

THE PROPOSED BRITISH FEDERATION.

How It Strikes an Able American Journal.

(From the Chicago Tribune.)

The *Westminster Review* has recently been discussing the feasibility of a federation of the British Empire, and the views presented by it are stated to be in consonance with those of the advanced English statesmen. There are not wanting indications of this change, so strong and suggestive that federation may be looked upon as the British policy in the not distant future. Substantially, the proposition is to create an Imperial Parliament, in which representatives from the colonies are to have seats, and to form local Parliaments for the consideration of local measures, leaving those which affect the interests of the whole Empire to the Imperial. As to the gain in Parliamentary legislation, the *Westminster* says—

"The local House would be of manageable and compact proportions; its members would be able to devote their time and energies to the proper treatment and consideration of various local questions; the dissatisfaction caused at present throughout the Empire by the constant burking of local measures would be allayed; and we might even hope that the Irish difficulty would be set at rest, perhaps by the formation of an Irish local Parliament, but, in any case, by reason of the House being able to devote proper time and attention to the consideration of Irish grievances. In a similar manner, the Imperial House would be much reduced in bulk and proportionately increased in activity and vitality. Its time would be occupied in the consideration of Imperial questions; its energy would not then be frittered away upon petty local matters; nor would the business of the House be obstructed by members anxious to force the consideration of some local grievance."

The immediate details of the scheme are set forth as follows:

"It is proposed that the Imperial House should consist of 300 members—185 for England, 25 for Scotland, 40 for Ireland, 50 for the colonies. This is about the proportion of the present Parliament. The distribution of the colonies for the present at least, would be as follows: Twenty for the Dominion of Canada and Newfoundland, fifteen for Australia, five for New Zealand, five for the Cape Settlements, five for the West Indies. The Ministry of the day would be drawn from members of the Imperial House and the House of Lords, and these, as at present, would be the immediate and responsible advisers of the Crown. The Parliament would sit at London, and its term of duration would be five years. Assuming that there would be local Parliaments in London, in Edinburgh and in Dublin, there would be Viceroy in each of these three capitals, whose advisers would be drawn from the members of the Local House, and would sustain to him the same relations as those sustained by his Ministers to the Queen. All measures passed by the Local House would require the assent of the Viceroy before they could become law. Any measure of doubtful constitutionality could be reviewed by the Viceroy and remitted for the consideration of the Queen in Council. Any measure passed by the Local House and assented to by the Viceroy could be annulled, vetoed by the Queen within two years from the time it received the Viceroy's assent. Copies of all bills assented to by the Viceroy would, of course, be sent to the Secretary of State for Imperial Consultation. The local Colonial Legislatures would remain much as they are, at least for the present."

The extracts printed above contain the salient features of the federation scheme. The practical question remains—Of what value will the scheme be to the English colonies? It is evident that it cannot be carried out until the local Parliaments of England, Ireland and Scotland adopt the American system of federation, as it has been copied in Canada in a large measure. This would involve, first of all, a written Constitution—which Great Britain does not possess—drawing a boundary line between the rights of the Empire and those of the colonies, and designating, so that there can be no conflict, the jurisdiction of the Imperial and Colonial Parliaments. This is a question which will severely tax English statesmanship. It has taxed the minds of our statesmen for years, and the problem is not yet fully settled. It has been the issue of our fiercest partisan fights, and it has plunged the country into a long and terrible war. It is not likely that the English statesmen will find it any easier to draw such a line than our own have done, though it is not impossible that it could be wrought out by them.

In the second place, the question of customs will be one of extreme difficulty to solve, and were the Imperial Government to suddenly resort to a revenue tariff, it could not but arouse opposition in colonies like Canada, Australia and New Zealand, which are in favor of protection, because it is easier for them to raise revenue in that way than by free trade and direct taxation. If, after federation, every Province can levy any kind of tariff, their federation would be as much a farce as if we had thirty-eight systems of tariffs, each State protecting itself against every other State by taxing their products. The principal gain to England, Ireland and Scotland would be in the establishment of free trade, for without it federation would be good for nothing; but would the colonies adopt it without hesitation and give up their present revenue system?

