PARNELLISM.

BY

AN IRISH NATIONALIST.

SIXTEENTH THOUSAND.

Dublin:

1886.

Houses of the Oireachtas

Houses of the Oireachtas

PARNELLISM.

BY

AN IRISH NATIONALIST.

SIXTEENTH THOUSAND.

Dublin

1886.

Houses of the Oireachtas

Houses of the Oireachtas

PREFACE.

THE writer of the following pages was born a rebel against British misgovernment and remains one still against as much of it as endures, now that he has long passed the confines of middle age. He has testified to the "faith that is in him" by the sacrifice of his liberty and his substance—he has spent years in prison, and lost his means—in the service of the Irish people. His patriotism has personally profited him nothing—nor did he hope or expect that it would He has never had a "testimonial," and never a "hat" has circulated to reward him—strange to say, he refused to accept the one, or permit the other. And he has no "axe to grind" now, nor is it likely that he will, at any future time. He is content to remain what he has always been —an humble, but earnest, worker in the promotion of the cause he has at heart—the liberty of his native land, and the prosperity and happiness of its people. From this "platform" he ventures to address his countrymen all over the world, in the hope that he will succeed in enlightening them as to the true character of the men and nature of the means by which they had been so long and heartlessly *exploited.*

November, 1885.

Houses of the Oireachtas

Houses of the Oireachtas

PARNELLISM.

THE LAND LEAGUE.

To arrive at an accurate conception of the machinations by which the "patriots" of our days have contrived to deceive a credulous and fanatic people, it is necessary to begin at the beginning. The knowledge that the Land League owes its origin to a combination of avowed revolutionists and less extreme politicians is pretty well diffused, but the precise conditions of the alliance, and the circumstances attending it, are known but to a select few; and, as it is necessary to a better understanding of the designs and aims of the "patriot" conspirators against the peace and prosperity of Ireland, the enlightenment of the general public on these points becomes a matter of the last importance.

In the early summer of the year 1879, Mr. John Devoy, a convicted Fenian of 1865, who had been released from penal servitude a short time previously on the condition that he was to reside out of Ireland until after the termination of the original term of his sentence, came to this country for the purpose, amongst other things, of organising a political movement, which would include Fenians and "moral force" men, and be directed to procure the abolition of landlordism, and ultimately of British rule—in other words, it was designed that the tenantry of Ireland should be rooted in the soil; the landlords and the British Government out of it. Devoy[1] was

[1] Devoy may also be said to have been not only the chief originator of the Land League and of the "Invincibles," but has solid claim to be regarded as the

Houses of the Oireachtas

one of the trustees of the American Fenian "Skirmishing" Fund subscribed for the purpose of "levying war" on England with "dynamite and such things." Some time previously [in October, 1878], he and his co-trustees of the "Skirmishing" Fund—Messrs. Breslin, Bourke, and Carroll—sent the following telegram to Mr. Parnell, which was published in the Nationalist papers:—

"The Nationalists here will support you on the following conditions:—First. Abandonment of the Federal demand, and substitution of a general declaration in favour of self-government. Second. Exclusion of all sectarian issues from the platform. Third. Vigorous agitation of the land question, on the basis of a peasant proprietary, while accepting all reforms tending to banish arbitrary eviction. Fourth. Irish members to act together on all questions, adopt an aggressive policy, and vigorously resist coercive legislation."

The public were expected to believe that these were the only requirements of the Irish Americans, but much more remained behind—as we shall presently see. The Parnellites, however, hesitated over the proposal; it was not the support of American, but of Irish, Fenians that they coveted, for they knew that without it, or, at all events, assurance of their neutrality, they could not hope to set an agitation going that would endure for any considerable time. They remembered how effective was the opposition of the Fenian, Stephens, to

original Dynamitard as well. At a meeting of the New York branch of the Irish Land League, held in January, 1881, speaking of the probable effects of the Peace Preservation Act, which was then being enacted, he suggested reprisals in this fashion:—"It is then that the people goaded into frenzy by studied injustice may rise against some constituted authority. A local eviction, a collision with the soldiers, may ensue, and our people may be shot down in multitudes. It is here that the offices of the Irish Land League will be called into requisition. Will we stand idly by and see our country devastated, and content ourselves with enthusiastic resolutions and sympathies? Our aid has hitherto given the people the impetus that has brought about this state of things. Shall we desert them in the hour of peril? No; for every Irishman murdered we will take in reprisal the life of a British Minister. For every hundred Irishmen murdered we will sacrifice the lives of an entire British Ministry. For a wholesale massacre of the Irish people we will make England a smouldering ruin of ashes and blood. The receipts of the Land League are now £100 a day, and that is ample for their wants, but we want a fund that will aid us in carrying out this design." And then he referred to the "Skirmishing Fund," urging that it was quite unable to meet the drain upon it, and therefore should be augmented without delay.

Houses of the Oireachtas

any moral force agitation whatever; they recalled that he had in 1864 nipped in the bud a movement started under the auspices of the O'Donoghue—who was then almost as popular as the League leader is now—by sending a contingent of his forces to break up the inaugural meeting; and how, some years later, the successors of Stephens acted similarly in like circumstances—they caused a tenant-right meeting at Limerick to be attacked and dispersed, chiefly, however, for the reason that the late Sir John Gray, who was a violent anti-Fenian, was one of the chief organisers of the projected movement. They were well aware, therefore, that a friendly understanding with the Irish, as well as the Irish-American, revolutionists, was essential to the success of their undertaking.

Devoy's telegram, for this reason, was unheeded; but that gentleman soon followed it in person across the Atlantic. He was bound by his undertaking to the Government that amnestied him not to set foot in Ireland until the term of imprisonment to which he had been condemned had run out; but he came all the same. He organised the "Invincibles," and he bargained with the Parnellites. The former were to work at extirpating landlordism after their fashion—that is, by the "removal" of "obnoxious individuals" belonging to that class and others—and in return for all the aid in men and money that the Transatlantic Fenians could command, the Parnellites were bound to take in hand the abolition of landlordism, and the restoration of the Irish Parliament. Failing to carry these difficult enterprises to the point of achievement—as they were pretty sure to do—the latter were required to undertake either to join the Fenian organization or else to stand aside and leave a fair field whereon the physical force men could make their effort unimpeded. Mr. Parnell has publicly stated that, after a month's consideration he accepted these terms.

It thus came to pass that many well-known leaders of the Separatist — *i.e.* the Fenian — faction made their appearance on League platforms in the character of Constitutional Agitators. As the League treasurer, Mr. Patrick Egan, in a letter to the Washington Convention of the Irish American League in '81 put it:— "The Land Movement was originated, built up, and sustained chiefly by Nationalists (that is Fenians) . . . . we all (Fenians and

House of Lords Orders

non-Fenians) regard the Land question only in the light of a step towards National Independence, which is, and shall continue to be, the goal of all our efforts." And he spoke by the book. He was himself a sworn Fenian, and he ought to know. Not only that; but for a short time he was a member of the Supreme Council of the Fenian brotherhood; he is out of reach of the "brutal British Government," and it can do him no harm to state that incontrovertible fact. He is therefore an unimpeachable authority on the subject. Indeed, there can be no impropriety in mentioning that to the personal knowledge of the writer the most prominent men amongst those constituting Mr. Parnell's Parliamentary tail at the present time also held high positions in the Fenian ranks, seeing that they have all long since either resigned their connection with the organization, or been expelled therefrom.

These are the members referred to by Mr. John O'Leary in his recent pregnant discourse on "Perjury and murder," as the "double oathed" gentlemen who solemnly swore fidelity to two entirely antagonistic allegiances, to either of which they must of necessity be false. As members of the British Parliament, they took the oath of allegiance to the Crown and Government of Great Britain, though they had previously sworn, as Fenians, to "take up arms" against both in Ireland. And yet they are now popular idols. It must be said, however, for one of the League party, Mr. Michael Davitt, that though he has renounced his Fenianism, he has not descended to the vile hypocrisy of wilful and corrupt perjury. He has refused to enter Parliament because he would not swear allegiance to a power whose rule in Ireland he is endeavouring to overturn.

It is not necessary to recall the record of the progress of the agitation thus commenced, with its catalogue of cowardly and fiendish crime, organised terrorism, and severe suffering of well-meaning but cruelly misled people; what is of more importance just now is to demonstrate the misappropriation by some of the agitators of public money intrusted to their charge for specific purposes. To do this it is necessary to go rather fully into details.

