

THE PROPAGANDA QUESTION AND OUR DUTY.

From the American Catholic Quarterly Review. CONTINUED.

No special precautions were taken, after the occupation of Rome, in 1870, by the armies of Piedmont, to secure the American College from occupation or confiscation, and for two good reasons: The first, because the officers and students of the College, like the Archbishops and Bishops in the United States, who were its foster-parents, like all Americans, in fact, of whatever creed, deemed their home inviolable, because covered by the American flag. We all felt sure that the same protection, which would, in case of need, be extended by our Government to any American citizen living in Rome, in a house purchased and owned by himself, would never be refused to Catholic Americans for the sole reason that they were Catholics.

The second is that no one in Rome, or here in America, had, after the Piedmontese occupation of Rome, any thought of possible danger to the Propaganda, to the property under its care, or to the Colleges directed by it. When the projects of 1866 and 1867, suppressing Religious Orders (or "Religious Associations," as the legislators termed them), became laws, it was expressly and solemnly declared by the King that these laws were not aimed at the Propaganda.

IT IS THE PROPAGANDA ITSELF WHICH WE MUST NOW SAVE!

It is not a "Religious Association" in the sense understood by the two laws of the Italian Parliament. The Congregation, or Board of Cardinals, charged, during more than two centuries and a half, with superintending and directing all the vast missionary enterprises of the Catholic Church, with guarding and promoting the interests of the Missions themselves, and with securing the training of a sufficient and competent number of laborers, is simply a Board or Committee. It would be absurd to liken, in legal phrase or for judicial purposes, the entire body of Cardinals to any one of the religious Orders or Congregations of the Church, and whose suppression was aimed at by the Italian laws invoked by the Italian Court of Cassation, and on which it rests its sentence. This distinction is clearly stated in the Times editorial. The College of Cardinals is the Pope's Supreme Council, composed of men of all nationalities, helping him to govern the Universal Church, and representing in his council the interests of their respective countries. This College can no more be called a Religious Association than the Cabinet of our President, than the Senate and House of Representatives can be called Political Associations. They hold, in the Government of our country, with the Supreme Magistrate, the same place that the Cardinals hold with the Sovereign Pontiff in the government of the Catholic Church, in the administration of the spiritual concerns of 200,000,000 of Christians scattered all over the globe.

The Committees of Congress on "Foreign Affairs," on "Trade and Industry," etc., offers a closer analogy to the Congregations of Cardinals, which are only committees or boards, charged, each, with some one department of the vast administration of the Church. It is preposterous, on the face of it, to liken such a board to a Religious or Monastic Order, and to confound, by an unworthy and disingenuous construction of technical terms, the property used for the purposes of such administration with the property of Monastic Associations. Our Treasury Buildings in Washington, our War Office, our General Post Office, our Home Department, our State Department, are all "Federal" property, belonging to the Government—the property of the entire people of the United States, not that of the State of Maryland, or of the city of Washington. Would our courts of law ever dream of considering or calling them the property of the respective Ministers with their staffs?

We can reason from this, on a ground of striking, if not perfect, analogy, to the organism we call Papacy, which is the Supreme Government in the Universal Church. Just as you could not confiscate, or alienate, or "convert" into scrip, the Executive Mansion and Department, the State Department, etc., unless you suppress the Federal Government and Constitution by revolution, so cannot the property, left to the Pope and to his Cardinals, for the absolute and indispensable necessities of their existence and administration, be confiscated, alienated, "converted," or in any way dealt with as the property of another save only by the sheer force of revolution subverting the Papacy itself, and declaring its existence in Rome incompatible with the new state of things. But brute force cannot subvert the eternal foundations of right and justice.