A third difficulty besets this scheme. It will be in the power of the Imperial Parliament in time of war not only to call upon the colonies for their quota of troops, but to lay upon them by conscription. If not, what would be the benefit of federation? As a fair instance, how would this operate in Canada? Suppose that a quarrel should arise between Great Britain and the United States; Canada must inevitably be dragged into it, and the sure result would be her conquest. Great Britain could not hold her through a single campaign. The United States in ninety days' time could march an army of a million of men across the border, and, as against such a force, Great Britain would be powerless. She might send her fleets into our harbors to be sunk by our torpedoes, or she might land 50,000 or 100,000 men at Halifax or Quebec, but what could they avail against a Republic that has men by millions? In case of any imbrigo in the future, and such an imbrigo may come at any time and upon very slight provocation, and Canada wants to keep out of it, the better plan would be to declare her independence as soon as possible. Standing alone she would be safe from any interference, but as a part of Great Britain, in the case of trouble, she would be a menace to this country that could not be disregarded.

The federation proposition is a dangerous one. It is undoubtedly desirable to the Mother Country to secure more perfect cohesion among her widely-scattered territories and to bring them into closer relations to her, instead of ruling them upon a basis that only irritates and exasperates them; but so long as it is very questionable whether it would improve their industrial or political condition, and whether the sacrifice would not be

all on their part, it looks more feasible to allow both to drift along until they become prosperous and powerful enough to drop off from the Home Government and set up for themselves, as the United States did.

THE "SIEVENAMON" FUND.

The Trustees' Views on Using it to Relieve the Suffering Poor.

The announcement published exclusively in the *Star* yesterday morning that the "Sievenamon Fund," being the unexpended balance of the money collected for the relief of the suffering Irish during the great famine of 1848, and which has lain for the past thirty-one years in the hands of Trustees, among whom were the late Robert Emmet and Horace Greeley, was about to be disbursed to aid in the present relief movement, has awakened a lively interest among thousands of Irish and American sympathizers in this city. Yesterday the surviving Trustees, John McKean, Charles O'Connor, Richard O'Gorman and the son of Mr. Emmet, were visited by a reporter for the purpose of gathering further information on the subject. Mr. Emmet was found by the reporter in his office, at No. 52 Wall street. "I cannot at this time give you any information about the Irish fund," he said. "In the immediate future Messrs. McKean and O'Gorman and myself will meet and decide what to do in the premises. The fund has grown; but one thing is certain, it has been well taken care of, and will be duly accounted for."

Mr. Emmet declined to say when the meeting would take place, or whether the facts would be given to the public, but it is altogether probable the committee will wait till the arrival of Mr. Parnell, when they will consult with that gentleman.

Hon. Richard O'Gorman was found in his office, deeply immersed in business. He declined, firmly, yet pleasantly, to converse upon the subject of the fund.

"Why don't you call upon Mr. Emmet or Mr. McKean?" he asked. "I am positively too busy to be interviewed."

Mr. John McKean was found in his private office. A copy of the *Star* lay in a chair alongside of him.

"I can give no information at present," he said, when the reporter made known the object of the interview.

Mr. McKean mused for a minute, smiled pleasantly and said further: "The information as printed in *The Star* is correct in some respects, but it is materially wrong in the figures. The present amount does not approximate the original sum. Many dollars of it have been judiciously expended for the purposes for which it was intended."

"More complete information would be very timely now," suggested the reporter.

"No doubt, no doubt; but I assure you that I can say nothing more upon the subject."

As the reporter was about leaving, Mr. McKean said:

"Mr. Robert Emmet, who now lies in his grave, was some years ago accused of misappropriation, or misapplying, certain moneys of the fund. He promptly had his accuser indicted by the Grand Jury, and nothing was ever heard of it since. You may depend upon it that the money is in responsible hands."

The history of the fund was obtained last evening from a business gentleman well known in Irish circles in this city. "I can remember," said he, "the events of '48 distinctly. A number of the most prominent patriots in Ireland banded together to ask aid from America. Among them were John B. Dillon, Richard O'Gorman, Thomas Francis Meagher, Charles Gavan Duffy, Smith O'Brien and others. The call was promptly responded to on this side of the water, and public opinion was strongly in favor of the movement. Our most respected citizens held several meetings, and eventually was organized a body of representative men known as the Irish Directory. The leading spirits in this were Charles O'Connor, Horace Greeley, Robert Emmet and John McKean."

