

them to become, in after years, either good needlewomen or hard working, respectable, and faithful servants. They received their first communion at eleven years of age, and it was generally from amongst these children that the young ladies of what was usually called "The Great House," chose the little girl they wished to dress for the happy occasion. At sixteen they orphaned the convent, and were then either bound, apprentices to some trade, or placed as servants, in quiet, respectable families, according to their choice. The good qualities of these young women were so universally recognized in the neighborhood that they were much in request among the various families in the vicinity of St. Mary's, and the Mother St. Ruphraise prided herself on the fact that not one of them had ever turned out badly. But, at the same time, the rules and regulations laid down for their general conduct were extremely rigid: the nuns exercised a vigilant supervision over them, and once in the convent they never left it until they had attained the age of sixteen. No visitors from without, except those of their mothers, if they still had the happiness of possessing one, or of the nearest female relative, twice a year, were allowed; a large court and garden, separated from the main building by a high wall, were reserved for their special use, consequently the pupils of "The Great House" never met them, and rarely saw any of them except in chapel on Sundays.

(To be continued.)

FEDERALISM V. REPEAL.

THE DOWAGER MARCHIONESS OF QUEENSBERRY AND MR. P. J. SMYTH, M.P.

We (Irishman) have received the following letter from the Marchioness of Queensberry, enclosing one from Mr. P. J. Smyth, M.P. —
 (To the Editor of the Irishman.)
 " Sir, — You will greatly oblige me by inserting in your paper the following letter, which will assist in a work so greatly needed in Ireland—viz, the endeavor to create a free and intelligent opinion. — There can be no heart, nor courage, nor sincerity without it. I am thankful to have found a man in Mr. Smyth able and willing to explain so clearly and intelligently the true cause of Ireland, and I earnestly desire to place his letter before Irishmen and all citizens of Ireland for their careful consideration ere they sign "the roll." There is an irrevocable pledge remaining to be redeemed by them—and that is, "never to abandon the struggle for national independence." I ask, is the programme "a struggle for nationality?" Mr. Smyth's letter is the reply. It is the truth, and therefore cannot be "reformed"—that immortal truth which, despite dungeons, gibbets, and the still more fearful destroyer, slavery, still finds the few remaining loyal to her, and enforcing her claim with an undying energy.—Yours, sir, faithfully,
 CAROLINE QUEENSBERRY.

April 12.
 DEAR MADAM, — I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your communication requiring from me categorical answers to certain specific inquiries, which, for convenience, may be reduced to three leading ones—namely, "Is Home Rule, according to the Conference programme, a restoration of the *status quo ante 1800*? Will it give Ireland Legislative Independence, and the rank of an independent State? Will it satisfy the National Aspirations of the Irish people, and be a settlement of the old feud between the countries? These questions, one and all, admit of but one answer—No. The programme is not restoration—it is innovation. It is not legislative independence—it is legislative restriction. It does not satisfy the National aspiration; for merging Ireland in a British Confederation, it deprives her of the very name of a nation.

