

"become treasonable conspirators in their projects, and union will be broken up." It is well that you should hear, my American friends, what was the oath that was demanded of the United Irishman. Let us suppose I was to be sworn in—

I, Thomas N. Burke—(applause)—in the presence of God, do pledge myself to my country, that I will use all my abilities and influence in the attainment of an impartial and adequate representation of the Irish nation in Parliament, and as a most absolute and immediate necessity for the attainment of this chief good of Ireland, I will endeavor as much as lies in my ability to forward and perpetuate the identity of interests, the union of rights and the union of power, among Irishmen of all religious persuasions."

I protest before high Heaven to-night that, priest as I am, if I was asked in 1779 to take that oath, I would have taken it and tried to keep it! (Great cheering.) Remember, my friends that it was no secret oath; remember that it was no treasonable oath; remember that it was an oath that no man could refuse to take, unless he was a dishonorable man and a traitor to his country. (Applause.)

The founder of this society was Theobald Wolfe Tone. I admit that Mr. Tone was imbued with French revolutionary ideas; but he certainly never endeavored to impress these views upon the society until Mr. William Pitt, the Prime Minister's influence forced that society to become a secret organization.

The third object of the Premier of the Government, namely: to create an Irish rebellion, was accomplished by the cruelties and abominations of the soldiers who were quartered at free quarters upon the people and destroyed them; they violated the most sacred and inviolable sanctity of Irish maidenhood and womanhood; burned their villages, plundered their farms, demolished their houses, until they made life even more intolerable than death itself, and compelled the people to rise in the rebellion of '98.

Yes, I answer Mr. Froude's assertion that the Irish people left the paths of political reform for political agitation, from agitation to conspiracy, and from conspiracy to rebellion.—Now, you may ask what advantage is this to William Pitt, the Premier, to have conspiracy and rebellion in Ireland? I answer you that William Pitt was a great English statesman and a great English statesman meant in those days an enemy to Ireland.

The object of great statesmanship from time to time is the great object of concentration. A fatal principle—a fatal principle whenever it is enforced against the principles and time-honored traditions and the genius of a people. (Applause.)

He saw that Ireland was in harmony, free and independent, making her own laws and consulting her own interests. He said: "This will never do; this country will be happy and prosperous—it will never do; it interferes with my business. What do I care for Ireland? I only care for the British Empire. I may have to cross their purposes." He made up his mind to destroy the Irish Parliament. He knew well as long as Ireland was happy, peaceable and prosperous, he never could affect them. He knew it was only through humiliation he could accomplish the destruction of Ireland. Ah! cruel man as he was, he resolved to plunge the country into rebellion and bloodshed in order to carry out his own imperial English State policy. (Hisses.)

And yet, dear friends, and especially dear American friends—my grand jury—(applause and laughter)—for I feel as if I was a lawyer; I feel as if I was a lawyer engaged in the cause of the poor defendant, whose case has been in court for many long years; the plaintiff is a great, rich, powerful woman; the poor defendant has nothing to commend her but a heart that never yet despaired—(cheers)—a spirit that never yet was broken, and a loyalty to God and to man that never yet was violated by one act of treason—(applause)—I ask you, the grand jury of America, to consider how easy it was to conciliate this poor mother, Ireland—I mean to make her peaceful and happy. He (Pitt) himself had a proof of it in '94. Suddenly the imperious, magnificent Premier of England seemed to have changed his mind, and he adopted a policy of conciliation and kindness towards Ireland; he recalled the Irish Lord Lieutenant, Lord Westmoreland, and sent Earl Fitzwilliam, who arrived there on the 4th of January, 1795. Lord Fitzwilliam was a man of liberal mind and of most excellent character; he felt kindly to the Irish people, and before he left England he made an express contract with William Pitt if he was made Lord Lieutenant of Ireland that he would govern the country on principles of conciliation and kindness. He came and found in Dublin Castle a certain Secretary, Cooke and a great family by the name of Beresford, who for years had monopolized all the State offices and all the emoluments of the State. He dismissed them all, and sent them to the "right about." (Laughter.) He surrounded himself with men of liberal minds like himself; he began by telling the Catholics of Ireland that he would labor for their emancipation, and sudden peace and joy spread throughout the nation—every vestige of insurrection and rebellion seemed to vanish out of Ireland, and happiness and joy for the time being was the portion of the Irish people. How long did it last? In an evil hour Pitt returned to his own designs. Fitzwilliam was recalled on the 5th of March, and Ireland enjoyed her peace for only two short months. When it was found that Lord Fitzwilliam was about to be recalled, scarcely a parish in Ireland that did not send in a petition to the British Government to leave them their Lord Lieutenant; but all was in vain. Pitt had made up his mind to carry out his own views. On the day that Lord Fitzwilliam left Dublin the principal citizens of Dublin took the horses from his carriage and drew the carriage themselves down to the water side. All Ireland was in tears, a whole nation was in