The headquarters of the enterprise were in Vanuxhall Garden, Astor place; but subscription depots were located all over the city. Merchants and well-reputed people sympathized with the cause, and went on collecting tours to add to the receipts. It was no uncommon sight to see Horace Greeley, whose whole heart and soul were with the sufferers, visit the various subscription offices, make a tour of the audience, and come up to the Treasurer's desk with his old white hat filled with money. Additional interest was given to the movement when, in the winter of '48, Messrs. John B. Dillon and Richard O'Gorman arrived in New York.

"Have you any idea as to the amount collected?"

"I should think between \$45,000 and \$50,000."

"It has been alleged that the amount now on hand is many thousands below those figures?"

"There was a great deal of it spent; I forget how much."

"How was it expended?"

"A large portion was sent to relieve the distress in Ireland," he said slowly, after mature deliberation—"a number of implements of war were purchased."

"Was any expended for other purposes?"

"I believe that money was advanced to bring out Meagher and Mitchell."

"Who was the treasurer of the fund?"

"Robert Emmet; and an honest or more conscientious gentleman never lived."

"Were these amounts paid out before or after the death of Mr. Emmet?"

"Both before and since his demise."

"At what figures do you place the amount of the fund now on hand?"

"Probably at \$15,000. The present Trustees are O'Connor, McKean and Emmet."

"Why was it called the Sievenamon Fund?"

"The troubles first arose near Tipperary under the shadow of a mountain called Sievenamon. The older Bonnett who opposed the scheme from its inception, and who tried to prevent its growth, paraphrased the name, and always alluded to it in the *Herald* as the 'Sievenamon'."

"Did the expenditures meet with the approval of the subscribers?"

"Every penny was spent in such a satisfactory way that even the most exacting could not find fault. Not a dollar left the institution wherein it was deposited without the unanimous consent of the Directory."—*N. Y. Star.*

Free Masonry Assailed.

The St. Matthew's German Lutheran Church of this city is said to be the oldest Lutheran society of this country. It was organized in the last part of the seventeenth century by some of the descendants of those Hollanders who were virtually expelled from the Netherlands by the action of the Calvinistic Synod of Dort. Like the Puritans, the Lutherans sought in the New World that freedom for religious worship which had been denied them in the Old.

The present church stands on the northeast corner of Broome and Elizabeth streets. It is a massive, rather imposing structure, built

of stone. On the front near the main entrance, is an inscription showing that this edifice was erected in the year 1841. Another inscription informs the reader that the church was founded in 1752, but this refers to the date of its legal incorporation as a church society by a grant from the British Crown.

St. Matthew's is the largest, wealthiest and most influential Lutheran church in New York. It has no church debt, and no financial embarrassments of any kind; indeed, one of the members remarked that they "hardly know what to do with their money." The Rev. J. H. Sieker, the present pastor, took charge of this society some three years ago. He came from Minnesota, where he enjoyed the reputation of being an able, conscientious preacher and a man of the strictest integrity, and the members of St. Matthew's regarded themselves peculiarly fortunate in securing the services of so eminent a clergyman. For some time after Pastor Sieker's installation everything went on harmoniously until after he had preached a certain sermon. Mr. Sieker belongs to the Missouri Synod, which not only opposes secret societies but has openly declared war against them all, and so, in the sermon referred to, he said, among other things, that:

"At the beginning of the seventeenth century, when the anti-Christians of Germany did not dare to appear publicly with their skeptical views, Free Masons from England planted the lodge in Germany for the purpose of fighting Christianity." Among the members of St. Matthew's, at the time the sermon was delivered, there were a large number of Free Masons. These were astounded, and said that the plain inference of the pastor's words was that a Mason could not consistently be a Christian. Their position in the church was a painful one, for, if their pastor's views were correct, they were virtually hypocrites. One of these gentlemen had been a member of St. Matthew's for more than twenty years, and latterly a very prominent one. He is a well-known business man in this city. He felt keenly the words he had heard, and resolved to call upon the pastor and inform him how they had affected him. Just before a meeting of the church society, some weeks later, he saw Mr. Sieker, told him in what position his recent sermon had placed him, and desired to have the matter brought before the meeting for discussion. The pastor declined, but said he would consider it at some future time.

