

and confined in a lunatic Asylum. If they were in good faith, we should praise their good intentions while pitying their ignorance. But they are not in good faith. They know very well that a Catholic child has a clearer and better idea of the Word of God than all the howling derisives that ever roared in basement or at camp-meeting. But they ignore facts as plainly visible as the noon-day sun.

If they had a religion to give in place of Catholicity it would not be so bad. But Evangelicism, by the confession of its own supporters, has gone to everlasting smash and is now bordering upon its only logical conclusion—pure Atheism. They deny hell, but let them beware of hell's most conclusive argument—itsself.

SISTERS OF CHARITY.

The Sisters of Charity will hold their annual bazaar on the 20th of May. The bazaar will be held at the Providence Orphanage, at the corner of St. Denis and Mignonne St. We are sure that this bazaar will be liberally patronized by the Catholics of Montreal. There is no more deserving charity in our midst and it becomes us all to do what we can to make the bazaar a success.

KNIGHTS OF ST. PATRICK.

According to an advertisement, which appears in another column, it appears an effort is being made to establish a new organization, called the "Knights of St. Patrick," in Montreal. We opine that the objects of this society are in keeping with the name it bears, and if so, Irishmen generally will wish it success.

THIS MORNING'S NEWS.

Colligan, is to be buried on Sunday, and it expected that the funeral demonstration will be an imposing one.

MORE FIRING LAST NIGHT.

Mr. J. Barry, who lives at the corner of McCord and William Street, states that last night about 10:30 a crowd of Young Rascals passed his house in a carriage, and fired a pistol shot at his wife, who happened to be standing at the door. The ball passed within a few inches of her left side, and lodged in the door. All this business will, we fear, have a tragic ending. The limit of endurance has been reached, and one more outrage may, we fear, cause such a commotion as the local authorities will be powerless to quell.

SHEEHAN AND DOHERTY.

John Sheehan and Wm. Doherty write to us and say that there was any revolver used in the affair of Saturday night.

NOT FAIR.

A drunken man named Patrick Lacy was yesterday arrested for brandishing a revolver and threatening to shoot somebody. The *Gazette* in its report of the circumstance calls Lacy "a would be assassin." Just so, partial to the end. But the *Gazette* did not call the cold-blooded murderers who plotted the death of Carrey "would be assassins;" not at all. They were orangemen, and the "would be assassin" of yesterday is a Papist. The *Gazette* is practicing "Croppies lie down."

A TERRIBLE AFFRAY.

A YOUNG IRISH CATHOLIC SHOT DEAD—SEVERAL OTHER PERSONS WOUNDED.

(From the Daily News.)

Shortly after eleven o'clock last night, a desperate encounter took place at the Wellington Bridge, in which about one hundred persons participated. How the affair originated is up to the present a mystery, but one unfortunate fact is that a young man named John Colligan was suddenly and without warning summoned into the presence of his Maker. It appears that about eleven o'clock a carter called upon Sergeant Lancy, at the Central Police Station, and informed him that a crowd congregated near the Wellington Bridge. The sergeant did not think this information sufficient to warrant any action on his part, but in a few moments another carter drove up to the station, and stated that a most serious encounter had taken place at the bridge. The officer at once took all the available men with him, and proceeded in carriages to the locality designated. On their arrival everything was quiet, but they learned that Mr. John Colligan had been shot dead, and that his body had been conveyed to the Sarsfield Hall, on Colborne street. They were also informed that a Mrs. McEwan had been shot in the foot. A young man named Beique, who was returning from a political meeting at Point St. Charles, says that when near the bridge he heard several shots fired, and on coming still closer, he could see by the flashes of the revolvers that there was a body of about thirty men on one side of the road, and about fifty on the other, vigorously attacking each other. Mr. Beique says he heard frequent cries of "I'm shot!" from various persons engaged in the affray.

Immediately on Colligan's body being carried away from the dreadful scene, Dr. Macdonell was sent for, but, on his arrival, life was extinct. The wound which caused death was made by a bullet which entered the head by the eye, passed through the brain, and out behind the left ear. The deceased had neither revolver nor arms of any description on his person at the time he was hurried to an untimely end.