Ireland has a legal, historical, and constitutional position, absolutely impregnable. It rests upon two Acts, one of the Irish, the other of the English Parliament, declaring the settlement of 1782 to be a "final" settlement—it is supported by the prosperity admittedly achieved, and the National rank gloriously held, from 1782 to 1800—and it is consecrated by the solemn declarations of the most eminent jurists of our country that the crimes of 1800 render the Union Act to all time a nullity. The Queen alone, O'Connell held, could revive the Irish Parliament. That is Ireland's natural position, and it is the most magnificent that recalcitrant nationality ever had. The programme abandons it, and takes up a quite different position, resting, not as the old one, on right, morality, and history, but on theories, speculations, and foreign examples. Contemplating, as it does, a mere "alteration of the Union arrangements" (Mr. Butt's words), not an abrogation of that vile instrument, it admits the validity of the Union, and condones the blackest crime in history. It leads the nation to abandon a claim she has an undoubted right to advance, and which England has no moral or constitutional right to refuse, and embrace a project which, whatever its merits, she has no right to enforce, and which England has a strictly moral and constitutional right to reject. The essence of the programme is local parliaments for purely local affairs for such divisions of the United Kingdom as choose to adopt the Federal principle, and a congress for Imperial affairs. Putting aside all question about the feasibility, or desirability, of such an arrangement, and having regard only to the principles of public morality, what right have we Irish to say to the people of England, Scotland, and Wales, content as they appear to be with the Imperial Parliament, "You must break up your whole constitutional system, and introduce an entirely new order of things, in order to satisfy us?" The programme, it is true, makes mention only of Ireland and England, but every intelligent person understands that Federalism involves of necessity local Parliaments for each and every subdivision of the United Kingdom that chooses to avail itself of that very elastic principle. So regarded, the programme inaugurates a British Reform, not an Irish national movement. Its predominant idea is Empire, not Ireland, and it wholly ignores the sentiment that has survived the storms of seven centuries, that of a distinct national destiny. The advocate of Federalism, to be consistent with himself, must put aside some of the most glorious names in our history, and avoid all reference to the brightest era of our country—for Repeal arguments are obviously out of place in a Federal propaganda. The advocate must stoop to the level of his cause. This was plainly illustrated in the "Home Rule debate" this session. The only speaker who asserted the right of Ireland was Lord Robert Montagu, and he could not have honestly done so had he not repudiated the programme. A cause that is not rooted in the national sentiment, that does not reflect the instincts, the feelings, and the traditions of the race, will inspire neither eloquence, enthusiasm, nor valor, and is wanting in the essential elements of success.

The decision of the Conference was to a large extent influenced by the extraordinary use made of foreign examples. The relations between Hungary and Austria and Norway and Sweden were actually quoted as examples of Federalism according to the programme. But every well-informed person knows that the constitution of Hungary is substantially the same as the Irish Constitution of 1782; and that the relation between Norway and Sweden is Dualism, the most pronounced in Europe; Canada was quite

fairly quoted, and would be a case strongly in point if the object of the programme were the establishment of an Irish Confederation, not a British Confederation. In the ratio of at least five parts British to one part Irish, Canada has no Imperial representation, but she has legislative independence. The position of Ireland in the British Confederation would correspond with that of Nova Scotia in the Canadian Confederation—with this essential difference, that whereas Nova Scotia, without a past, or a history, or a claim to be a nation, finds herself an equal member in a Canadian Confederation; Ireland, with her past, and her history, her memories and her hopes, would be swamped in a British Confederation. For a cluster of colonies, like the Canadas or the Australias, Federalism is admirably adapted; but Ireland is not a colony, her relation to England is not that of Nova Scotia to New Brunswick, or of Queensland to New South Wales; she is an ancient kingdom, the home of an ancient race, and she does aspire to a distinct destiny.

The corner-stone of the programme is Imperial representation. If that be removed, the whole edifice tumbles. How any Irishman can defend it is to me incomprehensible. It is not a right, for it did not exist before the Union, and it can be purchased only by a sacrifice of independence. No matter on what terms procured, I should regard it as unmix'd evil. "Ireland a voice in Imperial affairs!" What voice? If an unready now, it would be a greater unready then. Legislation for the Colonies? The Imperial Parliament has seen its last Colonial legislation. "The Civil Service and India?" Those would be open to Irishmen without Imperial representation. "Peace and War?" Ireland would wield a much greater influence through an independent legislature of her own, than through a shadowy representation in what would still be a foreign legislature. In the words of O'Connell, there would be "inherent in the Irish Constitution ample powers to check absurdities," &c. The immediate effects of this Imperial representation would be to make Ireland morally and materially responsible for every Imperial infamy, to reduce the local parliament to the dimensions of a local board, and to intensify and render for ever irremovable the giant grievance—absenteeism.—Thirty years ago, Charles Gavan Duffy, writing on Federalism, said—"The Imperial representation on which it is based is calculated to perpetuate our moral and intellectual subjugation to England. It will teach the aristocracy still to turn their eyes to London as the scene of their ambition. It will continue to train them in English manners, feelings, and prejudices; and to establish permanently a centre of action apart from their native country. By the same process it will plant deeper the physical evils of absenteeism. It will compel our Lords and Commons to reside out of the country, and continue the drain upon our resources on which you found so strong an argument for Repeal." Clearly, Imperial representation cannot stand, and that gone the whole programme is gone. Does a doubt, then, exist in any rational mind that to proceed further on such a basis is to court shame, humiliation, and defeat? I should greatly transgress the limits of an ordinary letter, and exhaust your patience, were I to enter upon a detailed criticism of this Federal scheme. There is one feature, though, of it which cannot be overlooked. When the Colonies claimed self-government, no question arose regarding Colonial and Imperial affairs respectively. They asked no Imperial representation; and the self-government they claimed they got by the Orders in Council. It would be well if Irish Home Rulers had followed the Colonial example. The Home Rule advocate would then be spared the necessity of defining what he means by "local" as contra-distinguished from "Imperial" affairs. He may give a large interpretation to the word "local," but the decision will not rest with him. He will find it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to hold out for a wider interpretation than that which England, Scotland, and Wales may be willing for themselves to accept; and, as he began by an uncalculated concession, it is morally certain that he will be forced back, step by step, by an inexorable logic, till he finds himself landed in a vestry or a grand jury-room. The Minister will say, for example, "What is an Imperial affair if not the maintenance of her Majesty's Crown and dignity, and the peace of the realm?" Very well—that means Treason Felony Act, Suspension of Habeas Corpus Act, and the right generally of coercion. And so on through the endless category of things that may be construed as (in the comprehensive words of the programme) "affecting Crown and Government."