mourning. How easy it was, my American friends, to conciliate these people whom two short months of kindness could so change. It shows to the English parliament, and English people that if they could only realize to themselves the mine of affection, the glorious heart, and the splendid gratitude that lies there in Ireland, and which they have never appealed to yet, and never touched. This turns the very honey of human nature into the gall of bitterness and of hatred. The rebellion broke out, and it was, as Mr. Froude truly says, the victors took away the old privileges, and made the yoke heavier. By the old privileges Mr. Froude means the Irish parliament, which was taken away. I hope, citizens of America, that this English gentleman, who has come here to get a verdict from you, will be taught by that verdict that the right of home legislation is not a privilege, but the right of every nation on the earth. (Great applause.)

Then, in the course of his lecture, going back to strengthen his argument, he says:—"You must not blame England for being hard upon you Irishmen. She took away your parliament; she inflicted upon you a heavier yoke than you bore before; but she could not help it—it was your own fault—what made you rebel?" This is the argument which the learned gentleman uses. He says the penal laws never would have been carried out only for the revolution in Ireland in 1600. Now, the revolution of 1600 meant the war that Hugh O'Neill made in Ulster against Queen Elizabeth. According to this learned historian the penal laws were the result, effect, and consequence of that revolution. Remember, he fixes that date himself, 1600. (Laughter.) Now, my friends, what is the record of history? The penal laws began to operate in Ireland in 1534. (Renewed laughter.) In 1537 the Archbishop of Armagh, the Primate of Ireland, who was an Englishman by the name of Cromer, was put into jail and left there for denying the supremacy of Henry the Eighth over the Church of God. Passing over the succeeding years of Harry the Eighth's reign, passing over the enactments of Somerset under Edward the Sixth, we come to Elizabeth's reign, and we find that she assembled a parliament in 1560—forty years before Mr. Froude's revolution. (Great laughter.)

Here is one of the laws passed by that parliament: "All officers and ministers, ecclesiastical or lay," that took in us, "were bound to take the oath of supremacy." They were bound to swear that Queen Elizabeth was Pope. (Laughter.) That she was the Head of the Church; that she was the successor of the Apostles; that she was the representative of St. Peter—[great laughter]—and through him of the Eternal Son of God—Queen Elizabeth! All were obliged to take this oath under pain of forfeiture and total incapacity. Any one who disputed her claims to spiritual supremacy was to forfeit, for the first offence, all his estate real and personal, and if he had no estate that was worth more than twenty pounds, he was put for one year in jail; and for the second and third offences he was guilty of high treason, and put to death. These laws were made and commissioners appointed to enforce them. Mr. Froude says they were not enforced; but we have the acts of Elizabeth's parliament appointing magistrates and officers to go out and enforce these laws, and these were made forty years before the revolution of which Mr. Froude alludes to as the revolution of 1600. How, then, can that gentleman ask us to regard the penal laws as the effect of that revolution? In my philosophy, and I believe in yours, citizens of America, the effect generally follows the cause. (Laughter.) But the English philosophical historian puts the effect forty years ahead of the cause. (Renewed laughter.) And as we say in Ireland, that is putting the cart before the horse. (Uproarious laughter.)