The Italian Court of Cassation, in formulating its strange decision, and the Italian Government in justifying and explaining it through Minister Mancini, knew perfectly that they were doing the very thing which would most please their Revolutionary Masters; all those, indeed, who, under various names, and for various reasons of their own, desire above all things the obliteration of the Papacy from Italy, and the downfall of the Catholic Church. That this is the result directly aimed at, no one, who is acquainted with the antecedents of M. Depretis and Mancini, as well as with those of the Judges of the Supreme Court of Cassation, will be disposed to deny. The professions of utter and irreconcilable hatred towards the Papacy and the great educational establishments it still controls in Rome, made time and again by the Prime Minister, and heartily re-echoed by Signor Mancini, leave no room to doubt that they will not rest satisfied with crippling the Pope and the Church by destroying or neutralizing the efficiency of the Propaganda. The next blow will be to throw aside the Law of Guarantees, and to declare the Vatican itself national property, convertible at any moment into Government scrip. This is what the "Anti-Clerical Circles" of Rome have been so long clamoring for, and what will most assuredly happen, unless the Powers step in and interpose their veto on the consummation of this supreme iniquity.

Fortunately, at this moment Catholics are not left alone to protest against the gratuitous, uncalled for and unjustifiable

proceeding of the Italian Government. Eloquent voices in the non-Catholic Press of Europe and America denounce and condemn the verdict rendered. We need only quote a few to show clearly how unprejudiced minds outside of the Church see the wrong done to civilization, as well as the injustice committed against the Propaganda and the great international interests represented by the latter.

"The functions of the Propaganda," says a foremost New York daily paper, "cannot be trammelled or enfeebled, without proportionally crippling the vital powers of the Church. That the Italian Government shrinks from avowedly contemplating such a result is clear, as also that it seeks, by ignoring the international character of the institution assailed, to avert interference on the part of Catholic Powers, and of those Protestant Powers, like Prussia, the United Kingdom and the United States, which number millions of Catholics among their citizens. As a matter of fact, the international character of the Papacy itself is not more demonstrable than is that of the Propaganda. Besides being an inseparable organ of the Roman Church, and therefore entitled to share its guarantees, the Congregation in question can draw impressive arguments for its inviolability from the history of its endowments. Its resources have been created, not by Italian donors for national objects, but by cosmopolitan contributors for ecumenical ends."

"The essentially cosmopolitan origin of the property which the Italian tribunal has declared itself competent to partly confiscate, may be exemplified by the grievous predicament in which the American College at Rome, like all other adjuncts and outgrowths of the Propaganda, is now placed. The building occupied by this seminary, which at present gives instruction to some fifty students, and by which some of the most eminent Catholic ecclesiastics in the United States were educated, was purchased by the Propaganda thirty years ago, and the use of it granted in perpetuity to the American Bishops. The latter, on their part, contributed some \$50,000 for alterations and equipments, and of course these improvements would be disposed of with the building which is ordered to be sold. But would not our Government, which recognizes the duty of protecting Catholics and Protestants alike, be justified in protesting against the arbitrary conversion of property belonging to American citizens? Would it not have been prompt and loud in remonstrance had an American Protestant church or chapel in Rome been similarly menaced with partial confiscation?"

These last words point out the plain and urgent duty, the execution of which the entire Catholic body in the United States must now press upon Congress and the Executive.

"When we examine"—the article goes on to say—"the considerations on which the Court of Cassation bases its decision, and the exculpatory plea of M. Mancini set forth in his letter to the diplomatic representatives of the Italian Government, we see that the Court gave judgment on the purely technical and disingenuous ground, that the Propaganda Congregation had not been specifically excepted by statute from the operation of the laws of 1866 and 1867, leveled at religious associations. We say 'disingenuous,' because it has been shown by official admission of Italian Ministers, and by the declaration of Victor Emmanuel himself, that the laws named were never meant to strike at the mainstay and paralyze the vital organ of the Papacy, and because for ten years after the occupation of Rome the civil power, respecting the moral guarantee possessed by this institution, refrained from any attempt to harm it by an application of these proscriptive statutes."

[New York Sun, March 13th, 1884.]

From the Capital of the State of New York another influential Protestant journal thus vents its honest indignation. "The act of the judicial branch of the Italian Government, in partially confiscating the property of the Propaganda at Rome, is robbery under the forms and to the shame of law. The Propaganda is the immense missionary and educational establishment of the Holy See. It is a University of Religion on the largest scale. It has been established and maintained at Rome by the contributions of Catholics in all parts of the earth. It has not been made or carried on by Italian money. It has incurred no obligations to the Italian State. It is as international as Catholicism itself. It does not exist for Italian objects, but for purposes as large and embracing as the work of the historical order of Christianity around the world.