A nation should always stand upon her good right. I affirm that the right of Ireland is restitution. I said at the Conference, I now repeat, that the only rational and logical ground on which a constitutional demand for self-government can be based, is restoration, signified by Repeal of the Union. If any man be kept out of an estate which his father held, and of which his father had been wrongfully deprived, what does he do? He goes into court with clean hands, produces his maps and title-deeds, and claims the restoration of his property. He does not claim an estate quite different from that which his father held, and to which he can show no title.—That would be to jeopardise his cause. He may, indeed, if he so will, accept a different estate, but he cannot safely or with honor demand other than that which is his own by indefeasible right. So with the nation. She may accept what she pleases—let the offer come from the other side—but her demand must be based upon right and justice, morality and law. A prominent feature of the age, and the spring of its many vices, is a disdain for past wisdom. Not in modern philosophy, but in ancient faith; will Ireland find her salvation. If she be true to herself, her pledges, her traditions, and the memories of the past, she will resume possession of the old historic lines, planned in wisdom by the great and good men of old, and consecrated through generations by the sacrifices of the brave and true.—I have the honor to be, dear madam, with great respect, yours truly,
 P. J. SMYTH.

PROFESSOR GOLDWIN SMITH ON HOME RULE.

(To the Editor of the Daily News.)

Sir—Not all the actual wrongs of Ireland have made a worse impression, or done more to prevent the cordial union of Ireland with England than the want of courtesy with which a large section of English writers and speakers have habitually treated the complaints and aspirations of the Irish people. Regard for sentiment, though it is surely no mean or trivial part of policy, seems to be alien to the minds of our people and our statesmen. France would have made the Irish French in half the time that we have spent in vainly trying to make them English, not because she would have done more for them; but because she would have found her way to their hearts. Irishmen would have been made to feel themselves the perfect equals of Frenchmen.—The French press, as well as the Government, would have been studiously courteous, and French royalty would have been often seen in Ireland.—When we spurn Irish demands, when we even blame our Government for softening a denial, we forget that Irish history is a series of concessions first scornfully refused by England; then granted under constraint, and when concession by losing all its grace, had lost more than half its virtue. It is deeply fixed in my memory, by an incident which occurred at the time, that so late as 1863, a proposal to disestablish the Irish Church and to abolish what was merely feudal in the Irish Land Law was regarded as revolutionary and rejected with horror by public men who, before the close of the decade, were themselves going as far in the way of disestablishment, and a good deal farther in that of Land