THE COLLECTION.

The first weekly meeting of the Irish National Land League, after its formation, was held on the 20th October, 1879, under the presidency of Mr. Kettle, and Mr. Parnell, M.P., was present. The following resolution was proposed by Mr. T. Ryan, seconded by Mr. T. Grehan, and adopted:—"That none of the funds of this League shall be used for the purchase of any landlord's interest in the land, or for furthering the interests of any Parliamentary candidate." This meant that the leaders of the movement were not to be looked upon as relying upon Parliamentary agitation to accomplish their ends, but on other means, which were not exactly defined. Their chief intention was understood to be to excite public opinion upon the injustice of the land laws, and, when the people were sufficiently "educated," to incite them to take the first step in the direction of the total abolition of landlordism—the refusal to pay rent. And as it was designed to do away with rent by expropriating the rent receivers, it would be obviously absurd to supply tenants with funds to buy out their landlords at an early stage of the movement. Landlordism would have to be first "brought to its knees" before it should be bargained with at all, and then its obliteration could be had for just so much as the tenant would be disposed to give, and no more.

At this meeting, also, a resolution was adopted, requesting the President of the League, Mr. Parnell, "to proceed to America for the purpose of obtaining assistance from our exiled countrymen and other sympathisers," for the objects of the League. That is, Mr. Parnell was to ask Irish Americans to supply the Irish National Land League with money to obtain the land of Ireland for its people, by the abolition of landlordism, "legally and constitutionally," but *not* by Parliamentary agitation. To solicit subscriptions from the Irish residents in the United States for an agitation in Ireland which looked to the British Parliament for the accomplishment of its object the League leaders knew would be hopeless; therefore they gave out that there was nothing Parliamentary about it; that it aimed only to elicit so striking a manifestation of the popular will as would

terrify shrinking landlordism and force it to sue for peace at any price, as well as compel the British Government to accelerate the process by finding the funds wherewith the tenants could rid themselves finally of their "tyrant oppressors."

The president Mr. Parnell, and the treasurer Mr. Egan, were thus put under strict terms as to the disposal of the money intrusted to them for expenditure—how did they treat the injunction? With the loftiest contempt for and total disregard of the undertaking which they bound themselves honourably to observe. They did not, it is true, use the money to "buy out" any landlord, but they admittedly employed a considerable part of it in helping Parliamentary Candidates. Hardly indeed had the compact been entered into than it was violated. Many thousands of pounds were spent in procuring the return of candidates nominated by Mr. Parnell for constituencies in places where he had influence, out of a fund intended for a totally different purpose, and directly at variance with the intentions of the people who subscribed it. And it was stoutly denied that any such misappropriation took place; the people were asked to believe that all the heavy expenses attending Mr. Parnell's phenomenal flight amongst the Irish constituencies previous to the general election of 1880—the special trains, the deputations of "Stumpers," and the myriad other charges incidental to electioneering at such high pressure—were defrayed either by the candidates themselves, though they were mostly notoriously impecunious, or their nominator, notwithstanding that it was well known that he was not flush of money, as he was then an impoverished landlord. It was not till long after that the truth began to leak out.

After the Kilmainham arrangement by which Mr. Parnell cleverly contrived to obtain his release from prison, the subscriptions from America rapidly declined, and at last all but ceased. Then, but not till then, it was confessed that the League fund had been used not only to "further the interests" of Parliamentary Candidates, but to support Members of Parliament. Then when the well-springs of Irish-American sympathy had run dry, and no more dollars could be expected from over the water, Mr. Parnell did not hesitate to make public confession that some of the money already received from there had been misapplied and misappropriated: "the unscrupulous use of money by the government," he said in an "official" *Com-*

munique to the Press Association in October, 1882, "in Parliamentary elections had in some instances rendered necessary heavy outlays to ensure the return of men pledged to the Cause of Ireland"; and Mr. Egan was also forced to make the admission that, at least in one instance, a Member of Parliament—Mr. Sexton, for whom the Parnellite "hat" is now being sent round—was paid a considerable yearly salary. *Ex uno disce omnes;* when one has been paid the inference is that so also have been the rest.

So indignant was Mr. Ford of the *Irish World*, through whom almost the whole of the Irish-American contributions to the Land League fund were sent, at these admissions, which revealed how he and those for whom he acted had been hoodwinked and befooled, that he indignantly washed his hands of the whole business, and thereafter never sent a dollar to the Parnellite treasury. Moreover, he indignantly denounced as a swindle the conduct of which he was made the victim in his paper in these scathing terms:—

"The knowledge which is here and now vouchsafed is certainly the first intimation of the kind we have ever got, and to the thousands in America who have subscribed their money to the Land League it will be a strange and disappointing revelation. The understanding here in America was that the Land League fund was to be spent on Land League work, and that that work was to be done in Ireland, as well as for Ireland. Davitt asked for some money—a mere trifle—to carry the war into Africa, and his moderate request was at once and sharply refused, and we interpreted that refusal as a strict construction put upon the understanding that prevailed in this country. Yet it now comes out that heavy outlays from the Land League fund have been made in order to enable a batch of young politicians to put 'M.P.' after their names. We solemnly and emphatically declare that we never dreamt that any such game was being played, nor did we ever suppose that those in charge of the Land League fund could for a moment have sanctioned such a proceeding. We as solemnly and as emphatically declare that had the knowledge of such transactions come into our possession at any time within the past three years, never would we have contributed a dollar to that fund, and never would the voice of the *Irish World* have gone forth in advocacy of its pretentions. And, in saying this, we feel that we give expression to the sentiments of the readers of this paper throughout the American continent. The *Irish World* from the first has disfavoured and derided this Parliamentary bye-play. We regarded it as a waste of time and energy, a delusion, a cheat. . . . It was the

pressure that was brought to bear on the British Government from without, and not what was said in the House, that always moved England to grant an instalment of justice to Ireland. . . . Had it been given out that the Land League money would be ever devoted to defray Parliamentary election expenses, not one penny from our pocket, nor a penny raised by our influence, would have ever found its way into that fund. We had rather cast the money into the Atlantic Ocean. As it is, the Irish Parliamentary programme, which we have ever regarded as a humbug, stands now branded as a swindle."

That this expenditure for "Parliamentary purposes" of money subscribed solely for the prosecution of the "Land War" in Ireland still continues is notorious. Many youthful senators amongst the "patriots," who have no visible means whatever, live in luxury and idleness, with no work whatever to do, save to loll comfortably on the benches of the "alien senate," indulge in the pleasing excitement of exasperating British Ministers and members, and make at intervals agreeable excursions into Ireland, where they can enjoy the exhilarating pastime of seditious speech-making to enthusiastic and delighted audiences. Patriotism, in fact, is the very best and pleasantest trade going; at least such is the only conclusion to be drawn from the conspicuous evidences of the exceeding prosperity of its professors. To be sure, the "light and pleasant fiction" that the earnings of these young men in the London world of literature amount to something exceedingly handsome annually has been industriously circulated by their backers and apologists, but it is all pure romance. The most prominent of them, Mr. Sexton, has admitted to the writer that while his drawings from the League fund for expenses and salary have averaged 1,000*l.* a year, since he entered Parliament he has not earned a fifty pound note by his profession as journalist. With the exception of Mr. W. O'Brien, editor of Mr. Parnell's paper, and Mr. T. P. O'Connor, the Parliamentary correspondent of the *Freeman's Journal*, the Parnellite journalists—so-called—and most of the other leaders, may be said with perfect truth to live and thrive solely on the profits of their "patriotism" paid out of the League fund.

Houses of the Oireachtas

THE "FAIR TRIAL" AND RELIEF OF DISTRESS FUNDS.

Mr. Parnell departed on his mission, and in view of the then impending famine, not only succeeded beyond the expectations of his most sanguine associates in establishing a seemingly never-failing source from which to draw supplies to carry on the "land war," but became the recipient of very large sums for distribution amongst the poor people in the districts where famine was feared. Thus the Land League was entrusted not only with money to bring about the abolition of landlordism, but to succour the most distressed of the victims of famine. And, furthermore, the League, at almost the hour of its birth, had the excessive good fortune to incur prosecution at the hands of the Government, and was thus, at once, placed in a position from which it could appeal, with confidence, to the sympathies of the whole—even of the least fervently patriotic—of the Irish race all over the world. In November, 1879, Messrs. Davitt, Daly, and Killen were arrested on a charge of sedition, and forthwith a collection was set on foot to pay the cost of defending them. This was called the "Fair Trial Fund," and, as a matter of course, Mr. P. Egan was appointed treasurer. Never was agitation set going under more favourable auspices; never one that more promptly took advantage of its good fortune.

