan and the
Alexandria, two of our finest ships, would
have been utterly at the mercy of the
heavy artillery of the French ironclads,
and what is worse, there was not at that
time any reserve whatever of heavy shells
in Malta. I will tell you another story
still more startling. You remember the
expedition to Kharbarm and the forma-
tion of the desert column which was to cut
itself off at its base and plunge into the
desert. The life of that column depended
upon its being properly equipped; yet
when that column started and was in
action it was found that a great portion
of the shells which had been sent out for
its artillery were too large for the guns
which accompanied the column, and
another great portion of the shells had
either not been filled or were so imper-
fectly filled that they would not explode."

The noble speaker amused his audience
when in his own sentences way he added
that he had not yet half done. He re-

called the critical condition of Europe last
fall. Had England then been called
to war there was not one
single cartridge of ammunition
in store for the machine guns.
He had something else to tell his audi-
ence—something worse he thought than
anything he had yet recited. He had no
doubt that the Admiralty would contra-
dict it, but that contradiction he declared
worthless. He stated:

"The Monarch, one of our powerful
ironclads, came into harbour, and
required heavy guns for her turret.
There were none to give her. They took
two heavy guns from Spithead and
Portsmouth and put them on board the
Monarch, and they are only capable of
firing seventy rounds. Now you under-
stand what this system is against which
I wish to bring if possible the pressure
of the English people. Now I have a
splendid story to tell you, a story which
has just come out and which is very little
known. A very important department
of the War Office is the Ordnance
Department, and they are under the
impression that they are capable of
designing heavy and powerful guns. In
1883 and 1884 they designed the gun
called the 43 ton gun, and they called on
the great firm of Messrs. Armstrong to
construct fifteen of these guns. Messrs.
Armstrong, who know a great deal more
about gun construction than the Ordi-
nance Committee, suggested that the gun
was a bad design and would be a bad
gun. The Ordnance Department told
Messrs. Armstrong to mind their own
business and make the guns. The guns
were made and cost £200,000. When
they were sent to Woolwich they were to
be put in ships of war and sent to sea.
A Government official, Captain Noble,
told the department, 'Do not send these
guns to sea. They are bad guns and
cannot stand the charge which you will
put into them.' The Ordnance Depart-
ment told Captain Noble to mind his own
business. Away go the guns to sea—four
on board the Collingwood. At the
second round of firing, with only half the
charge, one of those guns bursts right
away. The whole of the guns are
recalled and condemned. The whole of
the expenditure of £200,000 has been
found to be worthless. Now, would you
believe it? If you had to go to war to-
morrow, four of those precious guns are
being kept in reserve in order to be
placed on board the Collingwood."

Lord Randolph then went on to charge
that in 1883 the Admiralty had launched
the Ajax and the Agamemnon costing
£500,000. It was found that if they
steamed more than eight miles an hour
they did not steer, that they were really
unmanageable and perfectly useless be-
cause they could be sent to the bottom
by almost any adversary. He then
alluded to the Imperieuse, a very power-
ful ship, armed in a peculiar way. When
launched she was found to draw four
feet more of water than they had sup-
posed, all the armour was intended to
have above water was below water,
leaving her wholly unprotected. This
vessel had cost alone £500,000. Then
the Admiralty went on to construct six
large vessels of the Admiral class; one of
these is the Collingwood, already men-
tioned. These, said Lord Randolph, are
supposed to be protected vessels, able to
engage the heavy artillery of land forts or
hostile ironclads. But the fact is, that
they are so defectively constructed and so
poorly protected, that they are to all
intents and purposes unprotected. They
cost £4,500,000. On ships of the Admiral
class it is that the British nation must de-
pend to defend the coast. Had they to
engage against the heavy artillery of land
forts or ironclads, the sailors of the Colling-
wood, for instance, would know that they
had a gun certain to burst, and a ship
that could be perforated at a