Law Reform. The leader of the Tory party still tried to inflame the passions of his partisans by calling disestablishment sacrilege, and the reform of the land laws confiscation, though he no more dared to give effect to his professed conviction in either case than he dares to attempt the restoration of the penal laws. Between 1853 and 1868 did anything take place to which this complete change of opinion on the part of British statesmen can be ascribed? Every Irishman will answer, the Fenian movement. The answer will not be entirely just for Party had its influence as well as Fenianism; but conviction, it is to be feared, had little or none. The Irish have their political defects like other races. But would any nation which had undergone such a training have done much better than they have? Are not some nations which have not undergone so bad a training doing worse? Suppose England had been for centuries a dependency of a strong Roman Catholic power, treating her people as misbelievers and pariahs, what would the political character of the English now be? Suppose Ireland had escaped the Norman as she escaped the Roman, might she not have become the seat of a happy and graceful civilisation? In the late elections the motives which prevailed with the Irish constituencies seem to have been at least as high and as suggestive of hope for the political future of the people as those which prevailed in England.—Home Rule, however undesirable in English eyes, is at least a public object. To those who sincerely believe in it it is a patriotic object. It is better than corruption, servility, or mere wealth-worship. It is at least as good as "Our national beverage and our national religion." If ability and public spirit have anywhere a chance of success in elections against money, it is rather in Ireland than in England. The prospect of Burke, if he were now seeking an entrance into public life, would be poor enough in either country, but hardly so poor in his own as it would in ours. Perhaps an Irishman may not without plausibility maintain that the new Irish members are on the average at least the equals of the new English members in point of political eminence, though far their inferiors in command of beer. The objects of the Home Rulers may be indefinite or impracticable; but, unfortunately, it does not follow that there is not at the bottom of the movement a real sentiment such as constitutes a political force, and calls not merely for the sneers of cynics, but for the care of statesmen. Historians cannot be worse employed than in raking up the mutual atrocities of Normans and Celts in early times, or of Catholics and Protestants in the succeeding period. These things belong wholly to the past, from which it is criminal without necessity to recall them. They cannot even be presented with historical justice except as portions, in the first case, of the general barbarism of the dark ages, and in the second, of the great European conflict produced by the Reformation. Yet Irish history has formed Irish character. As English history has formed the character of the English people in love of England, so Irish history has formed Irish character in hatred of England. Hatred of England is the one political sentiment which fills the Irish heart at once in Ireland, in England where the Irish element is now growing fearfully strong, in Australia, and in the U. States. In America I have marvelled at the strength and vitality of the feeling. To say that Ireland "is in a state of veiled rebellion" is a reckless and mischievous exaggeration. "Sacrilège!" and "confiscation!" have put the leaders of the people, both lay and clerical in the main on the side of order, and rebellion, veiled or unveiled, never comes into existence without leaders. But the evil spirit of Irish history has not been laid, nor has the danger of Irish disaffection been finally removed. During the struggles and controversies of the last century, between orations, pamphlets, polemical histories, and ballads, the disunionist sentiment has even embodied itself in a patriotic literature, vigorous and popular enough to form another unhappy obstacle in the way of a complete fusion of the nations. Surely we do not require any extraordinary power of sympathy, or of looking at things not merely from an English point of view, to understand why an ordinary Irish Catholic, notwithstanding the concessions he has obtained, still cherishes the vision of Ireland for the Irish. After all, too, Ireland is a separate island, not a group of English counties. I once heard a Frenchman, with the gallantry of his race, impudently deny the existence of the St. George's Channel, and assert that England and Ireland were parts of the same island. Some Englishmen seem to be morally under the same impression. The extreme Home Rulers aim, I suppose, at legislative separation, with two Parliaments under one Crown. Whatever might be the case if Government were personal, it being Parliamentary, such a plan is totally out of the question. Better a thousand times would be the complete separation of the kingdoms. The two Parliaments, setting out in mutual jealousy and bitterness, would soon pull different ways. They would pull different ways in finance, in tariffs, in questions of peace and war, in the question, if it should ever arise, of a Regency, or even of the succession to the Crown. It is needless to argue where experience has decided. For nineteen years Ireland enjoyed the boon of legislative independence. During those years the harmony between the two Legislatures was preserved by foul and pernicious, but inevitable corruption. Then a hideous war of races and religions closed the auspicious annals of the Parliament of Ireland. No statesman, hardly any sane man, could deliberately propose to repeat an experiment so terribly decisive. On the other hand, it appears that some of those who call themselves Home Rulers would be likely to be content with a moderate measure of self-government. And this leads me to call your attention once more to a remedy by no means of the heroic kind, which I ventured long ago to suggest in your columns. I mean a general improvement of our local institutions extending to Ireland, but not peculiar to it, though perhaps with some allowance in the shape of special provisions for the existence of St. George's Channel.