"If the Italian Government undertook to confiscate the American Protestant chapel, or the doubtful Mr. Van Meter's 'ragged schools' in Rome, both built and maintained by American Protestants, a cry would go up from the Rio Grande to either Portland, which the American Government would be swift to heed. Great Britain, France, Spain, Germany, and Australia have far greater interests in the Propaganda than the United States have. Not the magnitude but the reality of any interest, however, is that which kernels the principle of the thing.

"We have examined the technical excuses put forth by the Italian Government. They are unworthy of serious attention. They are devoid both of honor and honesty. The act is one of sheer spoliation. It is a political looting of the property of citizens of all parts of the earth, located at Rome, and dedicated to the cause of religion and learning. It is one of those malign acts which stamp the Italian Government as a concern inspired by an essentially piratical spirit. Even the most bigoted opponent of Catholicism will hardly insist that robbery is rendered honest, or stealing holy, by making Catholic Christians the victims of it."

[Albany Argus, March 16th, 1884.]

This is strong language. Surely governments and statesmen, who still cling to the name of Catholic, and who are entrusted with the welfare of peoples an immense majority of whom are Catholics, must be surprised that Protestant publicists, in a free Protestant country, should thus energetically stigmatize acts for which there is, and can be, neither a sufficient motive nor a decent excuse. But the press of Europe has condemned, with a surprising animosity, both the judicial decision obtained by M. Depretis and Mancini, and the flimsy apology sent forth to cover the judicial iniquity.

"The Court of Cassation of Rome," says the Germania, "which has decreed the

liquidation of the property of the Propaganda, has not found in the whole European press a serious journal to defend it. The verdict is generally declared unsustainable in a legal point of view." Even the journals devoted to Italy "seek to extenuate the error by the false allegation, that in a financial point of view the conversion is an advantage to the Propaganda. But the question does not merely concern the effect produced by the judicial verdict, although the fate of the institution depends upon it; the question regards the legal value of the decision. That cannot be sustained, and the sentence is, therefore, of itself null and void."

In accordance with this comes to us the opinion of the official organ of the court of Saxony, the Dresden Journal. "The property of the Propaganda belongs to the Universal Church, and as such, it is not only under the safeguard of the Catholic States, but also that of the rights of nations. It is beyond doubt that the Catholic Church has an international existence, related to the rights of nations. This existence, as well as the unflinching maintenance of the resources disposed of by the Church, has a general interest for all Christendom."

The leading Italian newspaper, La Gazzetta d'Italia, although devoted to the new order of things introduced by the Revolution, has too much sagacity not to perceive that the Court of Cassation is wrong, and the government policy a terrible blunder. It urges on the Ministers the immediate and imperative necessity of having a law passed by the Chambers to exempt from conversion the Propaganda property; and that, for the twofold purpose of preventing serious international complications, and the universal odium sure to fall on both Government and Judiciary, as the result of an unwarranted and unwise act of spoliation. Such is also the advice given by another leading Italian journal, la Nazione.

We do not insist here on the ruinous effect of the "conversion" on all the property of the Propaganda. It is calculated that it would reduce its nominal value by one-third, besides placing all that great department of the Papal administration entirely at the mercy of the Government. It is the principle itself on which both the Government and the Supreme Court of Appeals proceed, that Catholics cannot admit, and that all true jurists must reject.

The Propaganda is not a religious association, a monastic order. We now come to what is for all American Catholics—indeed, for all Catholics in every land—the Duty of the Hour, sacred, most urgent, and imperative. To save both the Propaganda and the Pope's liberty. And, at the outset, let us express our grateful sense of the prompt action taken by President Arthur, the Secretary of State, and Mr. Astor in Rome.

Signor Mancini, in his circular to the representatives abroad of the Italian Government, turns aside from his direct path to the Government of the United States, that it must not interfere in a matter which does not concern it; as if the astute Minister of Foreign Relations had a presentiment that both our Executive and our Congress were sure to extend to American property, and the most sacred interests of American citizens imperilled in Rome, the protection never yet withheld in such cases.