The League, therefore, had the uncontrolled administration of three separate funds: the Fair Trial Fund; the Distress Fund; the League Fund proper. The first-named fund did not attain large proportions, for the good reason that the prosecution never advanced beyond the preliminary stage, and consequently no expenditure was necessary. The accused were committed for trial at Sligo, liberated on bail, and there the matter ended. There was no trial, and therefore little expense incurred. However, subscriptions were acknowledged as having been received by the League Treasurer for the "Fair Trial Fund," amounting to £102 8*s.* 2*d.*[1] This sum has quite disappeared from mortal ken. What has become of it is known only to the elect within the inner circle of the Parnellite

[1] This item is thus given by Lady Florence Dixie in her pamphlet on the Land League Fund: Receipts, £1,024 0*s.* 6*d.*; Expenses, £40; Balance, £984 0*s.* 6*d.*

House of Lords Oireachtas

system; it has not, at all events, been spent for the purpose for which it was subscribed, because it was not wanted; and it has not been returned to the subscribers.

Another Fund, the collection of which was commenced about the same time, by the same parties, and for which some money was acknowledged as having been received, was that for the holding of a great National Convention in the year 1882, in commemoration of the declaration of the independence of the Irish Parliament in 1782. The project perished still-born, and nothing since has been heard of it—or of the money.

The "Distress Fund" quickly mounted to a very high figure. The money which came into the hands of the League Executive for the relief of distress was subscribed on the distinct understanding that it should be used only for the purpose of relieving people then suffering from want, and none other. Mr. Parnell, Mr. Davitt, Mr. Brennan, and others of the League *côterie*, over and over again made the most pronounced protestations, in public and in private, in America and in Ireland, that under no circumstances which could be conceived possible of occurrence would a penny of it be used for any other purpose—every shilling which came into their hands would be devoted, without any deduction whatever, to the assistance of the famine-stricken and the famine-threatened peasantry, evicted or non-evicted, all over the country.

The League Treasurer acknowledged in the newspapers the amounts received, and the sums voted in "grants" were stated weekly at the League meetings. Complaints were made, however, in the public journals, of the manner in which the bounty of Irish-America was dispensed by the League managers. Applications on behalf of much-suffering people in different districts were, it was alleged, either refused or disregarded without just cause; people who were known to have paid their rent could not obtain assistance; and the meal sent for distribution to the country was given, in some cases only to those who could purchase small quantities—that is, the most distressed, who most needed it, were refused relief. Most of these charges were not denied—were, in fact, not noticed at all; the Treasurer and other officials, strong, no doubt, in the sense of their own impregnable integrity, not deigning to take heed of them. Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that they were bound, if only in

Houses of the Oireachtas

justice to themselves, to afford some explanation of so apparently unwarrantable a course of proceeding.

But what shall be said of the misappropriation—so astounding in its unwarrantableness—of the immense sum of £10,000 out of this fund to a purpose quite foreign to that for which it was subscribed? At the League meeting held on July 13th, 1880, on the motion of Mr. Brennan, it was agreed that £10,000 of the money sent from America for the sole use and benefit of poor people in the distressed districts, should be held in reserve for the relief of tenants who might thereafter incur the penalty of eviction for obedience to the League's decrees, although the League political fund, which at that time had accumulated until it stood at a total of over £12,000 and which was hardly at all trenched upon, was subscribed on the understanding that it would chiefly be used for the support of evicted tenants and their families.

Furthermore, it was stated that a balance-sheet of the expenditure of this little unconsidered trifle of £10,000 would, in due time, be made public. But no such publication took place; in fact it has been permitted to fade out of view and sink into that Limbo of surpluses of other patriotic funds, which shrouds their memory in perpetual forgetfulness.

It would be but to waste breath to demonstrate the shame and scandal of withholding money from the poor sufferers for whose relief it was meant, which would have been of such inestimable benefit to them. At the time that it was thus misappropriated the distress in the country, though decreasing, was still wide-spread and acute; the resources of the other Relief Committees were taxed to the utmost to meet all the demands upon them; and yet the extremely patriotic, eminently conscientious, and altogether superior people who managed the Land League, deliberately withdrew this money that would probably have saved hundreds from direst suffering.

But even if these poor people had had brief respite from destitution, still would they have been entitled to have received every shilling of the money. It was expressly entrusted to the League for their use and benefit, and should have been distributed amongst them without delay or hesitation, no matter what happened. Let us suppose a case, in which trustees, appointed under a court of justice to administer funds, acted as did those trustees of public money.

House of the Oireachtas

If such a thing happened—if a trustee in law deliberately appropriated a large portion of his trust, and gave no account of it—what would be the result? Needless to say, he would have to make prompt and sufficient restitution and atonement. Such a case is literally on all fours with that of the Leaguers and the balance of the Distress Fund. Nothing could justify their conduct. They had no option, save to distribute every shilling amongst the famine-stricken fairly and equitably; they had no right to retain any of it, save for the expense of administering the money. Suppose the Mansion House Committee had taken £10,000 from the fund entrusted to them for the relief of distress, and said they would reserve it to give assistance to tenants who might be evicted at some future time, and that, having so spent it, they would duly render an account of it. And imagine that evictions increased rapidly from that time; that distress amongst the evicted was severe and far-reaching; that still nothing was heard of the reserve of £10,000 which the Committee had declared they would retain for the succour of the sufferers; and that finally they refused to explain what had become of the money. What would be said of them? Orators would rail and storm at them, and rend them metaphorically limb from limb. The patriotic prints would become delirious with virtuous indignation; they would almost expire in spasms of horror and rage at such unheard of duplicity; such double-dyed and villainous treachery; such unutterably mean and callous dishonesty. The people would howl at them as the basest of the human kind.

And how vociferously they all would rage and fume, bluster and threaten, call names, and generally prefigure themselves as quite transfixed with holy horror if the ladies of the Duchess of Marlborough's Committee had appropriated £10,000 of their fund for the relief of the distressed ladies of property who had lost the greater part of their incomes owing to the knavery of their tenants, acting under the direction and coercion of the Land League.

Or suppose the Committee entrusted with the distribution of the fund of the *New York Herald* had held £10,000 in hand for future disbursement, never paid a shilling of it, and refused to tell the subscribers the reason why, is it not certain that they would be held up—and justly—as objects of popular execration and detestation by the so-called "National" papers?

All this is undoubted. And the culpability of the leaders of the

Land League is a great, if not greater, than that of any of the parties in the above-mentioned supposed cases; nevertheless, they are the popular heroes of the period and their influence great and far-reaching!

But this sum of £10,000 is not the only deduction made from the fund by the patriots who managed it. As will be seen from the following statement, they had a balance-sheet of receipts and expenditure made out and circulated up to the 30th of April, 1880, showing that they had a balance in hand of £16,113 5*s.* 5*d.* But for some months after that time they continued to receive large sums amounting in all to £10,563 10*s.*; so that they had for distribution *after* the publication of their only balance-sheet a sum of £26,676 15*s.* 6*d.*, out of which they made grants to the amount of £13,018 0*s.* 1*d.*; and transferred £10,000 to the political fund. There still remains, therefore, a balance of £3,658 0*s.* 3*d.*—a mere bagatelle to the magnificent financiers of the League, but which would, all the same, have relieved many hundreds of starving peasants—altogether unaccounted for. Into whose pockets has this exceedingly comfortable and substantial "surplus" gone?

Houses of the Oireachtas

RELIEF FUND.