It is obvious that the history of our local institutions points to the probable need of such a reorganization. They are the offspring of the feudal era, in which municipal life was confined to the town, the country being the domain of the feudal proprietors, and destitute of municipal life. The justice of the peace has leaped into the saddle of the feudal lord, but the grounds upon which his administrative jurisdiction is founded belong entirely to the past. Will you tell us, of course, that you are proposing to restore the Hierarchy. Their study of history has led them to the conviction that the Hierarchy was a central Government, with strong local institutions. When Canning said that to repeal the Union was to restore the Hierarchy, he used a rhetorical figure, but he knew what he was saying. Some years spent, since my name last appeared in your columns, in the United States have deeply impressed my mind with the conviction that popular Government depends for its salvation on two things—public instruction and strong local institutions; and that the second of these safeguards is at least as indispensable as the first. People now fancy that since the triumph of plutocracy in the late elections safeguards are unnecessary in the country. But the masses of ignorance and poverty which have been enfranchised only to be debauched, when once they have become conscious of their power and have got leaders and wire-pullers of their own will hardly be satisfied with a pot of beer.—When the populace of New York and other American cities was used by the slave-owning aristocracy as the Tories here are using their residuum, its services were not retained at so cheap a rate. Democracy is at the door. On public instruction in its most effective form, three powerful interests have in this country, combined to put a veto. There is all

NEW LIGHTS IN IRISH HISTORY.

To those whose views are darkened by the haze of Exeter Hall, and who hate Ireland and Catholicity as a certain notoriety hates holy water, Mr. James Anthony Froude's work, "The English in Ireland in the Eighteenth Century Vols. II. and III," will prove a welcome and seasonable production. We have had occasion, some time back, to draw the attention of our readers to Mr. Froude's character as a historian, and to the dual hostility he invariably manifests towards the Irish people and the religion they profess. Had Ireland followed the example of England, and thrown off the yoke of obedience to the Holy See at the bidding of a sacrilegious and bloodthirsty tyrant, the "Supreme Head" of the Anglican Church; had she yielded to bribes and menaces, to the logic of the gibbet and the dungeon, and taken part with England in her schism and apostasy she would be to-day spared the indignities and calumnies heaped upon her people by British writers and so-called historians—men who dig up out of the past every foul aspersion and groundless imputation to be found in manufactured state papers and lying records, and call this trash and rubbish the materials for history. If Ireland is no longer persecuted by penal laws she is pretty well abused from platform and in print in England. If the sword is not raised to strike her, the pen is wielded to revile her. When a man like Mr. Froude has the daring to come forth as the apologist of that human monster, Henry VIII, we need not wonder if he hold up to admiration the persecuting and exterminating Cromwell, the Attila of the Irish people, the scourge of their land, the unsparring Vandal and the heartless tyrant; the strangest mixture of enthusiasm, hypocrisy and ambition presented to us by history, ancient or modern; the most extraordinary compound of villainy, baseness, coarse familiarity and idle buffoonery to be found in the annals of mankind. It could scarcely be imagined that any man living out of Coomassie or the realm of Dahomey would have the unblushing audacity to suggest, as Mr. Froude has done, that the incomplete subjugation of Ireland was owing to the timidity with which English statesmen carried out the abominable penal laws. Mr. Froude is not very tender to the memories of those English statesmen of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, because they lacked vigour in carrying out the Draconic legislation of the period; because in other words, they did not follow up the confiscations, the sacrilege, the murders, the robberies of Cromwell and his fanatical followers, who swept over Ireland like a swarm of Huns, spreading devastation everywhere, and leaving only ruin, misery and the wail of the orphan behind them. The authorities on whom Mr. Froude relies for his charges of atrocious cruelties and savage outrages against the Irish peasantry were men of the Lydford jury stamp, who were said to hang and draw.