There are around the Italian Ministers and their complaint judges, far-seeing Americans, who must have told them that the Catholic community in the United States, as well as all that is truly liberal and large-minded in the press and the public, would raise such a storm of indignant remonstrance as to compel, if need were, our Government to take, at length, at the eleventh hour, the firm and generous stand which should have been taken before the Piedmontese flag ever appeared under the walls of Rome.

At any rate, M. Mancini's arrogant words, meaning "we make our laws as we please, and you make yours as it suits you,"—reminds us of a duty we owe ourselves, and which it is imperative that we do now, and do promptly and thoroughly. Clergy and laity owe it to themselves, to the Holy See outraged in its most vital prerogatives, and threatened, not only in its freedom of action, but in the very essential conditions of its existence in Rome, to take immediate and concerted action. There should be no delay. The Cardinal-Archbishop of New York, on the first intimation of the iniquity consummated, at once issued his eloquent pastoral. His voice has found a no less eloquent echo in the Archbishop of Baltimore and the Bishop of Albany. Doubtless, ere these lines are in print and the April number of the Review is given to the public, all our Archbishops and Bishops will have protested with equal eloquence and solemnity against the baneful measures of the Piedmontese Government in Rome,—against the wrong inflicted on Catholicity, on the Christian religion itself, on the best interests of civilization, by the virtual confiscation of the Propaganda property.

It is not by any means enough that our prelates should thus lift up their voices. The laity should at once use their own right of assembling and protesting. There should be meetings in every city, in every town, in every parish, and resolutions passed and transmitted to our representatives in both Houses of Congress, explaining the injury done to an institution which is not local, nor Roman, nor national or Italian, but international, cosmopolitan, Catholic. It belongs to all humanity, for the very aim of its founders and benefactors, the very nature of the education there given, the very character of its teaching, and its pupils, all point to a primary object,—the civilization and Christianization of the heathen, as well as the maintenance of a high intellectual and moral standard among Christian peoples themselves.

As we have seen, Protestants themselves consider that the crippling of the Propaganda means the crippling of the Church herself, the disabling her for the fulfillment of her mission,—to teach all nations.

Surely the duty of the hour is a most sacred and a most pressing one. The best thing, in our judgment, the only telling thing, in fact,—the only one worthy of the emergency, and in any way fitted to meet its requirements, is to prepare for Congress, for our Government, a Memorial, signed by our hier-

archy, clergy, and people, diocese by diocese, simultaneously and at once!

We doubt not but the Catholics of British North America will be up and doing. Let us take care that they do not anticipate us. We owe this to the entire body of our non-Catholic fellow-citizens, who expect us to speak up for our dearest religious interests, our most sacred rights violated in Rome, and threatened with still further violation. Let our Holy Father and those who with him in Rome fight the battles of Christianity against unbelief, the battles of Christianity against Socialism and the Revolution, see that here, at least, in free America, we shall give him our utmost moral support, our practical aid as well as our heartfelt sympathy.

And we count with reason on the joint co-operation with us of Congress and the Executive. They will not fail us, unless we lamentably fail ourselves and the expectation of all Christendom.

THE END.

IMPORTANT SPEECH BY MR. PARNELL.

He Repudiates The Theories of Henry George.

The ancient borough of Drogheda, on April 15, was the scene of perhaps the greatest demonstration in Ireland for years; and Mr. Parnell was the central figure of a vast popular ovation. The freedom of the city was voted to Mr. Parnell more than two years ago, but the constitution of the Corporation, which was delicately alluded to by Mr. Parnell in his speech in the Mayoralty Rooms, was such that it was not until his present Worship, Mr. Patrick Casey Connelly, came into the office that the recipient of the honor could be fitly presented with the freedom. The day was a holiday in Drogheda, most of the shops were shut, and the whole place wore a gala appearance. As Mr. Parnell travelled from Dublin, he received an ovation at every station on the line. At Skerries an immense multitude assembled and presented an address to the National Leader. At Balbriggan, another address was presented. At other stations the car in which he rode was covered with flowers. He was received in Drogheda by the Mayor and officials of the town, and escorted by a procession of all the trades and societies. In an open carriage sat the Mayor, Mr. Parnell, and the High Sheriff, Alderman John Mangan. The cheering that greeted Mr. Parnell never flagged. The route taken was a complete circuit of the borough, under the triumphal arches, past mottoes emblazoned on house fronts, evergreen decorations of every description, green flags and American banners, and through streets of houses in every window of which appeared faces. The enthusiasm and cheers and music, and gaily colored flags made up a picture that will be long remembered by those who saw it.