Dr.	£	s.	d.	Cr.	£	s.	d.
1880.				1880.			
To Cash received to 30th April, 1880, as per account audited by Messrs. Kevans & Kean	50,079	17	11	By Cash to Local Committees, ...	25,095	9	1
,, Interest allowed by Bank	29	1	11	Do. paid for seed (to 30th April, 1881, as per account audited by Messrs. Kevans & Kean.....	8,900	4	6
,, Cash acknowledged at Meetings in May	4,807	6	8	,, Grants voted at Meetings in May	4,375	0	0
Do. June ...	3,577	14	8	Do. June	4,448	11	8
Do. July	870	17	0	Do. July	2,590	0	0
Do. August..	1,307	11	9	Do. August	1,605	4	5
				,, Amount transferred to Political Fund...	10,000	0	0
				,, Balance not accounted for	3,658	0	3
	£60,672	9	11		£60,672	9	11

The manner in which this fund was misappropriated constitutes a scandal which is unparalleled in Ireland's recent history, and that it should have been allowed to pass unreproved shows the utter demoralisation of public opinion and the criminal cowardice of its exponents on the popular side.

THE POLITICAL AND OTHER FUNDS.

The Land League Political Fund, it was announced, was meant to sustain the tenants in their warfare against landlordism. Above all, it was to be devoted to giving aid to the wounded in the struggle—*i.e.* to the evicted tenants. Mr. Michael Davitt, who succeeded Mr. Parnell in stumping the States in the League's interest, said, in his first speech in Jones' Wood:—"To the Nationalist I would say that not a cent of his money will be used to prop up Home Rule or Repeal; and to those of an opposite way of thinking I would say that not a cent of their money will be used to precipitate armed opposition to English rule"—that is, that the money would not be used to help constitutional agitation for Home Rule or Repeal; or unconstitutional agitation for separation—it was not meant to sustain agitation at all, in the conventional sense of the

term. Ireland was peacefully to rebel against, and passively resist, British landlord law and British rule in general; and the money sent to the Land League was intended to sustain the warfare and succour the "wounded." This was the League "platform."

Fuller details of the heads of expenditure were subsequently made public by Mr. Egan, the League's Treasurer, and Mr. Davitt, in substantially the same terms. In a public letter, some time since, Mr. Egan wrote: "The funds are applied solely for legal expenses; defending tenants threatened with eviction, and who have good defence; in prosecuting claims for compensation against landlords; defraying costs of sheriffs' sales when persons hold out under the advice of the League; in supporting the families of those evicted for acting on the advice of the League, and the families of those imprisoned for any acts done in connection with resistance to process-serving, evictions, &c.; and for current expenses of the office—salary, organisers, travelling," &c. Such were the *sole* purposes for which the League money was to be expended, and there can be no doubt that they legitimately arose out of the prosecution of the war against landlordism, and were not at variance with the wishes of the donors. If these were the only purposes for which the League money was expended, plainly there was no solid reason why the accounts were not duly audited, vouched, and published, in accordance with the often repeated demands made on behalf of some of the subscribers that this should be done. But that there were other purposes, which were not legitimate, which it would be inconvenient to reveal, or the money was not expended to the extent it is pretended, is obvious.

Moreover, the expenditure was narrowed by the removal of two of the claims upon it, or at all events their pressure was greatly lessened; that is, the law expenses and the support of prisoners. The second defence fund—that for the defence of Mr. Parnell and the other traversers—realised a total of £20,461 4*s.* 6*d.*, from which, as will be seen by the following table, a large surplus accrued; and the Political Prisoners' Sustentation Fund also amounted to considerably more than was required for the prisoners' support; so that, so far from the League Fund being lessened by these charges upon it, it in fact was substantially increased.

PARNELL DEFENCE FUND.

Dr.		£	s.	d.
1880.				
Nov. 9—	To Cash acknowledged at Meeting on this date	88	1	6
,, 16—	Do. ...	135	7	0
,, 23—	Do. ...	357	11	10
,, 30—	Do. ...	426	19	9
Dec. 7—	Do. ...	555	1	8
,, 14—	Do. ...	773	0	11
,, 21—	Do. ...	431	12	11
,, 28—	Do. ...	682	19	11
1881.				
Jan. 4—	Do. ..	916	2	2
,, 11—	Do. ...	1,210	13	7
,, 18—	Do. ...	76	5	11
,, 25—	Do. ...	237	13	7
Feb. 3—	Do. ...	49	3	3
	Do. received from *Freeman's Journal*	14,520	10	6
		£20,461	4	6

Cr.		£	s.	d.
1880.				
By Cash to Solicitor.....		12,000	0	0
,, Balance not accounted for		8,461	4	6
		£20,461	4	6

The League treasurer loftily dismissed all demands for the audit and publication of his accounts, with the excuse that to adopt such a course would be to give information to the British government which it was desirable to withhold from them. But he had previously stated publicly *all* the purposes to which the money was applied, and how possibly could the Government be served by the knowledge of the exact amount disbursed under each head? They could not assert any authority in regard to such expenditure, no matter how lavish, or how perfect their knowledge of its details; nor could they benefit in any way by such knowledge. The thing, in plain truth, gave them no concern—why should it, so long as the money was spent for purposes that were lawful?

The only reasonable conclusion from all this is that there was something to conceal—that the funds were misspent and misapplied. Though there were no "official" accounts to refer to, still there was ample warrant in the details, which have appeared in the public prints, of the expenditure, showing how ludicrously incommensurate it was with the amount admitted to have been received, to make the demand for investigation imperative. But such demands were contemptuously

Houses of the Oireachtas

disregarded. In the complaints that have been made public of the neglect of tenants who brought ruin on themselves by observance of the League's commands—neglect to which the exhausting exodus of the past few years was mainly referable; in the statements which were made and were not contradicted, of the large payments to parliamentarians in direct contravention of the undertaking that none of the money would be spent for such a purpose; and in view of the refusal to publish the accounts; we have direct testimony to show that the money was misappropriated. It is the fact that the League solicitors appeared in many cases to defend perpetrators of outrages, and made no secret that they were paid with League money; and in the revelations made by Mr. Forster, late Chief Secretary for Ireland, in Parliament as regards the journeyings of the Land Leaguer, Sheridan, between Paris and the West of Ireland—every such visit being signalised by a fresh crop of outrages—there is enough to justify the suspicion that some of the League money was spent on Sheridan's account. If that be so, then one can well understand why details which would make such unpleasant facts manifest were not published.

In the early part of the year 1882, mention was made of a proposed secret audit in New York of Mr. Egan's accounts, by a committee of the American League, of which Mr. D. C. Birdsall, an American lawyer, was secretary. The present writer is aware that a well-known Irishman wrote to this gentleman demanding permission on behalf of some of the subscribers to the fund to submit evidence of Mr. Egan's financial shortcomings to the auditors. The reply was, he states, "to the effect that before it was decided to give me a hearing, I should first submit any specific charges I had to make to the committee. I declined, however, to show my hand thus prematurely; and repeated that I was prepared with my proofs at any time, and demanded as a right on behalf of contributors, that my charges should be stated by myself in person, and be carefully considered. But I heard nothing more from this gentleman, and, as a matter of fact the proposed audit and investigation never came off."

All this time immense sums were being received from America by the League Treasurer in Paris. And the amounts greatly increased after the arrest of Mr. Parnell and other *suspects*. The "no rent" manifesto was issued and was generally obeyed. Tenants were evicted relying on the promises of the League Treasurer to

Houses of the Oireachtas

sustain them. The evidence, however, that they were neglected, while all the time the League Treasurer was proclaiming in boastful terms the largeness of the balance of which he was the custodian, is perfectly overwhelming. Let us first put Mr. Parnell himself *en evidence.* "For some time before my release from Kilmainham on parole," he said to a *New York Herald* reporter, "to attend the funeral of my nephew in Paris, I, in common with all my fellow-prisoners, had been very much impressed with the grave situation which appeared imminent for the Irish people. We saw evictions daily increasing in number, and had every reason to fear that each ensuing quarter the number would increase."

Most of these evictions, it should be recollected, were the direct result of obedience to the "no rent" command. Left to themselves the evicted tenants might have made terms with their landlords, but when, at the instigation of the League, they set them at defiance and refused to pay any rent at all, the latter would be less than human if they did not invoke the aid of the law to assist them to recover that to which their lawful right was not disputed.

"I may mention," continues Mr. Parnell, "that the Land League had done its best to relieve the poorer evicted tenants, at vast expense, during the winter. After all, we found it absolutely impossible to do anything for more than a tithe of them, the remainder being left on the roadside or having to go into the workhouse."