But, my friends, Mr. Froude tells us, if you remember, in his second lecture, that the penal laws of Elizabeth were occasioned by the political necessity of her situation. Here is his argument as he gives it. He says: "Elizabeth could not afford to let Ireland be Catholic because if Ireland were Catholic Ireland must be hostile to Elizabeth. I may tell you now, and I hope the ladies here will pardon me for mentioning it, that Queen Elizabeth was not a legitimate child. Her name, in common parlance, is too vile for me to utter, or for the ladies present to hear. Suffice it to say that Elizabeth's mother was not Elizabeth's father's wife. (Great laughter.) The Queen of England knew the ancient abhorrence, that Ireland had for such a vice. She knew that abhorrence grew out of Ireland's Catholicity, and therefore she could not allow Ireland to remain Catholic because Ireland would be hostile to her, and Ireland remained Catholic.

The only way the amiable Queen could root out the Catholics in Ireland was by penal laws; making it a felony for any Irishman to remain in Ireland a Catholic. Therefore the English historian says "that she passed these laws because she could not help herself, and that she was coerced by the necessity of her situation." Now I argue from this argument of Mr. Froude's, that if Elizabeth were obliged, whether she would or not, to pass these penal laws, why does he turn round and say that these laws were the effects of Hugh O'Neill's revolution? If they were the result of Elizabeth's necessity, then they were not the result of the immortal Hugh O'Neill's brave effort. (Cheers.) His next assertion is "That after the American war England was only too well disposed to do justice to Ireland," and the proof lies here. He says "that the laws against the Catholics were almost repealed before 1798." Very well. Now I ask you, dear friends, to reflect upon what the large measures of indulgence to the Catholics were of which Mr. Froude speaks. Here they are. In the year 1777, parliament passed an act to enable Catholics to take a long lease on fifty acres of bog. (Laughter.) My American friends you may not understand the word bog. It means a marsh which is almost irremediable; which you may drain and drain until dooms-day and it will remain the original marsh. (Renewed laughter.) You may sink a fortune in it, in arterial drainage, in top dressing, as we call it in Ireland; and if it is left a couple of years, if you come back, you will find the bog has asserted itself once more. However, my friends, the parliament was kinder than you imagine, for whilst they granted to the Catholics a long lease for fifty acres of bog, they also stipulated,

if the bog was too deep for foundation that they might take half an acre of arable land upon which to build a house. Half an acre! For the life of him, not more than half an acre. (Laughter.) This holding, such as it was, should not be within a mile of any city or town. Oh, no! and mark this: If half the bog was not reclaimed, that is five-and-twenty acres, within twenty-one years, the lease was forfeited. (Laughter.)

Dear friends, the scripture tells us that King Pharaoh of Egypt was very cruel to the Hebrews, because he ordered them to make bricks without straw, but here is an order to the unfortunate Irishmen to reclaim twenty-five acres of bog or else give it up. (Hisses.) Now beggarly as this concession was, the very parliament that passed it was so much afraid of the Protestant ascendancy in Ireland that an order to conciliate them for the slight concession they passed another bill granting £10 additional to £38 already for every Popish priest duly converted to the Protestant religion. In October, 1777, the news reached England that Gen. Burgoyne had surrendered to Gen. Gates. (Tremendous applause.) The moment that the news reached Lord North, who was Prime Minister of England, he immediately expressed an ardent desire to relax the penal laws on Catholics. In January, the following year, 1778, the independence of America was acknowledged by glorious France. (Cheers.) And the moment that piece of news reached England the English parliament passed a bill for the relaxation of the laws on Catholics. In May of the same year the Irish parliament passed a bill—now mark!—to enable Catholics to lease land—to take a lease for 999 years. So it seems we were to get out of the bog at last. (Great laughter.) They also, in that year, repealed the unnatural penal law which altered the succession in favor of the child that became Protestant, and gave him his father's property; also repealing the law for the prosecution of priests, and for the imprisonment of Popish schoolmasters. In the year 1793 they gave back to the Catholics the power of electing a member of Parliament—the power of voting. And that is what Mr. Froude calls the total repeal of the law against Catholics. The Catholics still could not go upon the bench: could not be magistrates, and this English historian comes and says: "You are fools, you were almost free." Well, people of America, if these be Mr. Froude's notions of civil and religious freedom, I appeal to you for Ireland not to give him the verdict. (Cheers.)