PRESENTED WITH THE FREEDOM OF THE CITY.

At the Mayoralty Rooms the freedom of the ancient city was presented to Mr. Parnell by the Mayor. There was a great assembly of representatives there.

In his response Mr. Parnell said:—"It was in Drogheda that I found my first political friends in my contest for the County of Meath, the county which gave me an opportunity of entering into public life. It was just nine years ago—I think almost exactly nine years ago—that I made the first canvass of Meath in your town and market-places at Drogheda, and I am happy to be able to remember that on that occasion I hardly met with a single refusal!"

A POLICE REQUEST DENIED.

In the evening there was a grand banquet at Whitworth Hall, attended by the leading Irishmen in Meath and Louth. During the course of the dinner a message was conveyed to the Mayor from Captain Keogh, R. M., to the effect that he wished a police reporter to be present to take notes of the speeches. After a hurried consultation with Mr. Parnell, the Mayor sent an answer to the following effect:—"that the request was one very rarely made, and had never been acceded to, and that as Mayor of Drogheda declined to accede to Captain Keogh's request, regarding it as a personal insult. Very great indignation prevailed among the company when this occurrence was made known."

MR. PARNELL'S SPEECH.

Mr. Parnell, on rising to respond to his health, was received with minutes of cheering and applause. He began by enumerating the work of the national agitation, the successes it had already achieved, and the many purposes it had in view.

"So far as we have gone, this session, although not a very brilliant one, is promising good, and the hope has been much deepened by recent events—that before long over 400,000 of the men of Ireland who have been kept outside the gates of the Constitution may receive the franchise, and may be in a position to aid effectively the rest of their countrymen in regaining national rights for their country (cheers). Neither am I altogether without hope that some further advance may be made this session in reference to the land question (cheers). Now, sir, I think I have given some reasons why, at all events, we should not be discouraged—why we should have every confidence that we are upon the right track, and that the principles and methods of action which have been adopted by the people and their representatives during the last few years are well calculated to attain the end we have in view. It is necessary for me at the same time to take advantage of this occasion to warn you against elements of future difficulty—elements of possible future difficulty, and possibilities of grave disunion in our ranks, which may be obviated by my timely declaration. I refer to the project termed

THE NATIONALIZATION OF LAND

and in dealing with this question I don't wish to intrude upon you anything of a personal character. I prefer, as I have always done in public life and history, to deal with principles and not with men (hear, hear). I have read for you the two planks of the platform of the Land League—the destruction of rack rents and of landlord oppression and evictions, and of the facilitation of the occupying ownership by the tiller of the soil. Well, unwelcome of this fact, we have been recently informed upon distinguished authority, at a meeting in

Dublin, that we have been false to the spirit of the Land League, that we are unmindful of its principles, because we refused to desert that which has been our programme up to the present moment, and to follow this new craze. Ownership of land by anybody, we are told, is theft—whether that anybody be landlord or tenant it is equally a crime and a robbery, and because we refuse to agree with this sweeping assertion we are condemned as slack and as yielding basely to the present Coercion Act (applause). The desire to acquire land is everywhere one of the strongest instincts of human nature, and that instinct is never stronger and never more developed than in a country such as Ireland, where land is limited, and those who desire to acquire it are numerous in number. I submit further that this desire to acquire landed property, and the further desire to be released from the crushing impositions of rack-rents was the very basis and foundation of the movement of the National League, and that without it, although not solely owing to it, they never could have progressed or been successful. As reasonably might they have supposed that they could have persuaded the poor man that it was with him a crime to endeavor to hope for the ownership of the holding he tilled.