Now, why was this—why were those deluded people deserted in their bitter suffering, brought upon them by those who declared that indeed they could not help more than "a tithe of them"? Why could they not? Was there not the League Fund to draw upon, which was being constantly swelled, as the following table shows, by copious streams of gold from across the Atlantic? At the time referred to by Mr. Parnell, the League Treasurer, according to his own showing, must have had an available balance for the relief of the evicted, of over £50,000. Writing, on the 17th February, 1882, to a leading Leaguer of New York, with reference to the proposed secret audit of the League accounts, already mentioned, Mr. Egan said: "As regards the position of the fund, I may state approximately that we have at present, notwithstanding the heavy outlay that we were obliged to meet during the past eight months, a reserve fund of £57,000." And yet hundreds of the League victims were left, by

the custodians of this big balance, on the roadside or in the workhouses for want of money to relieve them !

This £57,000 would have supported 10,000 of the evicted—and the actual number did not reach nearly to that figure—for at least three months. But we know, from our tables, that the amounts taken credit for as having been expended for the relief of the evicted were miserable doles, at long intervals, of £5 or £10 per family, while all the time the fund was being increased by remittances from America, intended for the sustainment of these poor people in comfort and happiness, and ample in amount to do so.

Houses of the Oireachtas

LAND LEAGUE POLITICAL FUND.

Dr.	£	s.	d.
To Cash received and acknowledged in the National papers from 5th October, 1879, to 28th January, 1880...	338	9	11
Do., from 1st to 17th Feb., '80.....	928	8	3
,, 17th Feb. to 16th March, '80.....	2046	15	8
,, 6th March to 2nd April, '80.....	1104	5	10
,, 2nd April to 20th April, '80.....	4032	6	9
,, 20th April to 25th May, '80.....	3008	13	2
,, 25th May to 16th June, '80.....	243	16	11
,, 16th June to 4th August, '80.....	1053	12	0
,, 4th August to 8th Sept., '80.....	314	16	6
,, 8th Sept. to 13th Oct., '80.....	579	14	5
To Cash acknowledged at meetings from 13th October, to 30th October, '80.....	86	0	0
Do., in November, '80.	1746	4	10
,, December, '80.	4108	11	9
,, January, '81....	7994	12	8
,, February, '81..	5518	5	7
,, March, '81.....	8503	6	2
,, April, '81.....	10,127	12	2
,, May, '81.....	7989	13	2
,, June, '81.....	2793	2	10
,, July, '81.....	7915	8	5
,, August, '81....	5177	0	11
,, September, '81.	3888	8	1
,, October, '81....	4449	16	4
To Cash acknowledged by the League Treasurer from United States from November, '81, to April, '82	53,000	0	0
Do., from May to September, '82.....	4000	0	0
Cash transferred from Relief Fund.....	10,000	0	0
Balance of ditto	3658	0	3
Balance Parnell Defence Fund.....	8461	7	9
	£163,068	10	4

Cr.	£	s.	d.
By Cash voted at weekly meetings in			
February, '80.....	20	0	0
April, '80...	100	0	0
May, '80.....	45	0	0
June, '80.....	120	0	0
July, '80	5	0	0
August, '80.....	40	0	0
September, '80.....	150	0	0
October, '80.....	30	0	0
November, '80.....	105	0	0
December, '80.....	20	0	0
January, '81.....	180	0	0
February, '81.....	249	0	0
March, '81.....	310	0	0
April, '81.....	556	0	0
May, '81	1005	0	0
June, '81.....	618	0	0
July, '81	507	0	0
August, '81.....	644	0	0
September, '81.....	742	0	0
October, '81.....	482	0	0
,, Cash to Ladies' Land League—			
April... £500 0 0			
May.... 300 0 0			
June.... 545 19 1			
July..... 1489 3 9			
August. 930 1 4			
September 1151 2 5			
October... 2800 3 7			
December 6000 0 0			
	13716	10	2
Ladies' Land League balance.....	6016	18	2
Balance unaccounted for	137,417	2	0
	£163,068	10	4

Houses of the Oireachtas

That the evicted tenants were cruelly abandoned to their fate when the means for rescuing them were at hand, Mr. Parnell's testimony proves beyond doubt. And we have other evidence. Mr. John Devoy, of New York, it is needless to say, was not hostile to the late Land League, seeing that it was a bantling of his own creation and careful rearing. But even he could not restrain his indignation against the agitators in Ireland, who worked so much evil to Ireland's true interests, and wrought so much trouble for the tenants. He admitted that "thousands of the poorer farmers who have stood loyally to the Land League have been victimised, and the interests of some of the best men in Ireland sacrificed" by the League leaders; but he forgot to mention that having been victimised and deceived, these poor farmers were refused the help sent them from America by the men to whom it was intrusted for distribution.

It must not be imagined that at the time Mr. Parnell spoke there was any pause in the receipt of remittances from America. The table will show on the contrary that when, according to the League leader, tenants were being thrown out to perish on the road-side, or languish in the workhouses, the receipts of the League reached almost their highest figures. From one American source alone—the *Irish World* office—from the date of the arrest of Mr. Parnell to almost the time of his release, the League treasurer received £51,000, or, as the *World* put it, Mr. Egan received an average amount *daily*, for two years, of £100. And from other American sources the receipts were almost as great, so that, for the time mentioned, £200 a day could not be far in excess of the League's average receipts.

And all this time the League executive were voting a few five-pound notes to a few of the evicted families, and when the evictions increased, deliberately held their hands, and declared their inability to give further relief. The following, from the *Castlebar Telegraph*, published at the time, shows how "close-fisted" were these League gentlemen, and the treasurer, who held the plethoric money-bags in charge:—

"Nicholas and Margaret Noonan, of Cong, have been just discharged from Castlebar gaol, where they were detained since the

March Assizes for attempting to keep the 'firm grip.' These poor people have served over fifteen out of twenty-four months in gaol in trying to cling to the homestead. Since their late committal their father, an old man who saw eighty odd summers, had to take refuge in the Castlebar workhouse, where he is presently located. Having not in their possession one farthing to pay for their lodgings in Castlebar during the Assizes, a benefactor who made himself responsible for the amount £2, made several ineffectual applications to the self-constituted body, the executive of the Irish National Land League—a body who receive close on £3,000 weekly, and do not disburse as many shillings. We understand that the Cong Branch of the League made also several ineffectual appeals to the Dublin Branch to assist old Noonan, who saw better days than pine and die in a workhouse. We are sure that these benefactors of Ireland who subscribe their dollars intend them for a better purpose than that of lodging them in German banks, while men of the Noonan type, who brave the prison, are allowed to die in the poor-house. What is £5 to an evicted tenant, or to a family whose sole earner or protector is incarcerated? Yet £5, the maximum sum granted by this bogus ring in Sackville Street, cannot be wrung out of them to meet the destitution and want of those who are victimised between ruthless landlordism and faithless leadership in the ranks of the Land League. The funds sent to Ireland for the relief of the distress have fallen into the hands of those who think they are doing their duty to their country by giving an odd £5 to an evicted family, or at the rate of an isolated 10*s.* per head for those who allow themselves to be left homeless and wanderers on the world. At the last Assizes in the West of Ireland docks were filled with people of all ages, from the old woman of seventy, to the child scarcely able to walk. Yet not a legal voice was heard on their behalf from the Land League. At the Quarter Sessions for Mayo 409 ejectment Decrees were granted. Where was the Land League to defend them? Since then dozens of evictions have taken place nearly all over every parish in the West of Ireland. What has the Land League done to defend them? Nothing."

Not even, it would appear from the statement of another Western paper, was the defence of Mr. Gordon, one of the traversers in the State prosecutions, when accused before local magistrates with an offence committed in putting Land League maxims into practice, provided for by the League executive, although they had the large surplus left over from the Parnell Defence Fund in their hands. The Dublin Land League, it was stated, had due warning of Mr. Gordon's trial, yet he was left to contend single-handed against the Sub-

Inspector of Mayo, and Members of the Constabulary, well trained in conducting criminal proceedings.