"The insurrection of '98," continues the learned gentleman, "threw Ireland back into confusion and misery, from which she was partially delivered by the act of union." The first part of that proposition I admit; the second I emphatically deny. I admit that the unsuccessful rebellion of '98 threw Ireland back into a state of misery. Unsuccessful rebellion is one of the greatest calamities that can befall a nation, and the sooner Irishmen and Irish patriots understand this, the better it will be for them and their country. (Cheers.) I emphatically deny that by the act of union there was any remedy for these miseries; that it was anything in the shape of a benefit or blessing. I assert that the union of 1800, by which Ireland lost her parliament, was a pure curse for Ireland from that day, and nothing else, and it is an evil that must be remedied if the grievances of Ireland are ever to be redressed. (Cheers.)

I need not dwell upon the wholesale bribery and corruption by which the infamous Castlereagh, the political apostate, carried that detestable act of union. Mr. Froude had the good taste to pass by the dirty subject without touching it, and I can do nothing better. (Laughter.)

He says, "It was expected that whatever grievances Ireland complained of would be removed by legislation after the Act of Union." It was expected, it was quite true. Even Catholics expected something. They were promised in writing by Lord Cornwallis that Catholic emancipation would be given them if they only accepted the Union. Pitt himself assured them that he would not administer the government unless Catholic emancipation was made a Cabinet measure. The honor of Pitt, the honor of England was engaged; the honor of the brave, though unfortunate Lord Cornwallis, was engaged. But the Irish—as Tom Moore says, "I mourn the hopes that leave me;—they were left to meditate in bitterness of spirit upon the nature of English faith. Now let me introduce an honored name that I shall return to by and by. At that time the Parliament of Ireland was bribed with money and with titles, and the Catholic people were bribed by promised emancipation after they would sanction the Union.

Then it was that a young man appeared in Dublin speaking for the first time against the Union, in the name of the Catholics of Ireland, and that young man was the glorious Daniel O'Connell. (Enthusiastic applause.) Two or three of the bishops gave a kind of tacit negative assent to the measure in the hope of getting Catholic emancipation. I need hardly tell you, my friends, that the Catholic Lords of the Pale were only too willing to pass any measure that the English government required. O'Connell appeared before the Catholic Committee in Dublin, and here are his words. Remember they are the words of the people and of the Catholics of Ireland. He said, "It is my sentiment, and I am satisfied it is the sentiment not only of every gentleman that hears me, but of the Catholic people of Ireland that they are opposed to this injurious, insulting, and hated measure of Union. And if its rejection was to bring upon us the renewal of the penal laws we would boldly meet the prescriptive oppression, and throw ourselves once more on the Mercy of our Protestant brethren, before we will give our assent to the political murder of our country." (Great cheering.)

"I know," he says, "I do know that although exclusive advantages may be ambiguously held forth to the Irish Catholic to seduce him from the sacred duty that he owes to his country, yet I know that the Catholics of Ireland will remember that they have a country, and they will never accept of any advantage as a sect of that which would depose and destroy them as a people." (Renewed cheers.) Shade of the great departed! You never uttered truer words. Shade of the great O'Connell, every true Irishman, priest and layman subscribes to this glorious sentiment, wherever that Irishman is this night. (Great enthusiasm.)

Now Mr. Froude goes on in an innocent sort of way. (Laughter.) He says, "It is strange that after the Union was passed that the people of Ireland were still grumbling and complaining. Yet they had no foundation for their complaints, they were not treated unjustly." Here are his words. Good God! people of America! What idea can this gentleman have of justice? What loss did the Union which he admitted so much, and which he declares that England will maintain, did it bring to Ireland? What gain did it bring to Ireland, and what loss did it inflict on her? I answer from history. The gain to Ireland was absolutely nothing, and I ask you to consider two or three of the losses.

ed at the time of the Union, and England paid to those who owned those boroughs, or who had the nomination of them, actually paid them one million two hundred thousand pounds sterling for their loss; the loss being the nominations, the loss by the proprietor of the corrupt influence in returning the members to Parliament. O'Connell, speaking on this subject some years later, says: "Really it was strange that Ireland was not asked to pay for the knife with which twenty years later Castlereagh cut his throat." (Laughter.)