But notwithstanding the most strenuous endeavors of the member referred to, no action was taken by the church until a long time after, when at a meeting at which there were present but 39 out of 250 voting members, a resolution was adopted condemning secret societies as inconsistent with Christian duty. One person who voted for this resolution was not entitled, it is said, to a vote, and nine voted against it, so that 29 of the 250 members of St. Matthew's Church adopted a resolution which has resulted in driving from the church many of its oldest and most prominent members. It is understood that sixty or seventy persons at least have retired from St. Matthew's and joined other Lutheran churches in the city. The Trinity Lutheran has taken many of them, and the pastor, Dr. Kretel, has been, it is said, severely criticised by his brother of St. Matthew's for receiving the seceding brethren.—*N. Y. Sun.*

The Pope and Ireland.

The correspondent of the *Freeman* at Rome writes—

The channel of communication between the Pope and the Irish Bishops is the Propaganda, not the Secretary of State's office, and I am able to assure you that on the subject of the land agitation in Ireland no representations have been made to any Irish prelate. It is perfectly true that the present distress in Ireland has deeply engaged the sympathies of the Holy Father, who will at his own time and in his own way give expression to his sentiments of sorrow for the sufferings of the Irish Catholics. But the idea of interfering in the land agitation by prescribing to the bishops any particular line of conduct has not yet crossed the mind of the Holy Father. The idea is yet more absurd of supposing that Leo XIII. volunteered to champion the cause of the British Government, by representing that Government as anxious, by means of State aid, to diminish Irish distress, and as eager to open the purse of the British nation to relieve Irish misery. The feeling entertained in higher clerical orders in Rome is one of amazement at the apathy of the British Ministry, and at the hard, unfeeling manner in which the misery of the Irish people was treated. That many of the Irish ecclesiastics should have displayed vehemence and excitement in advocating the cause of the suffering poor is considered nothing extraordinary, and is far from deserving severe censure from the Vatican. If any Catholic ecclesiastics of Ireland, in their zeal for the interest of their flock, are outstepping the bounds of prudence, it is not the Vatican which must condemn or approve them. The priests are amenable to the laws. If they have transgressed those laws, let the civil authorities prosecute them. If they have not transgressed those laws, no more need be said.

Bigotry Not Protestantism.

Vice-Chancellor Blake is charged with saying at a recent meeting "the Protestant emigrants add strength to our country; but the Roman Catholic comes as an element of weakness, of discord and of strife." The learned gentleman seems to be a diligent imitator of the *Globe* in its worst anti-Popery days, and it is a pity that he does not change his mental diet to something more worthy of a gentleman, and which would store his mind with sentiments more worthy of that religion for which he professes to be so zealous. It is not necessary that we should denounce our Catholic friends against the coarse brutality of every pharisaical fanatic who chooses to belch forth his puerile indecencies against them, in the silly belief—spawn of overweening conceit—that he is frightening the Pope and shaking the foundation of the church of Rome. For if defence were needed Catholics have in the *Irish Canadian* and *Montreal Post* organs quite able to deal effectively with much abler men than their present pigmy assailant. Besides Catholics can point to a long list of Catholics who have come to Canada and have left their names embalmed in the grateful memories of Canadians, and they can name scores of names of Catholics which will be held in grateful remembrance when the name of Vice-Chancellor Blake shall have been relegated to that oblivion which is decreed for all narrow minded bigotry. It is not our Catholic friends who need defence in this instance, but we would put in a plea for the ninety-nine hundredths of our Protestant population in whose hearts the vile bigotry of such men as the Vice-Chancellor finds no answering echo, unless it awakes a feeling of disgust; and causes a regret that one so intolerant and illiberal should be placed in a position where litigants of all creeds must come before him for justice (?) We ask that our Catholic

friends should remember that it is not Protestantism that insults them, but merely a foul exorcism which, for lack of a name more expressive of loathsomeness and uncharitableness, we call bigotry.—*Guelph Herald.*

Land League Committee.