And sit in judgment after.

the more reason for looking to the local institutions. In the case of England, however, no one would propose to delegate to a local assembly the power of legislating on any matters except under the supreme control of the Imperial Parliament. Subject to that control there would seem to be many matters of legislation which might, with advantage be so delegated. Parliament is manifestly overloaded with work; which, as members themselves confess, is done worse every session. Much of this work is really of a local character. But there are subjects, not strictly local in themselves, local treatment of which might nevertheless be expedient. Perhaps we might include among them the liquor question and that of public education. With regard to education, indeed, the principle of local legislation has been in some measure already adopted. The difficulty of legislation on many subjects, and the perils to which governments are exposed in dealing with them, arise from the necessity of forcing the same legislation on districts varying very much in their character and circumstances, and of compelling Birmingham and Somersetshire to march abreast.—There are questions in America—the liquor question is one—which would tear the Union to pieces if they could not be dealt with separately by the legislatures of the different States. Local legislation would also mitigate the pest of election pledges on questions of local interest, which are becoming highly injurious to the character of the national Parliament.

Local legislatures would probably train and mark out a better class of candidates for Parliament.—Plutocracy may have very good grounds for exulting in the ostracism of intellect and the reduction of a once illustrious assembly to a mass of what a pungent writer among your contemporaries calls "soap-boilers." But there are probably some who regard as ominous the fact that in the last two general elections scarcely a single man of mark or promise has found his way into the House of Commons. I remember hearing the late Speaker, then Mr. Devon, bitterly deplore the death of rising men in the house. He said that he did not know how, when the present leaders were gone, the country was to be governed. It was suggested that the need would provide men. "Lord Palmerston," rejoined the Speaker, "was told that there was no need of a large standing army, because in case of invasion the people would rise as one man." "Yes," he replied, "and they would be knocked down again as one man." Again, local legislatures afford the means of making limited experiments in politics, for want of which a nation is compelled, on a bare balance of probabilities, to make irrevocable changes of the most sweeping kind. The result of the Ballot, whether good or evil, has shown how completely provision in politics may be at fault without experiment; while under the present system of national legislation no safe experiment can be made. Frequent elections may be in some respects a nuisance, but they are an essential condition of popular government, because in no other way can the interest of the people in politics and the political intelligence of the masses be kept alive. After seven years of political inactivity and apathy, your elections will be carried by the merest local influence, by beer, corruption, low wire-pulling, or blind chance.—Kiddminster is not the only place which in the late elections has read the nation a serious lesson on this subject. Moreover, the election of a local legislature with competent powers, might supersede the necessity of those minor elections the multiplication of which, under recent legislation, caused some one to say that an Englishman's life would soon be spent in voting. If ever England musters courage to follow the example of all other nations by reforming her Upper Chamber and bringing it into harmony with her general institutions, election by local legislatures affords the obvious, and probably the only available means of accomplishing the object. I confess that for my part, after what I have seen in the United States, I should be content with a single chamber, elected by local legislatures, the local legislatures themselves being elected by the people at large. I believe that this would be the best central legislature, and the one which would most faithfully express the deliberate will of the nation, clear of passion and corruption. But there are probably few at present who share my opinion. Quite independently, then, of the Irish question, the improvement of local institutions appears to deserve the speedy attention of English statesmen. But if a rational measure of self-government would satisfy and attach to the Union a large section of the Home Rulers, this seems an additional consideration of no small moment. The subject is one especially congenial to the Liberal party, which appears destined hereafter to act as the guardian of steady and enlightened progress against an oligarchy maintaining itself in power by appeals to popular ignorance and other essentially revolutionary means.—Your obedient servant,
 GOLDWIN SMITH.

ENGLISH MAJORITIES AND IRISH RIGHTS.