If the debt of Ireland was swollen from 3,000,000 before the Union to 28,000,000. I ask you to consider what followed. We now come to the period after the Union. Mark, my friends. In January, 1801, you may say the year of the Union, the debt of England was 450,000,000 and a half pounds sterling, and to pay that debt they required £17,708,800, consequently they had to raise by taxation 18,000,000 to pay the interest on the debt of 450,000,000 in that year. Such was the condition of Ireland. In 1817, sixteen years after, the same debt of England had risen from 450,000,000 to 735,000,000. Nearly double; and they had an annual debt of 28,000,000, odd to pay. So you see they doubled their national debt in the sixteen years through which Pitt had waged war with Napoleon. They were obliged to subsidize and to pay Germans, Hessians, and all sorts of people to fight against France. At one time Wm. Pitt was supporting the whole Austrian army. The Austrians had the men, but no money. Now mark this; in Ireland, the debt in 1801 was 28,000,000 and a half, and consequently the annual taxation was one million two hundred and fifty thousand pounds. In the year 1817 the same Irish debt, which sixteen years before was only 28,000,000, was now 112,704,000 pounds sterling, and the taxes amounted to four million one hundred and five thousand pounds sterling. In other words in sixteen years the debt of Ireland was made four times as much as it was in the year that the Union was passed. How did that happen? It happened from the very fact that being united to England, having lost their Parliament, the English Chancellor of the Exchequer took and kept the money and the Irish accounts, and the Irish kept the bogs. (Laughter.) Ireland lost the privilege of keeping her own accounts. And this is the account he brought against Ireland in 1817. Ireland was so lightly burdened with debt at the time of the Union as compared with England, that the English did not ask us when they united the Parliament with theirs; they did not presume to ask us; they had not the presumption to ask us to take share and share alike in the taxes. Why should they? We only owed 28,000,000 and they owed 450,000,000. Why should we be asked to pay the interest on their debt? They were rich and could bear that taxation; Ireland was poor and she could not bear it. Ireland was, consequently, much more lightly taxed than England. It was very much easier to pay interest on £28,000,000 than on 450,000,000. But there was an agreement made with Castlereagh by the Irish Parliament. It was this. He said: "That if the Irish national debt came up to one seventh of the national debt of England, then we will throw it all in together and tax them share and share alike. The object of raising up the Irish debt was to bring it up within one-fourth of the English debt. This they accomplished in 1817. Then the Irish and the English were taxed indiscriminately, and they all alike; we were obliged to pay the taxes for the interest on the 450,000,000 of debt that the crown of England had incurred before the Union had taken place. (Hisses.)

"The people," says Mr. Froude, "were not treated unjustly. (Laughter.)" "All!" but says Mr. Froude, "consider the advantages of the Union; you had the same commercial privileges that the English had." To this I answer in the words of the illustrious, honest and high-minded John Mitchell. (Enthusiastic cheers.) "It is true," says Mr. Mitchell, "that the laws regulating trade are the same in the two islands. Ireland may export even woollen cloth to England; she may import her own tea from China and sugar from the Barbadoes. The law which made these acts penal offences no longer exists. Why? Because they are no longer needed. England is fully in possession, and by the operation of these old laws Ireland was utterly ruined. England has the commercial marine; Ireland has it to create. England has the manufacturing machinery and skill of which Ireland was deprived by express laws for that purpose. England has the current of trade established so strongly in her own channels, while Ireland is left dry to create or recover at this day those great industrial and commercial resources, and that in the face of wealthy rivals that are already in full possession, is manifestly impossible without one or the other of these two conditions, namely: the immense command of capital or effective protective duties. But by the Union our capital is drawn away to England, and by the Union we were deprived of the power of imposing protective duties."