The following are the names of the Committee of the Land League authorized to receive subscriptions for the relief of the distress in Ireland—

Charles Stewart Parnell, M. P., President; Percell O'Gorman, M. P., Waterford; John Ferguson, Glasgow; W. Quirk, P. P., Dean of Cashel; A. Cummins, LL. D., Liverpool; Matthew Harris, Ballinasloe; Ulick J. Canon Bourke, Claremorris; J. O'Connor Power, M. P., London; John Behan, C. C., Francis St., Dublin; Richard Lalor, Mountath; J. D. Finnegan, M. P., London; R. Sheehy, C. C., Kilmallock; J. J. Lonsdale, B. L., Westport; O'Gorman Mahon, M. P., London; John Dillon, St. George St., Dublin; W. Joyce, P. P., Louisville; Co. Mayo; N. Ennis, M. P., Claremorris; Meath; Thomas Roe, "Dundalk Democrat"; J. I. McCloskey, M. D., Derry; George Delany, Dublin; T. D. Sullivan, "Nation," Dublin; Jas. Byrne, Walsall Castle, Cork; J. E. Kenny, T. L. Gardiner St., Dublin; Mulholland Marum, J. P., Ballyragget; P. F. Johnson, Kautuk; M. Torney, C. C., Painsdown, Westport; Thomas Canon Doyle, P. P., Ransgarra; Philip J. Moran, Fines, Granard; O. J. Curran, Charlestown, Co. Louth; J. White, P. P., Milltown; Mulvey, P. P., Cummins; P. L. G. Rathmines; James Daly, P. L. G., Castlebar; P. M. Furlong, C. C., New Ross; Thomas Ryan, Dublin; James Bourke, Great Britain street, Dublin; Richard Kelly, Town Hall; William Dillon, Dublin; T. J. Kennedy, T. C., Dublin; M. O'Flaherty, Duomo, Cast. Croon; John Sweetnam, Kells; M. F. Madden, Clonmel; J. C. Howe, London; T. Lynch, P. P., Painsdown, Beaupre; J. F. Graham, P. L. G., Co. Dublin; D. Brennan, P. P., Co. Kilkenny; W. Kelly, Donabate, Co. Dublin; C. Kelly, Arluna, Co. Dub. L. M. Court, P. L. G., Dublin; Stephen O'Mara, Limerick; Thomas Graham, Co. Dublin; M. K. Dunne, C. C., Ennis; M. J. Kenny, P. P., Scariff; R. H. Medge, Athlumney House, Navan; Michael A. Canavan, P. P., Co. Sligo. Treasurers: W. H. Sullivan, M. P., Kilmallock; G. Billar, M. P., Belfast; Patrick Egan, 25, Synod place, Dublin. Honorary Secretaries: J. F. Kelly, P. L. G., Co. Dublin; Michael Davitt, 83 Attiens street, Dublin; Thomas Brennan, 5 Russell street, Dublin. Committee Rooms, 62 Middle Abbey street, Dublin.

THE SANITARY MEMORIAL COMMITTEE.