Mr. John Devoy also called attention to the fact, that most of the emigrants arriving in New York that year from Ireland, were small farmers who had lost their farms for acting on the advice of the League, and to whom the League denied assistance ; and the following significant paragraph appeared subsequently in another Irish-American newspaper :—" It is true that the moneys we are subscribing in this country to aid and sustain the persecuted tenant farmers of Ireland are not applied to the object for which we contribute, as we learn from the emigrants arriving in our ports every day, that although evicted from their lands through rack-renting, they received no help whatever from the Land League." And about the same time a correspondent of Mr. Parnell's own organ, *United Ireland*—surmised to be Mr. Michael Davitt—wrote from a remote district in Connemara :—

" A great deal of dissatisfaction is felt in this poor district at the neglect of the Land League, and complaints are made that they were encouraged to make a stand for fair play, and are now abandoned to the merciless hands of those who can wield the Coercion Act to the ruin and extermination of the tenants who stood by the principles of the League."

After the suppression of the Land League the Ladies' Land League was constituted, and took charge of subscriptions sent to them for the relief of evicted tenants, and also for the Political Prisoners' Sustentation Fund. The following table shows the receipts and expenditure of this feminine auxiliary of the League and its treasurer, Mr. Egan.

Houses of the Oireachtas

LADIES' LAND LEAGUE.

Dr.	£	s.	d.
To Cash acknowledged at weekly meetings in March, 1881.....	121	13	0
,, April, 1881 (including £500 from Land League).....	822	7	0
,, May (do. £300)	650	10	10
,, June (do. £545 19*s.* 1*d.*)	794	10	5
,, July (do. £1,489 3*s.* 9*d.*)	1,774	8	8
,, Aug. (do. £930 1*s.* 4*d.*)	1,550	18	7
,, Sept. (do. £1,151 2*s.* 5*d.*)	1,615	10	1
,, Oct. (do. £2,800 3*s.* 7*d.*)	3,552	2	0
,, Nov., for Special and Political Prisoners' Sustentation Fund..	1,926	17	0
,, Dec., (including £6,000 from Land League, per P. Egan, and £2,000 from Freeman)	9,425	10	4
,, Jan., 1882 (including £2,000 per Freeman)	4,189	3	0
,, Feb. (do. £2,000) ...	4,381	16	0
,, March (do. £2,000)...	5,037	10	2
,, April (do. £9,000) ...	10,831	7	9
,, May	2,798	7	11
,, Cash acknowledged at meeting in June, 1882 (including £5265 5*s.* 11*d.* from Freeman)	5,767	19	7
,, Do. July, 1882.....	152	4	8
,, Do. August, 1882 ...	392	19	7
,, Land League Political Fund for balance ...	6,016	18	2
	£61,802	14	9

Cr.	£	s.	d.
To Grants voted at weekly meetings for families of evicted tenants; families of prisoners; and support of *suspects*, in April, 1881...	701	0	0
May, ,, ...	710	0	0
June, ,, ...	831	10	0
July, ,, ...	859	15	9
Aug., ,, ...	2,058	10	1
Sept., ,, ...	2,083	16	10
Oct., ,, ...	1,110	3	10
Nov., ,, ...	4,149	19	11
Dec., ,, ...	2,829	1	10
Jan., 1882...	6,612	10	2
Feb., ,, ...	6,624	10	2
Mar., ,, ...	9,302	19	10
April, ,, ...	7,095	2	10
May, ,, ...	7,843	4	1
June, ,, ...	3,702	5	10
July, ,, ...	2,738	6	6
Aug., ,, ...	2,549	17	1
	£61,802	14	9

No Report of Grants for October 21st, 1881.

THE SURPLUS.

A short time after the Phœnix Park murders the League treasurer ventured to return to his native land, bringing with him the balance of the League Fund. And at the National League Conference in October, 1882, he surrendered his trust and furnished his little

Houses of the Oireachtas

account—and a remarkably little one it was, giving no detailed information whatever, and none that was at all reliable. It was as follows :—

"Since I undertook the position of treasurer in October, 1879, there has passed through my hands in all a sum of £244,820, made up as follows: Relief Fund, £59,178 14*s.* 3*d.*; Land League Fund to the 3rd February, 1881, £30,828 0*s.* 7*d.*; Defence Fund per Land League, £6,563 8*s.* 5*d.*; Defence Fund per *Freeman's Journal*, £14,514. Received since my arrival in Paris, on the 3rd February, 1881, to date, £129,907; amount of coupons as investments, £2,582; profit realised by sale of 91,000 dols. of United States 4 per cent. bonds, £1,250, making a grand total of £244,820. Of this sum about £50,000 was disbursed in relief of distress in 1879 and 1880. Over £15,000 was spent on state trials of December, 1880, and of January, 1881; nearly £148,000 has been expended through the General Land League and the Ladies' Land League in support of evicted tenants, providing wooden houses, law costs, sheriffs' sales, defence against ejectments, and various local law proceedings, and upon the general expenses of the organisation, and I have now on hand a balance of £31,900 to turn over to whoever shall be duly authorised to take charge of it."

Now, as will be noted, there is a remarkable discrepancy between the above amounts and those given in the foregoing tables, which, it should be observed, were very carefully compiled, by a public accountant, from the weekly reports of receipts and disbursements supplied to the *Freeman's Journal* by the League treasurer himself. He understated the receipts and overstated the payments.

For the Relief Fund he said he received £59,178 14*s.* 3*d.*, and expended "about" £50,000; his acknowledgments in the *Freeman* of receipts come to £60,672 9*s.* 11*d.*, and his statements of expenditure to £47,014 9*s.* 9*d.*, leaving £13,658 0*s.* 3*d.* unaccounted for.

The total of the receipts for the Land League Fund he put down at £164,564 0*s.* 7*d.*, but he was accountable on his own showing in the *Freeman*, for in all, including the sums sent to the Ladies' Land League, £190,550 8*s.* 9*d.*, the difference, of which there is no account, being £25,986 8*s.* 2*d.* And the sum of his payments, and those of the Ladies' Land League for all purposes, he stated as amounting to £148,000; but the total of the weekly disbursements

in the papers fall far short of this total. Tried by that infallible test, it would appear that all his payments, and those of the Ladies' Land League, except the expenses of organisation, amounted to only £67,720 14*s.* 9*d.*; so that if we make the very liberal estimate of £150 per week for the expenses of the organisation, or say £15,000 for the two years that the League existed, and if we add that to above amount, we find that the total expenditure was only £83,720 14*s.* 9*d.*, or less by £65,259 5*s.* 3*d.* than the sum for which the treasurer took credit.

The total receipts for the Parnell's Defence Fund he made out to be £21,077 8*s.* 5*d.*; expenditure £15,000. The reports summed up give the receipts £20,461 4*s.* 6*d.*; expenses £12,000. Difference unaccounted for £2,383 16*s.* 1*d.*

Mr. Egan put down as his grand total £244,820 3*s.* 3*d.*, according to the *Freeman* it should be £271,684 3*s.* 2*d.*—that is, £26,863 19*s.* 11*d.* acknowledged as received, is not taken into account; his total of expenditure is £213,000; it should be only £141,735 4*s.* 6*d.*—showing an over-statement of payments of £71,264 15*s.* 6*d.* He owned to have a balance in hand of £31,900; he should have had to the good at least £129,948 18*s.* 8*d.*—so that, in round numbers, for the expenditure of £98,000 there is no account whatever.

The most astounding fact which these figures make evident, however, is that the tenant victims of the League—the men, that is, who were dispossessed for obedience to the "no rent" manifesto —received by way of relief, and had expended in other ways on their behalf, out of a total of £271,683 3*s.* 2*d.* no larger sum than £67,725 14*s.* 9*d.*, or about a fourth of the whole amount which was to be used, deducting only the expenses of the organisation, solely for the support and sustainment of the "wounded" in the warfare against landlordism. And what is still more significant is the fact that the whole of the money stated to have been expended in the interests of the evicted tenants was subscribed by the tenant farmers themselves. Of the total receipts of the Land League Political Fund, according to a statement made by Mr. Egan himself in a letter read at a New York meeting in June, 1883, over £70,000 was collected in Ireland itself. It was therefore the money of the Irish farmers that was used to relieve the families of the evicted;

Houses of the Oireachtas

to support the families of *suspects* while in prison; to provide luxuries for the "Patriots" themselves while in durance—not by any means vile; and in defrayal of the legal expenses of the Leaguers charged with breaches of the law. The American money, in all probability, was used for "organisation" purposes alone—that is, for the support, *not* of the evicted, but of the "Patriots"—the Organisers, the Orators, the Members of Parliament, the Journalists, and all the rest of the gang of agitators.