The face of the deceased was white and cold, but appeared as calm as if death resulted from natural causes. The hall was crowded with young men, looking sad and sorrowful, but at the same time angry for the latest victim of fanaticism.

Colligan bore an irreproachable reputation, and was as sober and steady as any young man in the city of Montreal. He was famous for his personal prowess, and although peaceably disposed, was often

compelled to engage in personal encounters with Britons.

It is understood that the funeral, which will not take place till Sunday, will be on a gigantic scale and that Irish Catholics are to be invited from all quarters to attend. The shooting of Colligan creates intense excitement throughout Griffintown, and in fact through all parts of the city. People shake their heads sadly and say that this is only the beginning of the end.

In the meantime, the police are making all the exertions necessary to "discover the parties in the business." An Orangeman of the name of Lang was wounded in the hip rather severely, and it is reported that several men—Union and Orange—were hurt in the fray, but are inclined to keep in the back ground.

Our reporter visited the Sarsfield Hall this morning, and was deeply struck with the solemn spectacle that presented itself. The body of the murdered man lay on the secretary's table, covered with a sheet, and immediately surrounded by his sorrowing wife, mother, and other relatives, all of whom were weeping bitterly. Statues of the Saviour and his Virgin Mother were placed one at the head and the other at the feet of the corpse.

The latest report concerning the death of Colligan is that he was driving in a carriage to his home at Point St. Charles and was taken out and shot to death by an armed party. The noise drew a large crowd of Irish Catholics together, and some skirmishing ensued. The question now is:—Supposing the carriage story to be true, who was the carter that drove the deceased and who were the carterers that reported the shooting affair at the police station. They may be able to throw some light on the circumstances.

The fact of five bullet wounds being in the head of Colligan, is a reason why the story of the carriage affair is entitled to a fair share of belief.

LORD LEITRIM.

EXCITING DEBATE IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE BAD EARL'S CONDUCT EXPOSED.

LORD LEITRIM'S "HOME RULE" DEFENDERS.

THE REPORTERS TURNED OUT—THE SECRET SITTING.

MR. GLADSTONE INSULTED.

On Friday night week, the 12th inst., Mr. O'Donnell brought forward his promised motion in reference to Lord Leitrim, and thereby gave rise to a remarkable scene in the House of Commons. The *Freeman* report begins as follows:—

Mr. O'Donnell rose to call attention to the action of the Government in Donagel with reference to the murder of the late Lord Leitrim, and to move that it is unconstitutional, unsuited to promote the ends of justice, and calculated to foster disbelief in the impartiality of the law. He said—I do not know that I could better bring the facts of this case before an audience which is so largely composed of English gentlemen than by supposing an imaginary case, which, with the substitution of a few names of persons and places, may easily afterwards be applied to the case of this deplorable murder in Donagel, and to the manner in which the Government are carrying on the inquiry for the discovery of the assassins. I would ask the House to imagine that on some morning the news appeared in the London papers that a terrible outrage had occurred in some quiet vale of Cumberland in the midst of a population conspicuous for their law-abiding virtues, conspicuous for their patient industry, and conspicuous for the practice of the duties of family and civil life. I will further ask the House to suppose that this landlord in Cumberland, accompanied by two servants, had been suddenly attacked in a lonely part of the country and had been shot down, and not only he, but his casual assistants and servants ruthlessly murdered along with him. Such an occurrence as that happening in Cumberland would have riveted the attention of England; but if on further inquiry it was discovered that while no portion of Cumberland was more conspicuous for its orderly virtues and for the absence of vice and crime, yet nevertheless that portion of what was believed to be a happy English country had been placed at the mercy of one who, by the lamentable shortcomings of the English law, had been enabled to execute the caprices of some baron of a semi-barbaric age of civilization by means of the chicanery of nineteenth century legal procedure; if it had been discovered that during a quarter of a century these Cumberland dalemen had been exposed to the tyranny of a mental torture, that they had been in the power of a man of iron-will and ruthless passion, who practically exercised absolute power; if it was known on inquiry that the villages had been cleared, that the valleys in some cases had been swept clear of their inhabitants, that over all was hanging the doom of eviction or of some punishment akin to eviction; and if, it was known that in spite of all that continual torture, these wholesale evictions and that systematic extermination, the relations between the landlord and his Cumberland tenants had never been stained by one excess of an agrarian character on the side of this unfortunate tenantry; if it were further ascertained that the only case in which that Cumberland landlord had been exposed to outrage, attempted violence, and attempted assassination, was when his life was attempted by the wife of the humble girl whom he had dishonoured (shame), it would have flashed with the strength of conviction upon the minds of all men that in such a long-trying and law-abiding community, whom no extremity of suffering during 25 years had goaded to a violation of the law—it would have struck every Englishman speaking in his highest degree unlikely that these peasants had entered into a widespread conspiracy of a mere agrarian character, and that the murder which had taken place would have required an enormous amount of proof to bring it within the category of mere attempts against life and property. If, on further examination, it was shown that this landlord was known throughout all the Northern counties as the "Bad Earl" (no, no, and shame).