NO MORE ABSURD OR PREPOSTEROUS PROPOSITION

was ever made to a people than, after having declared on a thousand platforms, by a million of voices, that the tenant should be the owner of his holding, that after this declaration had been agreed to by a million of our countrymen in England, America, and Australia, after having, with unexampled success, proceeded forward on these lines for five years, we should quietly turn round, retrace our steps to the starting-point, and commence anew a movement which should be wanting in every element and prospect of success; and of the successful working of which even its supporters could not afford us any single example (applause). Sir, I say possible disunion might arise out of this new movement, this new policy and programme. I don't think it is at all likely there may be a design to forge out of the newly enfranchised artisans and workmen of the towns and cities of Ireland a sort of battering-ram to propel against the tenant-farmers; but I am confident that if any such desire of that kind exists there is far too much patriotism amongst the artisans and workmen of Ireland to allow our movement to be stranded, and that the artisan or factory hand would prefer to see his own interest sink to the dust rather than that he should for a single moment paralyze the force and the strength of his country (cheers). Now, sir, this doctrine is, even in the eyes of its most ardent supporters, so utterly devoid of any hope of success, so entirely destitute of any attraction, that it is necessary to invest it with something which does not exclusively belong to it, and the cry of "No compensation to the landlords" has been raised. Now, Sir, I think I can more particularly speak on this matter because I have been entirely consistent upon it from the beginning. I have neither advanced nor receded from the position which I took up in 1879 (cheers). It was a position which I thought you would be able to carry, and which in all probability you will be able to carry. Upon every platform in this country or America I laid down the principle of

PURCHASE AT A FAIR AND REASONABLE PRICE

and what people in those days would have considered a low price. I said in New York in 1879 when I landed there what I say to you to-night—that you must either pay for the land or fight for it (loud cheer). There is no use in thinking that you can get it for nothing by talking about it on any number of platforms—you must either pay for it or fight for it. And in 1879 the Land League deliberately adopted the principle of payment as being most likely to be the cheapest in the long run, and possibly the most successful (laughter). I admit, as I admitted then, that the amount to be paid was a matter for considerable discussion and arrangement and negotiation, and even agitation. Constitutional agitation and organization can do a great deal to whittle down the price that the landlord asks for his land, but it must be paid for unless you adopt the other alternative, which I say nothing about (laughter and cheer). We are told of some great wave of English democracy which is now to come over here to poor Ireland and assist the Irish democracy. Well, I do not believe in the English democracy (cheers). The poor Irish democracy will have, I fear, to rely upon themselves in the future, as they have had to do up to the present moment (hear, hear). I have not seen any evidence of this movement which has started in England. The hard question of Ireland must be settled by the Irish people at home (applause), by their own exertions, and by the exertions of those men whom they depend upon in the House of Commons, if it is to be settled at all. Now, Sir, there is another point. I have explained to you that I believed this new movement is hopeless and one impossible of success. It possibly may tend to disunion in our ranks; but

I HAVE ANOTHER AND GREATER REASON

which has always influenced me in my action upon the land question. In my judgment, the land question, if it is to be settled by constitutional means, will have to be settled before the national question can be settled by constitutional means. I do not express any opinion as to whether either of these questions is likely to be or can be settled by constitutional means, but my proposition is this—that the Irish Land Question must be settled before the National Question if constitutional measures are adopted (hear, hear). And why is this? Carry your mind back to the history of the two great national movements since the Union—the history of the Repeal agitation, and the history of the Home Rule agitation. Both of these movements proceeded on the basis of an attempt to conciliate the landlords, and that attempt proved equally futile in each case. The landlords of Ireland will have to be got rid of before we can hope to unite North and South, Catholic and Protestant, in such a way as to present our demands for National self-government constitutionally in an overwhelming fashion in the English Parliament (great cheering). As long as you have owners of land of *hoc genus omne*—men like Lord Clifton—

deluding their unfortunate countrymen into the belief that the size and weight of the landlord person—such as they—is a vital necessity in order to maintain the freedom of the Protestant religion in Ireland, you cannot do this (cheers.)