The anti-Home Rule press, English and Irish, are very energetically inviting the Home Rulers to consider themselves utterly and irreparably discomfited by the division on Mr. Butt's motion. They are immensely annoyed on perceiving that the Home Rulers do not seem to feel a bit the worse for their "beating," but are as full of spirit and vigour as ever, and are evidently meditating further and early action. "Please to understand that your party has been overwhelmingly defeated, your cause tried out and the question finally disposed of," say the anti-Irish journals. And the Home Rulers reply—"We do not believe a word of it; we take quite a different view of the case." "Has there not been a large majority against your motion," say the Tory Journals "and does not that settle for it?" "There has been a large majority against it," say the Home Rulers, "but that settles nothing. There will be majorities against it on future divisions also, but even that will not dispose of the Home Rule question." "Surely, for this session at all events you are done with it, and will now settle down to help us with the ordinary work of British legislation," say the Government printers. "You need not delude yourselves with any such notions," say the Home Rule members. "Our business here is to bush on the Home Rule question, and to forward all such measures as will strengthen the hands of the Irish nation in contesting for Home Rule. That is the work the people of Ireland have commissioned us to execute, and to its accomplishment we mean to devote all our powers." In the foregoing "imaginary conversation" we have given the actual position and the ideas of both parties. Day after day we are being asked to believe that the Home Rule party are grievously hurt, mortally wounded, and actually killed by the division on Mr. Butt's motion; and when we refuse to take any such view of the case we find ourselves treated to a great amount of vituperation, and not a few violent and savage threats. These things, however, do not much affect us. Our course as Home Rulers is quite clear, and we mean to tread it unflinchingly. In Parliament and out of Parliament the agitation of the Home Rule cause must go on, no matter how distasteful it may be to the oppressors of Ireland. An adverse vote of the House of Commons will certainly not slay that cause—it would be a weak cause if it could be so disposed of. A parliamentary majority against it on one, or two, or twenty divisions will not be accepted by the Irish people as decisive of its merits. They are quite aware that in that arena the question will be defeated again and again; but they have also a profound conviction that by the might of the Irish people in Parliament and out of Parliament, they will carry it.

Mr. Froude has a great love for one-sided evidence. The man who would have the world believe that in the Cromwell papers in the Cotton Library and the Rolls House may be read true accusations against the monks, and a justification for robbing out the whole monastic system, may well task his credulous readers to place implicit faith in the official documents of Dublin Castle. Because the Irish people would not "lame, lie down like" whipped spaniels while their liberties were crushed, their religion outraged, their consciences fettered, and their country turned into a garrison; because they rose from time to time to defend their property and their lives; because they made chronic efforts to regain their independence and throw off a galling despotism; and an ignominious servitude therefore are they stigmatized by the *Free Press* as cut-throats and miscreants. Impartial history will show that the worst agrarian crimes committed in Ireland have been owing to the corruption of the tribunals of justice in that country; when there was no law for a Catholic save the law of extermination, and when a society was organized in Dublin, called then the United Irishmen whose chief aim was to steadfastly and resolutely oppose the system of corrupt Government of the country, which was goading the people on to periodic resistance to their oppressors. The Irish people had unfortunately to recur to a "wild justice" to defend themselves against their persecutors. They were driven into crime by reason of the cruelties practised on them and their own powerlessness to obtain redress by legitimate means. But these crimes lack the turpitude and meanness which Mr. Froude would attach to them, but which usually characterize the atrocities that are year after year disclosed at an English assize. When as Arthur Young wrote nearly a hundred years ago, "It is domineering aristocracy of 500,000 Protestants feel the sweets of having 2,000,000 of slaves" it is not to be wondered at if a system of religious separation, fanatical bigotry and legalized persecution nurtured the passions of the Irish peasantry and drove them in despair to take the law into their own hands. But Mr. Froude is one of those who call every struggle made by the Irish people in their self-defence by the odious name of "rebellion," and who see the elements of deep premeditated and cold-blooded guilt in those excesses into which the Irish people were precipitated by the cruelties to which they were subjected. But while Mr. Froude dwells with savage unctious over the atrocities of the Irish peasantry, he unscrupulously withholds from his readers the facts that would bear witness to the provocation they had received. As a writer in the *Daily Telegraph* says in an able review of Mr. Froude's work:—