Sir A. Gordon—I beg to ask, sir, if this is language which is fit to be addressed to the House of Commons? (Cheers)

Mr. Parnell—May I ask you, sir, to protect the privilege of speech, when that speech conveys the truth.

Mr. O'Donnell, resuming, said that if such a man had been noted for his debauchery—(no, no, and shame). Mr. King-Harman—I ask the hon. member to say whether he can give proofs of what he says, or whether he is maligning the memory of the dead earl on a matter of which he has no knowledge? Dr. Keenly—There seems to be a systematic attempt to interfere with the freedom and independence of Parliamentary speech (laughter).

The Speaker—The language which the hon. member has addressed to the House is to be deprecated as being very strong, at the same time I am not prepared to say that he was not within his right in using the expressions he did.

Mr. Parnell—Hear, hear.

Mr. O'Donnell, resuming—I have endeavoured to push my forbearance to the utmost in the case of

my member for Sligo. What I state it will be for this House to consider the value of at the conclusion of my speech. I am endeavouring at present to bring the broad questions of right of law, and of justice before the House. I have carefully taken up a sort of imaginary case, and this House will be able to find out whether that which I have imagined with regard to Cumberland may be a parallel capable of application elsewhere. Sir, if it was found that this landlord, known throughout all the northern country of England as the "Bad Earl," had carried on these practices of debauchery, and had carried them on not only by means of the vulgar wiles of seduction, but by means of his authority and power as a landlord—by means of the power of eviction so plentifully placed in his hands; if it was known through all the country, beyond the possibility of a doubt, commented upon in the public press, denied nowhere, that he had placed the alternative of eviction or dishonour before the peasant girls on his property, and that when his infamous advances had been slighted he had carried out his threat of eviction—

Mr. King-Harman—Mr. Speaker, I beg to say that I see strangers.

The Speaker—The hon. member having taken notice of strangers, I am bound to take the course I have taken upon a former occasion, and to put the question to the House whether strangers shall be ordered to withdraw. As many as are of that opinion say "ay."

There being a loud volume of "ayes," the Speaker having put the negative, to which Mr. O'Donnell responded.

The House then divided, when the numbers were—

Ayes.....27
Noes.....12

Majority.....15

The Strangers' Gallery had been cleared during the division, but the reporters remained. When Mr. O'Donnell resumed his address there were cries of "Order," "Strangers in the House."

The Speaker then said—The sergeant will clear the galleries of strangers.

The debate was then resumed in private, with the exception that the numerous attendance in the Ladies Gallery remained undisturbed, the Ladies Gallery being technically "out of the House."