That has been the principle upon which we have proceeded. We appeared to lay aside all reference to the Home Rule question—in the last four years the word was never used; we appeared to have simply turned ourselves into so many land reformers, and that was made the occasion for complaint and carping against us more than once. Well, sir, why did we do this? Because I believe that if this Irish land question was once definitely settled upon a certain sure foundation, and upon an immovable one, and it is very far from being so—very far from being so settled at present—there should be no class interest in Ireland of sufficient strength capable of offering an obstacle to the triumphant march of our people towards national self-government. And we have proceeded upon that assumption. No, sir, I don't mean to say that the price of land has touched bottom in Ireland as yet, or anything like it, but I do ask the people of Ireland as rational beings, not to be turned aside from the idea they have followed successfully, for the years of the Land League agitation—not to be turned aside to

THE PURSUIT OF A WILL-O'-THE-WISP

which is an impossibility, and which may lead to serious disunion, and which undoubtedly will postpone the settlement of the land question, and make the heart grow sick regarding the probability of the restoration of an Irish Parliament (cheers). I would ask the tenant-farmers of Ireland to turn to another part of my subject, and to consider how they are likely to be affected when the laborers obtain the vote. I would ask each tenant farmer to reflect whether he has altogether treated his laborers as he thinks he would like to have treated them if he knew they were going to be entitled to equal constitutional power with himself. I believe the tenant-farmers to be a very important class. Upon their courage, probity and patriotism much of the future of Ireland depends. Recollect this—in a very short time, these laborers, who some of you show you think so little of, will have equal rights with yourselves—their votes will reckon just as much as yours in the ballot-box, and now is the time, before they have a right to your consideration, now is the time for you to refrain from obstructing the working of that important measure, the Laborers' Act. I think it would not be to your interest or to the cause of Ireland that this important though long suffering and badly treated class should be further neglected (cheers). Now let me ask you another question. A great movement for a revival of home industry originated a year or two ago in Ireland. How are you supporting that movement at the present moment? How many of you in any of your occupations wear some article of Irish manufacture? How many of you show a practical desire to restore Irish manufacture? What have each of you done to provide employment in the mills at home? This is a matter which should be always present to our mind. We may have to pay a little more for Blarney or Navan tweed, but its wear will abundantly recompense us in the end. It is possible for each of us, whether man or woman or child, to do something to afford employment to Irish men or Irish women at home, and I would entreat you to consider that in the absence of a Parliament such as that which is enjoyed in Australia, and endowed with a power to protect native manufactures, it is our hopes that a very little self-sacrifice to-day will restore

THE ANCIENT FAME OF IRELAND AS A MANUFACTURING NATION.

The political situation is undoubtedly full of encouragement and of hope. We have a people who in the face of every discouragement and disadvantage have gradually forced their way up until their attitude has come to be regarded by both friend and foe alike as sound. Their position is impregnable. If you have progressed with a limited suffrage, and in the face of the worst Coercion Acts ever inflicted upon a country, what will you not do when coercion has been blotted out (hear, hear), and when you have the security which will enable you to press on for the liberty and security of our country? (Applause which lasted for one minute.)

Stephen Allen's Advice.

"Never be idle. If your hands cannot be usefully employed, attend to the cultivation of your mind. Always speak the truth. Make few promises. Live up to your engagements. Keep your own secrets if you have any. When you speak to a person, look him in the face. Good company and good conversation are the very sinews of virtue. Good character is above all things else. Your character cannot be essentially injured except by your own acts. If any one speaks ill of you, let your life be so that none will believe him. Drink no kind of intoxicating liquors. Ever live, misfortune excepted, within your income. When you retire to bed, think over what you have been doing during the day. Make no haste to be rich. Small and steady gains give competency with tranquility of mind. Never play at any game of chance. Avoid temptation through fear you may not withstand it. Earn money before you spend it. Never run into debt unless you see a way to get out again. Never borrow unless you cannot possibly avoid it. Do not marry until you are able to support a wife. Never speak evil of any one. Be just before you are generous. Keep yourself innocent if you would be happy. Save when you are young to spend when you are old. Read over the above maxims at least once a week."

Come, Gentle Spring,

and bring malaria, dyspepsia, biliousness, torpidity of liver and a train of kindred maladies. Fortunately Kidney-Wort is at hand. It may be had of the nearest druggist and will purify the system, correct the stomach and bowels, stimulate the liver and kidneys to healthy action, remove all poisonous humors and make you feel like a new man. As a spring medicine, tonic and blood Purifier it has no equal.