Mr. Froude does not do anything like full justice to the excesses on the other side—the judicial murders executed by the order or with the connivance of the Government, and the abominable cruelties perpetrated in the later years of the rebellion and many years afterwards by the organized Orangemen. He has a short way of writing history on these subjects; he consults the State Paper Office, and believes every official record; he reads the popular records and treats them all as lying Popish fabrications. And this is the man who is to delineate the Irish character in all historic truthfulness to his prejudiced countrymen! Need we wonder if Mr. Froude finds occasionally a mare's nest among the lying chronicles of Dublin Castle? For instance the veracious Mr. Froude has made the wonderful discovery that Wolfe Tone was ready to sell his country for a small post under Government—one of the basest calumnies ever uttered. And what opinion shall we form of Mr. Froude's historic accuracy when he tells us that the immortal Father O'Leary was a spy in the pay of Pitt?—one of the greatest libels ever penned against the memory of a devoted patriot and patriotic Irishman. This is the writer over whom the *Daily Telegraph* grows hot and cold. One day it accuses him of garbling history, of suppressing most important facts and of "seeing red" when he "comes across Roman Catholics and their priests." It says, in the critique already referred to:—

Nor can we, without something like repulsion, write that while Mr. Froude enters into the details of every atrocious outrage committed by the peasantry, he always excuses where he does not slur over the retaliatory crimes of the authorities, the troops and the Protestant settlers. And yet a few days after it suggests that a more fitting title for Mr. Froude's work would be "Home Rule in the Olden Time," and then proceeds to dish up and spice Mr. Froude's calumnies for the English palate and enjoy the confection with evident relish. And then, after sneering at the idea of Ireland's legislative independence, it winds up a bitter diatribe against some of the greatest names in Irish history by the following *non sequitur*:—

Hence Home Rule is the worst political absurdity ever demanded by clever men, and the Irish ought to thank Mr. Froude for telling them the truth.

Thus it is that the *Daily Telegraph*, like Mr. Froude "sees red," when it looks at the Irish character and at Irish subjects.—*The Universe*.

ENGLISH MAJORITIES AND IRISH RIGHTS.

The anti-Home Rule press, English and Irish, are very energetically inviting the Home Rulers to consider themselves utterly and irreparably discomfited by the division on Mr. Butt's motion. They are immensely annoyed on perceiving that the Home Rulers do not seem to feel a bit the worse for their "beating," but are as full of spirit and vigour as ever, and are evidently meditating further and early action. "Please to understand that your party has been overwhelmingly defeated, your cause tried out and the question finally disposed of," say the anti-Irish journals. And the Home Rulers reply—"We do not believe a word of it; we take quite a different view of the case." "Has there not been a large majority against your motion," say the Tory Journals "and does not that settle for it?" "There has been a large majority against it," say the Home Rulers, "but that settles nothing. There will be majorities against it on future divisions also, but even that will not dispose of the Home Rule question." "Surely, for this session at all events you are done with it, and will now settle down to help us with the ordinary work of British legislation," say the Government printers. "You need not delude yourselves with any such notions," say the Home Rule members. "Our business here is to bush on the Home Rule question, and to forward all such measures as will strengthen the hands of the Irish nation in contesting for Home Rule. That is the work the people of Ireland have commissioned us to execute, and to its accomplishment we mean to devote all our powers." In the foregoing "imaginary conversation" we have given the actual position and the ideas of both parties. Day after day we are being asked to believe that the Home Rule party are grievously hurt, mortally wounded, and actually killed by the division on Mr. Butt's motion; and when we refuse to take any such view of the case we find ourselves treated to a great amount of vituperation, and not a few violent and savage threats. These things, however, do not much affect us. Our course as Home Rulers is quite clear, and we mean to tread it unflinchingly. In Parliament and out of Parliament the agitation of the Home Rule cause must go on, no matter how distasteful it may be to the oppressors of Ireland. An adverse vote of the House of Commons will certainly not slay that cause—it would be a weak cause if it could be so disposed of. A parliamentary majority against it on one, or two, or twenty divisions will not be accepted by the Irish people as decisive of its merits. They are quite aware that in that arena the question will be defeated again and again; but they have also a profound conviction that by the might of the Irish people in Parliament and out of Parliament, they will carry it.