After the strangers had been excluded,

Mr. O'Donnell read extracts from the *Freeman's Journal*, as the popular daily paper of Ireland; the *London Standard*, a leading Presbyterian organ; the *Belfast Morning News*, an independent journal; and the *Irishman*, the organ of the Nationalist party, in corroboration of the statements he had made; all of them, he said, being unanimous in relating the same facts as to the licentiousness of the late earl. He condemned assassination most strongly, but begged to remind the House that it was quite possible that the murder of the Earl of Leitrim was not an agrarian offence, but based on motives of private vengeance, and he protested against the conduct of the Government in assuming, before investigation, trial, or conviction, that this offence had been committed as the result of agrarian conspiracy. He, therefore, objected to the branding of a whole barony with the stigma of membership of a murderous conspiracy against the rights of property, while it still remained unproved. What were the incentives to the act? The action of the Government had given the tone to public sentiment and "the murderous tendencies of the Irish peasantry" were now the common theme of English journals.

Mr. Parnell, in supporting the motion, went over the facts of the case, and also pointed out that there was quite sufficient ground existing for attributing the commission of the act to motives of private vengeance. The whole public opinion of Ireland decidedly declared in that direction.

Mr. King-Harman said there were no proofs of that.

Mr. Parnell said if the hon. member doubted the proofs supplied by the leading journals of the country he was welcome to ask for a Parliamentary inquiry. For his own part, as the House very well knew, he had no power "to send for persons, papers, or records," but the hon. member could ask for a Parliamentary committee if he wished. The fact was, the conduct of the late earl was simply admitted on all hands. He warned the House that the manner in which Irish tenants were abandoned to the worst caprices of men like the late Lord Leitrim tended to destroy all hope in constitutional agitation among the Irish people, and to lead the wilder spirits to think that the only way in which Irish public opinion could ever influence the British legislature was when it winged the bullet of the assassin. It was a terrible and a deplorable state of affairs, and he implored the House to do something to win back the confidence of the peasantry, and not wantonly to insult them by assuming them to be guilty of crimes that were utterly unproved, and with regard to which the probabilities lay all in the other direction.

The proceedings during the remainder of the private sitting are reported as follows in the *London Observer*:—

Mr. King-Harman made a strong complaint of what he looked on as an unprovoked attack on the character and actions of the murdered earl—an attack which was unsupported by any ascertained facts, and ought never to have been countenanced in that House.

Dr. Ward protested against the way in which that question had been raised. It had ostensibly been brought forward on constitutional grounds; but it had taken the form of an indecent attack upon the dead (cheers). Why was it so brought on? Was it in the interests of the tenants? It was notorious that it was not so, because it was brought on at the most inconvenient time, when Parliament was certain not to listen to it, and was sure to regard it as an apology for assassination. He firmly believed that this, like many other motions of the honourable members for Dungarvan and Meath, was not for the purpose of promoting great Irish questions, for they brought them on when they knew the result could only be injurious, but solely in order to acquire for themselves a notoriety which in this case looked very like infamy. It was a sad thing, indeed, to find that members of Parliament required to have recourse to the expedient of endeavouring to found a reputation on apologies for assassination.

Mr. Parnell and Mr. O'Donnell rose to order.

Dr. Ward said they had seen that night what almost looked like an apology for assassination.

Mr. O'Donnell again rose to order, and said the charge brought against him by Dr. Ward was an infamous lie (uproar).

Mr. Parnell also contended that Dr. Ward had been out of order.

The Speaker, however, ruled that nothing improper had been said by Dr. Ward.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer remarked that an expression had been used which he thought the House would insist on being withdrawn. It was that in which the member for Dungarvan had charged another member of having been guilty of an infamous lie.

After a good deal of uproar and contention,

Mr. O'Donnell agreed to withdraw the objectionable remark.

Dr. Ward, continuing, remarked that Mr. Parnell said it was a hollow fallacy to recommend constitutional means, but he was not surprised at its being so if that was the hon. gentleman's idea of what were constitutional means. He believed these proceedings were taken with a deliberate purpose, and were intended to appeal to the unconstitutional and

revolutionary section, which the hon. members, however they might foster, had not the courage to belong to (great uproar).