It is a fact that the weekly records of the League proceedings disclose that the money dispensed by the Land League itself, and by its female off-shoot, the Ladies' Land League—to the evicted people, in munificent "grants" of £5 per family, at long intervals, and for the support of prisoners' families and the prisoners themselves, was, as a rule under, sometimes equalled, but never exceeded, the amount received from provincial branches of the League—that is, from the farmers themselves.

Of the balance of £31,900 acknowledged by Mr. Egan to be in his possession nothing whatever is known. Whether it accompanied him in his panic flight to New York in February, 1883, or he left it behind in charge of his leader, it is impossible to say. In a "certificate" which he ostentatiously exhibited to his friends in the United States, and which purported to be signed by Messrs. Dillon, Harris, and Father Sheehey, this imposing balance was stated to have shrunken to £27,154—that is to say, when he resigned his treasurership he stated he had in hand a sum of £31,900; but to his American admirers he owned to only £27,154. This so-called certificate, however, was no more than a statement that the three gentlemen named had examined Egan's accounts and found them all right, without giving any details whatever. Such accounts it is plain to demonstration could only be satisfactorily examined and vouched by skilled professional accountants, and would require prolonged and laborious investigation for their proper unravelment: whereas the people who professed to have performed that duty were incompetent from the nature of their callings—a priest, a medical student, and a journeyman builder. The surplus, at any rate, whether it was the bigger or lesser sum mentioned, so far as is publicly known, is not available.

As has been pointed out, there is ample evidence to at least

justify the suspicion that a considerable amount of the unaccounted-for surplus of the Land League Fund was spent by Egan on men who had been guilty of outrage, and the circumstances of Egan's flight are amply sufficient to convert that suspicion into an assured certainty. Carey's first appearance in the character of a crown witness was coincident with Egan's disappearance – from that time he became a fugitive from justice. And with reason. Carey swore that, to his best belief, the money to pay the "Invincible" fiends came from the Land League treasury. And there is the further testimony in this connection of that well-known "patriot" O'Donovan Rossa, who stated in Chicago that "money sent from America to support the No-Rent Movement in Ireland was followed over by some parties, who got 100,000 dollars (£20,000) out of it; that it was not to be used for any such work in Ireland; and that Patrick Egan knows all about it." Egan denied this, but Rossa challenged him to a meeting before a court of arbitration in order that he might substantiate his allegation by evidence. Egan declined. Furthermore, Egan's friends in Dublin stated, that Carey and Egan were comparative strangers, and were not politically associated; but the fact is well known that both were members of the Fenian organisation, holding positions which must of necessity have brought them together frequently; and moreover it is on record that when the last batch of Fenian prisoners was released in January, 1878, an address was presented to them from the "people of Dublin" which was signed, "on behalf of the Reception Committee, by Chas. S. Parnell, M.P.; J. G. Biggar, M.P.; John Dillon; Patrick Egan; James Carey; Thomas Brennan." Here we have Carey and Egan bracketed. *United Ireland*, the League organ, maintained that Egan had taken a return ticket and would come back; and that veracious person himself gave out that his visit to the States was to be of brief duration. But he did not come back—he knew better. He has become an American citizen, and has left his native land for good. His country will necessarily be much the better for his absence.

THE EVICTED TENANTS (MANSION HOUSE) FUND, AND THE IRISH NATIONAL LEAGUE FUND.

After the suppression of the Land League, and the dissolution of the Ladies' Land League, another organisation for the collection of

money for the relief of evicted tenants, under much the same management, was established, and was known as the Mansion House Committee. There was however this difference—and it was an important one—it had a new treasurer. Egan was no longer available, and his place was taken by Mr. Alfred Webb, a highly respectable Protestant gentleman. In addition to subscriptions received from the country for the relief of evicted tenants the treasurer acknowledged sums amounting to about £500 for the purpose of enabling tenants to avail themselves of the Arrears Act. This collection commenced in September 1882, and appears to have closed in April 1883, when the Parnell Testimonial Organisation elbowed the Committee out of the Mansion House, and the thing came to an end. The total amount of acknowledgments of subscriptions to this fund from all sources falls not far short of £8,500; and the expenditure, as published, does not reach £7,500, so that there would appear to have been a surplus of over £1,000. But no accounts have been published and the exact figures cannot be ascertained, since the expenses of collection have to be deducted. That there was a considerable sum left that does not seem to have been spent appears certain. At one of the meetings of the Committee Mr. Webb stated that the accounts would be audited by an eminent firm of public accountants and published, but nothing of the kind was done. It should be stated, however, that early in April 1883, announcement was made that Mr. Webb had resigned his office, but whether it was because the audit he had promised would not be permitted by the managers of the collection or not does not appear.

The National League, which is the revived Land League rebaptised, as a matter of course has also its fund, of which until the month of March in the present year Mr. Webb was also custodian. After that time his name disappeared from the published reports and, in place of it, we find that of a Mr. Moloney, who is entirely unknown to fame. Mr. Webb is highly honourable and conscientious, and his unexplained withdrawal suggests the notion that he has had cause to find fault with the manner in which the money is being dealt with by the "Organising Committee" under whose orders he had to make his disbursements. It will very likely be found that this gentleman, feeling he was personally responsible for the distribution of the funds in strict accordance with the wishes of the donors, and finding ob-

stacles in the way of discharging his trust without any qualms of conscience, quietly withdrew.

From the date of the formal inauguration of the National League in September, '82 down to the present time, the acknowledgments of subscriptions received amount to over £36,000. This includes £10,000 received from Australia, £5,500 from America, and £4,500 from Australia and America for Parliamentary purposes. The grants to evicted tenants and for all other charges, save the expenses of the organisation, amount to about £12,000. The balance in hand therefore should not fall far short of £20,000; and the collection is in full swing and increasing in amount every week. Then there is ex-Treasurer Egan's balance—if it is available, which, however, as has been shown, is doubtful—of £31,900. If we are to consider this as an asset, then there is no doubt whatever that the League has the very considerable sum of £52,000 in reserve to meet contingencies, and it is difficult to realise for what purpose more money is required. As regards the legitimate expenses of the organisation, the profits of *United Ireland*, the League organ, are no doubt adequate to discharge them. That paper was established and sustained with League money, and should now pay a very large profit, seeing how extensively it is circulated. But in all probability the profits find a different destination—they belong of right to the general body of the subscribers to the League who found the capital with which the paper was established. As it is, not quite a third of the amount received by the League is expended in relieving the evicted—the primary purpose for which the fund is collected.

If there are no more tenants to be relieved then plainly no more money is required, for it will profit the people nothing to contribute to accumulate a reserve fund that will disappear some day, as did the surplus of the Land League and other funds. Never in Ireland before was there a movement that absorbed such an enormous sum of money for undefined purposes as that which is conducted by Mr. Parnell and his followers, and the sooner the people of this country, and the Irish in America, resolutely refuse to contribute another shilling, until, at all events, a full and satisfactorily vouched account of the expenditure of the large sums already subscribed by them be given, all the better for themselves.

Houses of the Oireachtas

They have undoubtedly been severely taxed by their "patriot" leaders, quite as remorselessly and more unreasonably than by the hated British Government. Mr. Egan is a good authority on the subject of the generosity and liberality of the people of Ireland, and the following is his estimate of their contributions for patriotic purposes during his term of office in connection with the Land League, as published in a New York paper :—

To the Central and Ladies' Land League up to end of '82 in round numbers	£35,000
Cost of public meetings, law and other costs expended locally, and independent of the Central Treasury, estimated at	80,000
State Trial Fund for the defence of Mr. Parnell and other Traversers in 1881	21,000
Sustentation Fund for support of nearly 1,000 *suspects* confined in various jails, about	25,000
Dublin Exhibition, about	25,000
Total from October 1879 to end of 1882 ...	£186,000

But since then there have been other collections. A grateful country subscribed £40,000 as a reward for Mr. Parnell's said to be unselfish, but really interested patriotism; £8,000 in recognition of Mr. W. O'Brien's successful effort to prove that the "island of saints" can produce very loathsome sinners, and numerous other testimonials of different amounts; so that Mr. Egan's estimate, extended to the present time, would give these results :—

Total to end of '82 (as above)	£186,000
Evicted Tenants (Mansion House) Committee	8,500
National League Fund deducting Australian and American remittances	20,500
Cost of meetings defrayed locally for three years ending October, '85. Same as Mr. Egan's estimate for the three preceding years	80,000
Parnell Testimonial about	40,000
O'Brien Defence Fund ,, ...	8,000
Sullivan Testimonial ,, ...	8,000
Other Testimonials : Dr. Kenny's, Father Sheehy's, Mr. Healy's, Messrs. Harrington and Sullivan's and others, including the collection to pay Mr. Gray's fine (about)	6,000
Total for five years ending Oct. '85	357,000

or over £70,000 a year. Surely this is a very large sum to levy off an impoverished country, with a decreasing population, and for no

adequate return. And the exactions continue and increase in volume. The League now uses the system of boycotting not so much for the punishment of "land grabbers," and those who hold intercourse with them, as the coercion of persons who are reluctant to subscribe to its funds—in other words, it extorts black mail in the form of subscriptions under threats of boycotting. And more especially grievous is it that, no matter how liberally the people subscribe, they can never know what becomes of their money; for, as we have seen, unlike other organisations the Parnellite Leagues have published no complete accounts.