It was to this very end that the Union was forced upon Ireland by treachery. "Don't unite with us, sir," says the honest old man, Dr. Samuel Johnson, when addressed on the subject of unity in his day. "Don't unite with us, we shall rob you." (Laughter and applause.) In the very first year after the Union was passed, Mr. Foster stated in the English House of Parliament, that there was a falling off in the linen trade of Ireland of 5,000,000 less of yards exported. The same gentleman three years later, stated that in 1800 the net produce of the Irish revenue was more than 2,800,000, while the debt was only £25,000,000. Three years later, after three years' experience of the union, the debt was increased to £33,000,000, and the revenue had diminished by £11,000. Ireland was deserted. That absenteeism that was the curse of Ireland in the days of Swift, had so increased by the Union that Dublin became almost a deserted city, and all the cities in Ireland had the appearance, and became as places in the wilderness. At this very day in Dublin the Duke of Leinster's city palace is turned into a museum of Irish industry; Marlborough House, on the same street, has become a dumper's shop; Tyrone House is a school-house. The house of the Earl of Beresford was pulled down a few years ago to build a Scotch Presbyterian meeting house on the place. Charleston House was sold about six months before I came to America, and it is now the head office of the Board of Works; and Bolivar House is a convent. So fashion, trade, commercial activity, intellectual enterprise, political interest—everything has gone to London, and Ireland may fold her hands and sigh over the ruin that is left to her now. And that is the result of the Union. (Applause.) The crumbling liberties of Dublin attest the decay and ruin of Ireland; the forsaken harbors of Limerick and Galway tell of the destruction of her commerce; the palaces of Dublin, abandoned to decay, announce no longer the residence of the nobility; the deserted custom-houses tell of the income transferred elsewhere. What do we get in England for all this? Absolutely nothing. Every Irish question goes now to London to be debated, and the moment an Irish member stands up in the House, the first thing he expects is to be coughed down, sneered at, or crowded down—(laughter)—unless, indeed, he has the lungs of an O'Connell, and turns upon them like an African lion, and, with a roar, puts down their beastly bellowing. (Renewed laughter and applause.)

Pitt promised emancipation. Six months after the Union was passed, he retired from office on the pretence, indeed, that the king would not grant emancipation, and would not keep his word. But it is well known that the true reason why Mr. Pitt retired was that his continental policy had failed. The people of England were tired of his wars, and were clamoring for peace. He was too proud to sign even a temporary peace with France, and he retired in sullen pride and disgust. He retired under the pro-

test that he would not be allowed to carry Catholic emancipation. Some time later, after the addition administration was broken up, Mr. Pitt returned again to be the Premier of England. Not one word escaped from him about emancipation; and he resisted it until his death. He was as great an enemy to the Catholics of Ireland as ever poor, old, foolish, and George III. was. And it was only after twenty-nine years of heroic effort that the great O'Connell rallied the Irish nation, and he succeeded for a time in uniting all the Catholics of Ireland as one man, as well as a great number of our noble-hearted Protestant fellow-Irishmen. (Great cheering.) And when O'Connell came and knocked at the doors of the British Parliament, with the hand of a United Irish people; when he spoke with the voice of eight millions, then and only then, even as the walls of Jericho crumbled at the sound of Joshua's trumpet, did the old, bigoted threshold of the British House of Commons tremble whilst its doors burst open and let in the gigantic Irishman that represented eight millions of the people of Ireland. (Great cheering.)

The English historian goes on to say that England granted Catholic emancipation willingly. She granted it as a man would yield up; a bad tooth to the dentist. (Laughter, renewed again and again.) O'Connell put the forceps into that false, old mouth; the old tyrant wriggled and groaned; the bigoted prodigal, who then disgraced England's crown, shed his crocodile tears upon the bill; the eyes that were never known to weep over the ruin of female virtue, the face that never was known to change color in the presence of any foul deed or accusation of vice, grew pale, and George IV. wept with sorrow that he had to sign it. (Cheers.) The man who had conquered Napoleon upon the field of Waterloo, the man who was declared to be the invincible victor and the greatest of warriors, stood there with the bill in his hands, and said to the King of England: "I would not grant it, your Majesty, any more than you; but it is forced from you and me. You must either sign that paper, or prepare for civil war and revolution in Ireland!" (Great cheering.)

I regret to be obliged to say it, but really, my friends, the history of my native land proves to me that England never granted anything from love, or through a sense of justice, or through any other motive than from a craven fear of civil war or some serious inconvenience to herself. (Applause.)