Mr. Parnell again called the hon. member to order, but

The Speaker again ruled that there had been nothing irregular in Dr. Ward's remarks.

Dr. Ward continuing, and things had come to a sad pass when men calling themselves Irish patriots dragged the cause of Ireland through blood and mire in order to build up their own reputations (uproar).

For the third time the hon. member was called to order, with the same result.

Mr. McCarthy Downing, as an Irish member, expressed himself deeply pained at the scene he had been forced to witness that evening. He assured the House that he had done all he could to prevent Mr. O'Donnell from proposing his motion, and he felt bound to express his deep regret that any Irishman could submit such a proposal within a few days only of the three fellow-creatures having found a bloody grave, and while the administrators of justice were engaged in the endeavor to discover the perpetrators of the abominable crime. He had always been an advocate of the Irish tenants, but could never lend himself to asserting their rights by violence or intimidation. He did not think, however, that the murder of Lord Leitrim was of an agrarian character, and it might have arisen from other causes, glanced at by Mr. O'Donnell and Mr. Parnell. Of course it might turn out in the end that it was agrarian, but at the present stage the Government was evidently giving a partial complexion to the case, and he was quite sure that no murder, however terrible, in England could entail on an entire neighborhood of innocent people the stigma and the penalties inflicted.

Mr. Gibson condemned the course that had been taken by the supporters of the motion.

The Marquis of Hartington spoke against the action of Mr. O'Donnell and Mr. Parnell; but both he and Mr. Gladstone confined their remarks to the statement that they voted with the minority on the question of the exclusion of the press. They saw no reason why the question should not be publicly discussed. They complained of the hooting to which they had been subjected by the Conservative members as something unparalleled in the history of Parliament. The words of Lord Hartington were specially strong in resentment of the insult offered to him and his right hon. friend.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer said the conduct of the hon. members for Dungarvan and Meath could only be regarded with reprobation (cheers, and cries of "oh, oh"). He had never used such language before, and he was sorry to do it now; but he was glad to see members from Ireland, and more especially those at the other side of the House, taking the manly course of protesting against such conduct (cheers). He regretted, on the whole, that the press had been excluded, because he thought it would have been well if the speeches of those gentlemen had been published.

Mr. O'Connor Power supported the resolution, and said it was no use attempting to evade the question which had been brought before the House by the hon. members for Dungarvan and Meath. All sides condemned assassination equally; but panic measures and superfluous coercion were not calculated to promote the interests of justice, and the manner in which a crime took place in a special language should not be seized hold of to punish the innocent or made a handle to fix the stigma of murderous conspiracy on whole classes of the Irish people. That was not likely to create confidence in the justice of the law.

Dr. Keenly defended the whole of the action and language of Mr. O'Donnell and Mr. Parnell.

Sir W. M. Harcourt remarked that it had been left to Dr. Keenly to defend the monstrous language of those two hon. gentlemen (cheers). What had occurred had had the effect of showing how unfounded were the claims of those members to speak on behalf of Ireland.

Mr. Callan joined in the condemnation of the conduct of Mr. Parnell and Mr. O'Donnell.

Sir Patrick O'Brien said it was all a matter of taste (laughter). He had been in the House twenty six years, and had never seen such an example of bad taste (laughter).

Mr. David Plunket passed some severe criticism on the conduct of the minority. He had heard language from the member for Meath which, he thought, could only be tolerated by the foul rabble which had hooted the corpse of the late earl in Dublin the other day. He expressed his delight at finding other Irish members repudiating the language of those two gentlemen, and hoped that they would not be contaminated by that policy any longer.

A division was then called for, but was not taken as Mr. O'Donnell did not press his motion, and the reporters were re-admitted at half-past twelve o'clock.

A correspondent of the *Nation* sends the following account of what happened when Dr. Ward was called to order:—

Both Mr. Parnell and Mr. O'Donnell rose to call Dr. Ward to order amid terrific hooting from the Tories.

Raising his voice, Mr. O'Donnell exclaimed—"Any suggestion that I countenance assassination is a foul and infamous lie."