A special meeting of the committee was held on the 11th December in the Mayor's Office, Town Hall, Limerick. The Mayor (Mr. Michael O'Gorman) occupied the chair. The other members present were—The Most Rev. Bishop Butler, the Right Hon. Lord Emery, Mr. Robert Vore O'Brien, J. P.; Mr. E. S. Wyman, M. P.; Mr. Ambrose Hall, J. P.; Mr. William Spillane, J. P.; Mr. Maurice Lenihan, J. P.; Mr. P. O'Mara, Mr. Thomas Gaffney, Mr. P. S. Conolly, Solicitor, and Mr. William Heffernan. After the minutes of the previous meeting had been read and signed, Mr. Gaffney asked was the present meeting called by circular. Mr. Hall—It was, and I forwarded one to you, Mr. Gaffney—Well, I did not get one, and I only came here by accident. The Mayor—What is the business to-day? Mr. Hall—To select one of the models in the other room. There are six models inside from Messrs. W. Lawlor, St. Cahill, J. Lawlor, J. Forsyth, J. Cahill, and another whose name can't be mentioned. Mr. Gaffney—Well, none of those models are what Sanseilfield; we want an equestrian statue to Sanseilfield. Mr. Hall—That has already been decided. It would cost £5,000 to erect an equestrian statue, when we will have only money to erect a figure eight feet high on a pedestal. After a lengthy conversation the pedestrian statue by Mr. J. Lawlor, of Dublin, was selected on the motion of Mr. O'Brien, seconded by Lord Emery, and it was resolved that the agreement be entered into forthwith. Mr. O'Brien, Mr. Hall, and Mr. Spillane were appointed as sub-committee to arrange with the artist as regarded details. Mr. O'Brien—Well, it is satisfactory to find that after five-and-twenty years we have done something. Mr. O'Mara asked if the accepted design was not originated by Mr. Henry O'Shea, of George street, in this city. Mr. Hall—Yes, this model of Mr. Lawlor is after the sketch made by Mr. O'Shea. Mr. O'Mara—Yes, so I thought, and it is only fair that the public should know that (hear, hear). It was agreed after a very general expression of opinion as to the eminent service rendered to the committee by Mr. O'Shea, that he should be asked to give the sub-committee the benefit of his experience. The meeting then separated.

Irish Relief Fund.

The following letter from His Grace Archbishop Lynch has been received by the Mayor of Toronto:—

St. Michael's Palace,
Toronto, Dec. 23, 1879.

To His Worship the Mayor of Toronto:

Sir,—I will gladly co-operate in any plan adopted for the relief of the poor of Ireland. I have seen with my own eyes the shadowings of great destitution in many parts of that sorely afflicted country. You cannot entrust your funds to a more kind-hearted lady than to Her Grace the Duchess of Marlborough, who interests herself so much, and on all occasions, for the benefit of the poor of Ireland. I have the honour to be, Mr. Mayor, Yours faithfully,
JOHN JOSEPH LYNCH,
Archbishop of Toronto.

New York death rate averages 25 4-5 per 1,000.

An ounce of keep-your-mouth-shut is better than a pound of explanations after you have said it.—*Free Press.*

Marshal Canrobert, says a Paris correspondent, has given his famous explanation and proved to all who are unprejudiced that the legend which accuses him of having commanded the troops to fire on the people during the coup d'état is as untrue as it is absurd. The sobriquet of "Rrrran," given to the marshal as an imitation of the roll of musketry, is as the last words of Marmon or as the reply Victor Hugo has placed in the mouth of Cambronne when summoned to surrender at Waterloo. He was not in command at the time, and, although unable to account for the troops opening fire, very reasonably argues that some young soldiers, irritated and excited by the menacing cries of the crowd or by one of those famous pistol shots which before now have caused more than one sanguinary scene in the Paris streets, fired their muskets, giving an example which was immediately followed by their comrades. The Marshal told his colleagues in the Senate that at the peril of his own life he had done all he could to stop the firing, and that the lad who accompanied him as bugler was killed by his side. Finally, he assured them that he was a Frenchman and a soldier and that no political considerations would ever prevent him from drawing his sword in the cause of order.

AFGHANISTAN.

FLEEING FROM CABUL.

CALCUTTA, December 29.—Gen. Roberts telegraphs that on the 25th instant the Butkack has been re-occupied, and that a force will start for Kohistan to-morrow to punish those who participated in the recent movement there. Gen. Roberts' total loss to date is 77 killed and 220 wounded.

LONDON, December 29.—A telegram from General Roberts on the 26th instant says:—"There was a heavy snow fall on the 25th, which prevented the pursuit of the enemy. The country about Cabul and the line of communication is now clear. The Balla-Hissar magazine was emptied. There were several explosions in the Balla-Hissar during the occupation by the insurgents. One explosion is said to have killed a hundred persons. The telegraph was for a good part destroyed, but it is being rapidly repaired."

CALCUTTA, December 30.—A despatch from Cabul states that the acaclawars which were thrown up around Shikrapa cantonments at the end of the British were driven to occupy as the base of operations, have been levelled by order of General Roberts, being no longer required for the purpose of defence, and the general position of Cabul and establishment of outposts. The country as a whole is declared to be quieting down, and that the British are now in a position to direct their dispersion on the evening of the 28th. General Baker, at the head of a detachment of 1,700 men with four guns, is reported to be marching on Kohistan. None of the principal insurgent leaders have yet been captured.