Now, having arrived at this point, Mr. Froude glances in a masterly manner over the great questions that have taken place since the day that emancipation was demanded. He speaks words the most eloquent and compassionate over the terrible period of '46 and '47—words, reading which brought tears to my eyes, words of compassion that he gave to the people who suffered, for which I pray God to bless him and reward him. (Applause.) He speaks words of generous, enlightened, statesmanlike sympathy for the peasantry of Ireland, and for these words, Mr. Froude, if you were an Englishman ten thousand times over, I love you. (Great cheering.) I now attempt to speak of the future of Ireland. Perhaps it is a dangerous thing for me to attempt (laughter); yet, I suppose that all that we have been discussing in the past must have some reference to the future. For, surely, the verdict that Mr. Froude looks for is not a mere verdict of absolution for past iniquities. He has come here—though he is not a Catholic—he has come to America, like a man going to confession, and he cries out loudly, "We have sinned! we have sinned! we have grievously sinned!" The verdict which he calls for must, surely, regard the future more than the past; for, how, in the name of God, can this great historian, or any other man, ask a verdict justifying the iniquity and heart-rending record of cruelty and injustice, the traditions of robbery and bloodshed which we have suffered? My friends, there must be a future. What is that future? Well, my friends—first of all, my American Grand Jury, you must remember that I am only a monk, not a man of the world, and I do not understand much about these things; and there are wiser heads than mine, and I will give you my opinion. There is a particular class of men who love Ireland—love Ireland truly, and love her sincerely. There is a particular class of men who love Ireland, and think, in their love for Ireland, that if ever she is to be freed it is by insurrection, by rising in arms—men who hold that Ireland is enslaved, if you will. Well, if the history which Mr. Froude has given, and which I have attempted to review, if it teaches us anything, it teaches us, as Irishmen, that there is no use appealing to the sword, or to armed insurrections in Ireland. Mr. Froude says, that to succeed, there are two things necessary; namely—union as one man, and a determination not to sheathe that sword until the work is done. (Applause.) I know that I would care no longer plaudits, citizens of America, and speak a more popular language in the ears of my auditors, if I were to declare my adhesion to this class of Irishmen. But there is not a living man that loves Ireland more dearly than I do. There are those who may love her with greater distinction. (Cries of "No," "No.") But there is no man living that loves Ireland more tenderly or more sincerely than I do. I prize, citizens of America, the good-will of my fellow-Irishmen; I prize it next to the grace of God. I also prize the popularity which, however unworthily, I possess with them. But I tell you, American citizens, for all that popularity, for all that good-will, I would not compromise one iota of my convictions; nor would I state what I do not believe to be true. I do not believe in insurrectionary movements in a country so divided as Ireland.

There is another class of Irishmen who hold that Ireland has a future—a glorious future; that that future is to be wrought out in this way. They say—and, I think, with a good right—that wealth, acquired by industry, brings with it power and political influence. They say, therefore, to the Irish at home, "Try, and accumulate wealth; lay hold of industry; develop the resources of your country; try in the meantime to effect that blessing of union, without which there never can be a future for Ireland. That union can be effected by largeness of mind, by generosity and urbanity toward your fellow-citizens; by rising above the miserable bigotry that carries religious differences and religious hatreds into relations of life—that don't belong to religion. (Applause.)

"Meantime," they say to the men of Ireland "try to acquire property, wealth; and this can only be done by peaceful, assiduous industry; and that industry can only be exercised so long as a country is at peace, so long as there is true to violent political agitation."—Then, these men say again to the Irishmen in America: "Men of Ireland in America, men of Irish birth, men of American birth but of Irish blood, we believe that God has largely entrusted the destinies of Ireland to you. America demands of her citizens only energy, industry, truthfulness, temperance, obedience to the law."

"Accordingly, the man that has these cannot fail to realize the future, and a glorious future in this grand Republic. And if you are faithful to America in these respects America will be faithful to you. And in proportion as the grand Irish element in America rises in wealth it will rise in political influence and power—a political influence and power which in a few years is destined to overshadow the whole world, and to bring about peace, justice, and a far greater revolution in the cause of honor and the cause of humanity than has ever been effected by the sword. This is the programme of a second class of Irishmen. Now, I tell you candidly, that, to this programme, I give my heart and soul. You will ask me, what about separation from England? Well, that is a ticklish question, gentlemen and ladies. I dare say you will remember that when Charles Edward, the son of the Pretender to the throne of England, was alive, there was a toast which the Jacobite gentlemen used to give. It was