Dr. Ward made some explanation which was ruled by the Speaker to clear him of having imputed approval of assassination to any hon. members, and called upon Mr. O'Donnell to withdraw his statement accordingly, as it seemed to imply unparliamentary conduct to Dr. Ward.

Mr. O'Donnell replied that it was Dr. Ward who held by the Speaker to have explained himself in a Parliamentary manner, of course he bowed to the decision of the chair. The cheering for Dr. Ward and the hooting of Messrs. Parnell and O'Donnell were continued during the whole episode.

The London correspondent of the *Freeman* thus describes the insult offered to Mr. Gladstone by the infuriated Tories.

The comparatively full and almost exclusive report I was able to give you on Saturday morning of the proceeding at the "private" sitting of the House of Commons requires supplementing but on one point, and that was the marked insult offered to the Liberal leaders who voted against the exclusion of the press. The scene when the Tories found that Mr. Gladstone, Lord Hartington, and Mr. Lowe were voting in the negative was most disgraceful. Those about to vote with the "ayes" had all passed into the lobby, and the glass door was locked behind them as usual by the officials. Instead, however, of moving on to record their votes at the other end, a considerable number remained watching at the door looking into the Opposition lobby. As the ordinary members, who might have been expected to support Mr. O'Donnell's motion passed they were received with no more than usual manifestations, and it was only when Mr. Lowe and Lord Hartington appeared that the Tory manifestation became apparent. Yells, shouts of "Yah, yah," hisses, hootings, and groans then broke out. Lord Hartington passed by with a haughty smile imprinted on his features. As Mr. Gladstone walked out of the "no" lobby with his usual sedate demeanour the storm raged with tenfold violence. "Yah, yah," was repeated until the roof rang again. Howls, derisive cheers, hisses, cat-calls were continued as long as the right hon. member remained visible, and even until after he had passed from sight into the House. As the Liberal leaders resumed their seats on their benches a consultation on the extraordinary and insulting scene evidently took place between them. They took no immediate notice, however, of the demon-

stration and in this, perhaps, made a technical mistake. The time for bringing the outrage under the notice of the chair was immediately after it was committed. The disingenuous statesman who was subjected to this foul outrage, however, felt reluctant to expose the name of it, and it was only towards the end of the debate on the general question that Mr. Gladstone first, and Lord Hartington afterwards, complained of the scene in the lobby. Mr. Gladstone spoke most temperately, describing the sounds which issued from the Government lobby as ironical cheers of a character that had never before fallen within his experience. Lord Hartington spoke with more spirit, evidently feeling the insult to the veteran statesman, his former leader more than that to himself. He roundly stated that Mr. Gladstone underrated the character of the demonstration by speaking of it as "ironical cheering." "Howling," he said, was the word which would better describe it. To the regret of many members, the Chancellor of the exchequer sought to palliate the outrage by referring the excited feelings of his followers to their belief the right hon. gentleman meant to support the motion of the member for Dungarvan, but the excuse may be taken for what it is worth.

Mr. O'Donnell has supplemented his excellent speech by the following excellent letter, which he has addressed to the *Freeman*:—

Temple April 13.

SIR—The device which covered with the veil of secrecy the exposure of the meaning and scope of the Tory measures ostensibly adopted for the sole purpose of discovering the assassins of Lord Leitrim, having prevented a report of my speech from appearing in your columns, I beg to lay before your readers the following brief notes of my address:—

In order to bring home the Englishmen the truth of the situation, I asked them to consider that not an Irish county, but say, Cumberland or Yorkshire, had been the scene of the deplorable events. If an English landowner of the character of Lord Leitrim had been murdered anywhere in Cumberland, would an English Government have dared, before trial, before conviction of the assassins, to have assumed that they acted in confederacy with the entire population of the district, well known to consist of virtuous, law-abiding, and patient rural tenantry? Would the Government have dared to assume that not motives of private vengeance, but a general conspiracy against the rights of property, had led to the awful crime? Would any English Government have dared to proclaim an English district as suspected of murderous conspiracy, before even a single public investigation had suggested a shadow of a reason for an imputation of such a kind upon thousands of innocent persons? No, an English Government in an English county would have carefully held aloof from prejudging the character of an undiscovered crime, would have carefully respected the honour and the liberty of English people, and would have calmly and wisely proceeded to use the ordinary agencies of detection in all directions, and without conveying suggestions calculated to be used for class party purposes. Why should the tenantry of Donagel be treated on principles different from a similar body of tenantry in Cumberland or Yorkshire?