CALCUTTA, December 30.—A despatch from Shikrapa states that Chief Amulla, with a considerable force of followers, Colonel Norman, at Gundamak yesterday, but that after a short engagement the Afghans were repulsed with some loss. Colonel Norman is said to be marching on Kohistan, and that the British intend to the latter place is the most available for military movements of any in the vicinity of Cabul, running due east in a straight line from Bala-Hissar, and about 25 miles from Cabul, and then in a southerly direction to Jagdallak, 5 miles further on. On this account the value of Labandah, who is declared to be a valuable ally of the British, is declared to intend to hold it by an adequate garrison.

CALCUTTA, December 26.—The Mohammedans are abandoning Cabul, fearing some retribution will be exercised on them, as they all sympathize with the Bosthi Hindoos who remain in Cabul. The report is that a reign of terror existed from the 15th December until the city was abandoned by the rebels. Every shop and house was gutted, except those belonging to Mohammedans. The women were stripped publicly, and the men shot in the streets. The total loss of the enemy near Cabul is placed at 2,000. The snow is fast melting.

December 22.—Among the stipulations presented by Mahomed Jan as a basis for peace were the return to India of a British force at Cabul, and that a promise be given to send back the Amer with five British officers to remain at Cabul as hostages for the fulfillment of promises.

LONDON, December 21.—The Viceroy telegraphs as follows: General Roberts reports that on December 30th the force under the command of General Baker, which left Cabul on the 27th December, is returning from Kohistan, having destroyed the unopposed fort of the rebel chief Mirbataha, which was found abandoned. Several Kohistan and Logar chiefs have tendered their submission.

THE TAY CATASTROPHE.

Further Tidings—An Over-Estimated Loss—List of Passengers.

LONDON, December 29.—The railway authorities now estimate the total loss at 75. A telegram from Dundee says only 56 passenger tickets were taken at the last stopping place, but these do not account for a number of young children requiring no tickets, nor for a number of passengers for Broughty Ferry, whose tickets were not taken up. However, if this statement is correct, it is evident that the loss of life has been greatly over-estimated.

Government has sent two inspectors to ascertain the particulars of the Tay-Bridge disaster, and has also directed a formal inquiry into the occurrence. Divers thus far have been unable to discover the wrecked train. They will make another effort to-day. The place where the train sank is full of quicksands, and if the bodies drowned are not recovered they will become imbedded with the cars beyond recovery.

The Queen has telegraphed the Provost of Dundee tendering her condolence with the bereaved. Only one body, so far, has been recovered, and that badly mutilated.

Various accounts agree in placing the total loss of life by the disaster at 90.

LONDON, December 30.—The gale which destroyed Tay Bridge was the most violent ever known in Scotland since the memorable storm of January, '67. The streets of Dundee were covered with debris. The streets were almost deserted until the rumor of the demolition of the bridge attracted hundreds to the shore of the Tay. Reports from Glasgow, Paisley, Greenock and Edinburgh say the storm raged with great violence. It is claimed by some that the bridge was not demolished by the gale, but that one or more of the back carriages went off the rails and, coming against the lattice work, tore the structure to pieces.

LONDON, December 30.—The following list of names of officials and passengers which went through the Tay Bridge has been supplied by officers of the company and by relatives and friends of passengers who were waiting at the station.

Officials—David McBeath, guard; David Mitchell, porter; John Marshall, driver; Donald Murray, stoker, all of Dundee. Passengers—James Alexander, Robert Johnson, James Duncan, David Johnston, Robert Watson, with David and Robert Hissons, David Scott, goods clerk; Robert Synn, clerk James Leslie, Archibald Bain, Jessie Bain, David Neish, teacher and registrar James Peebles, apprentice; George Johnston, Mrs. Chapp, Thomas Scott, Alexander Robertson, Robert Brown, and David McDonald, David Graham, Peter Salmond, Mrs. Mann, Lizzie Brown, John Hamilton, Alice Upton.