There was no excuse for the Government conduct. Had the people of Donagel offered the slightest opposition to the researches of the police and the detectives? There was not the shadow of such an imputation. Had the clergy failed to denounce the enormity of the crime? No, again. The venerable prelate of the diocese had at once and in the most solemn manner warned his people of the dreadful nature and the deep sin of murder on any pretext and under any provocation whatsoever.

It was well known that other reasons besides questions of rent and questions of rights to seaweed and rights of turbary had existed to account for the detestation in which the murdered earl was held. When his life was attempted before it was by a relation of one of his ruined victims. I proceeded to quote the leading press of Ireland upon the notorious facts of the prosecution to which tenants on the Leitrim estates had been subjected, because, with Irish stiff-neckedness, they refused to sacrifice the purity of an Irish home. I need not here remark upon the baseless pretence which sought to keep from the cognizance of the English public crimes published throughout the length and breadth of Ireland.

I commented upon the secret character of the information on which, perhaps, innocent lives might be sworn away. Whoever heard in broad England within civilized times of criminal investigations without the guarantee of publicity of any kind? I condemned the action of the Government as "unconstitutional," because it employed without proved necessity extraordinary powers, and because it assumed that the crime in Cratloe Wood was the result of a conspiracy of tenants against the rights of property when it might very well be the effect of the relentless vengeance of a handful of individuals. I condemned that action as "unsuited to promote the interests of justice," because by branding with an undeserved stigma a whole population it naturally set the natural instincts of many people against a law which seemed incapable of being set in motion in Ireland without outraging the best sentiments of the most numerous and the most worthy classes of the community. Finally, I condemned that action of the Government as "calculated to promote disbelief in the impartiality of the law," because, besides the other reasons, by the branding of the tenantry with the stigma of murderous conspiracy against the rights of property, every man in Ireland felt, and the tenants of Donagel felt, that an intimation was conveyed certain to be acted upon by the evicting landlords and their allies, that the peasantry of Ireland were in a murderous conspiracy against the just rights of the proprietors, and that, while nothing could be gained by further conciliation of such a criminal confederacy, the essential security of property required sweeping and unsparring measures of coercion.

As a result of the intimation which the Government had given, as a result of the official rendering of the relations between the evil Earl of Leitrim and his tenantry, the Tory party, the whole Tory press, and a considerable section of the general public, had expended their energies, ever since the fearful crime in Cratloe Wood, in seeking to fasten the guilt upon the natural character and tendencies of the Irish tenantry, instead of waiting, as the Government should have waited, for the calm investigations of impartial justice to have detected the criminals, and to have punished the crime.

At the same time, sir, that publicity was refused to the exposure of the truth about the Leitrim tenantry in the House of Commons, a debate was permitted to proceed in the House of Lords in which the Government theory was fully ventilated and applied, and in which the murderous proclivities of the tenantry of Ireland were urged as conclusive reasons, not only for going no further in the way of doing justice to the oppressed population of our country districts, but for even condemning the slight approach to a reform contained in the Gladstone Land Act.

I would be permitted to conclude with a single observation on the "opportunities" or "inopportunities" of tearing the mask from the tyranny which weighs upon our country. When Ireland is misjudged, when Ireland is calumniated, when the enemies of the Irish people are loudest in their insolent and interested defamation, then I claim that it is always opportune for an Irish member to vindicate the truth and to smite the lie wherever it can be confronted.—I have the honour, sir, to remain your obedient servant,

FRANK HUGH O'DONNELL.