Sir Thomas Laidlaw, the engineer of the bridge, with a number of good engineers, made an inspection to-day. They found that the whole foundations were intact. The opinion of himself and others is that the train proceeded without interruption until it reached the high girders; then one or more of the back carriages went off the rails, coming against the lattice work, and tore the structure to pieces, causing the frightful disaster. The showers of sparks seen by those on shore it is believed were caused by collision of the carriages with the iron work.

The North British Railway Company have decided at the next meeting of that Board that immediate steps be taken to rebuild the Tay bridge.

Diving in the Tay at the bridge disaster has been suspended, owing to boisterous weather. The railway authorities say there is little doubt that the bodies have been washed seaward. A boat expedition has been organized to search for them.

Irish Land Laws.

Mr. O'Connor Power, writing in the *Nineteenth Century*, put the case of the Irish tenants in the very strongest light. He says:—

"The main cause of Irish poverty is not to be found in over-population, or in any want of energy or economy on the part of the Irish people, but in the system of land tenure

imposed by Imperial conquest. Foreign competition and bad harvests, by which, in one year alone, according to the calculation of Mr. Dwyer Gray, Ireland lost thirty millions sterling, have had one advantage, and that is, they have drawn attention, in a striking way, to the great evil of the system of tenant-at-will, the most demoralising and degrading to which it is possible to reduce the working population of any country. It is hardly in the power of language to describe the many evil effects of this system. It has blasted the hopes, ruined the homes, and destroyed the lives of millions of the Irish race. It has stopped the social, political, and industrial growth of Ireland as effectually as if the country had been in a state of perpetual civil war; and no war has ever been so cruel in its incidents or operations towards those among whom it was carried on, than the war which Irish landlordism has waged against the people whose inheritance it usurped, and whose property it has confiscated. The worst fact, the worst clothed, and the worst housed people in Europe—this is the description which every impartial traveller who has seen the Irish people at home has given of them. Behold the result of the system of tenant-at-will and centuries of English rule!

Of the 600,000 tenant farmers in Ireland more than half a million, representing with their families about three million persons, have no security in their homes, or in the business upon which they depend for their daily bread, but are at the mercy of a few thousand persons—the lords of the soil of Ireland. Agriculture being the mainstay of the nation's wealth, the interests of the commercial and trading community are naturally dependent upon the industry of the farmers, and so it results that the fate and fortunes of more than five millions of people are in the hands of the small section numbering not more than a few thousands.

No system of government could possibly bring prosperity to a people so circumstanced. Even if they were endowed with all the attributes of political freedom, their social condition would still be a condition of slavery.

"They are the victims of a system, elegantly compatible with social rights and industrial freedom. It may be necessary for me to explain here what I mean by 'social rights' and 'industrial freedom.' Social rights may be defined in words which are to be found in the Declaration of America: 'to be free to live as I would define it, to be independent, and to live in liberty, in those words, as 'the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.' I use the phrase, 'the right of the workers to enjoy the fruits of their own exertions, and to be safe, in the pursuit of their industry, from the rapacity of their neighbours. There is nothing more capable of proof than that the present land system of Ireland is opposed to the social rights and the industrial freedom of the Irish people as here understood. When a people die in large numbers of starvation in their own country, or fly from it because they cannot get enough to eat out of the soil which that country has produced, and which is more than sufficient to sustain them, that the people are denied the right to live; and if a people have not a right to live in their own land while it is rich enough to support them, they are deprived of liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

I hold that Mr. O'Connor Power is right, and the writer in this journal last week who signed himself "Saxon" is wrong in affirming that the State cannot take property from landlords when the interests of the people demand it. The power which gives property can always take it again when the common good makes it necessary. Mr. Gladstone, in his speech at West Calder in Midlothian, said, "If it is known to be for the welfare of the community at large, the Legislature is perfectly entitled to buy out the landed proprietors"; and he then admitted the justice of the principle so long insisted upon by Herbert Spencer, John Stuart Mill and others, that "those who possess large portions of the spaces of the earth are not altogether in the same position as the possessors of more personality; personality, or portable property, does not impose the same limitations upon the actions and industry of men and the well