The chief cause of the secession of the young Irelanders from the Repeal Association was their dissatisfaction at the non-publication of the details of the receipts and expenditure; and we have it on the authority of Sir Charles Gavan Duffy that the agitation which they founded and conducted was carried on for two years—from 1846 to 1848—at an expense to the country of only £400—that is, the total outlay was £916, but of this amount the members of the Council of the Confederation themselves contributed £516. Contrast this with treasurer Egan's charge for the Land League's "expenses of organisation," which reach the enormous sum of £100,000. And as before pointed out, there is no earthly reason why the accounts of the Land League were not properly vouched and published, or that those of the National League should not be similarly dealt with—except, as is only too probable, disclosure would be made of matters that it is necessary to conceal—seeing that that was the course adopted by every political organisation within the memory of the present generation. The Tenant League, the Catholic Defence Association, the Home Rule League, the O'Connell Centenary Committee, the Mansion House, the Marlborough Relief and the *New York Herald* Committees, all made public the fullest possible details of their financial affairs, vouched by competent authority as correct in every particular.

Is it possible that the deluded people can longer shut their eyes to the fact that some of the most prominent of the political leaders of the day who have a voice in the disposition of their money are, men of no fixed principles, either in religion or politics—men whom the latest convulsion of the Irish social system has brought as scum to the surface from their native obscurity—men who

Houses of the Oireachtas

profess patriotism that they may make a living? I defy any fair-minded man who has watched the progress of the present pestilent agitation, and who has—as it has been my misfortune to be compelled to do—made himself acquainted with the antecedents, character and intentions of those who controlled it, to put his finger on any half-dozen of them who are not dependent for their livelihood upon the resources which have been misappropriated and hoarded up for their benefit, or have not, either directly or indirectly, the strongest motives of personal advantage in the continuance of agitation, turmoil, and unrest. It is hardly within the bounds of possibility that they can longer continue to minister to the insatiable greed of such men.

PARNELL'S "LAST PLANK."

We are asked to believe that the League leader stands poised on the last plank of his platform over, on one side, the abyss of rebellion, but on the other with the pleasing prospect of withdrawal. Compelled by his compact with the active revolutionists to make his final effort for the legislative independence of Ireland in the "alien senate," he has no other alternative than to make formal demand for the restoration of "Grattan's Parliament," and in the all but certain event of the unqualified rejection of the demand to withdraw with his forces and either join the rebels—that is the Fenians—or retire from public life altogether. It is, of course, quite possible that he may find a loop-hole for escape from both alternatives, for he is very adroit, and continue to strive for small concessions from the British legislature by means of obstruction in Parliament, and organised terrorism outside it.

But he will find the Revolutionary party particularly awkward obstacles to his machinations should he not prove amenable to their dictation. That, however, is a matter that lies altogether in the future. The League leader's present purpose no doubt is to utilise to the fullest extent the opportunity which the general election presents of making a final raid on the pockets of the Irish and Irish-American public. With that object he promises impossibilities with an assumed confidence in his power to fulfil them that he hopes will carry conviction to the minds of his *clientèle*. In his recent speeches he first defined his demand for Home Rule as consisting of

Houses of the Oireachtas

a single-chambered independent Parliament that would be permitted to levy protective duties on British importations. But finding that he had rather overshot the mark and made an impression on public opinion in Great Britain that was altogether unfavourable to his designs, he subsequently modified his claim so far as to declare that it did not of necessity involve the separation of the governed from the governing country, but only contemplated an undefined shadowy Federal arrangement as to the details of which he was prudently reticent. And lest the farmers should resent his apparent disregard of their interests, he raised once more the too familiar shibboleth of landlord abolition.

Now let us consider what precisely these demands amount to. First as to the abolition of landlordism. To accomplish that within a reasonable time the State should compulsorily expropriate the landlord's property, and parcel it out amongst the tenants; in no other way could so signal a revolution be brought about save by successful rebellion. Mr. Parnell is quite above the weakness of hesitating to ask concessions from England that he knows cannot be granted, but even he draws the line at the expropriation of landlords and the confiscation of their properties. He has left no doubt on this point. In a speech made in Drogheda, in April 1884, he declared that the farmers "should either pay for the land or fight for it." "There is no use," he added, "thinking that you can get it for nothing by talking about it on any number of platforms—you must either pay for the land or fight for it." Of course, fighting for the land is not to be thought of, and it remains but to buy and pay for it. The only question then is one of price and consent of the landlords to sell. Both these things the Parnellites pretend are amenable to agitation; by holding out against payment of rent without a large reduction in the long run, they assert, the value of land will be so seriously depreciated that the present owners will be glad to sell at any price. Granting all this and that landlordism is "brought to its knees," how long will it survive—how long will it endure before, in Mr. Parnell's forcible if not eloquent phrase, it is "chucked overboard altogether"? Plainly, a very long time, if, according to the League leader, we have to wait for more legislation by either an English or an Irish Parliament that will further reduce the already "judicially" reduced rents by thirty or forty per cent. Such legisla-

tion is not possible, no matter what may be alleged to the contrary —the British Parliament cannot be expected to go on always passing Land Bill after Land Bill for Ireland ; finality must be reached some time, and if not already attained cannot certainly be far off.

Everyone knows that eviction is not now possible, except for non-payment of rent. Tenants in arrear have had opportunity by availing of the advantages of the Arrears Act of freeing themselves from all arrears. If a tenant's rent is too high, the Land Commissioners will reduce it to a fair "live and let live" figure. If he desires to purchase his farm, and the landlord agrees to sell, the Government will find him the whole of the purchase-money. But the evicted tenant who foolishly imagines that if he waits for a time the landlord will be forced to accept any terms he may dictate, in return for the restoration of his farm, will find before long, in spite of boycotting and all other forms of terrorism, that he has grievously miscalculated the staying powers of landlordism, and if he loses the land outright the verdict of the public will be "serve him right."

In this connection it is well to note that in one of his recent orations delivered under exalted ecclesiastical patronage, Mr. Parnell strongly deprecated the suggestion that at any time he advised or instigated a combination against the payment of rents : but he surely cannot forget the infamous "no rent" manifesto ; and what, it may be asked, is the National Land League if it is not a gigantic combination against payment of all rent, except such rent as a tenant chooses to pay ? Indeed it has no other *raison d'être* than this, save the collection of money to be entrusted to a little ring of professional patriots of whom no account of its disposal is ever to be demanded or expected. A tenant refuses to pay rent and is evicted ; then the League comes to his assistance. His landlord is boycotted, and his farm left derelict by reason of the intimidation which the League can wield at present "within the law." What is this but inciting, aiding, and abetting resistance to a demand which British law is intended to enforce ? And is it not the fact that the advice tendered by the Parnellite orators at the present time to the Irish tenantry in general, and those in particular who have had their rents fixed by the Land Commissioners, is to combine on each property and agree to make an offer of a sum greatly under their stated rents, and, if the offer be not accepted, then to refuse to pay at all and trust to the

sustainment of the League in maintaining their determination not to pay. Stress is laid on the advantages of combination, and the tenant who refuses to commit himself to it is denounced as a coward and a traitor, and his relentless boycotting decreed. If this does not constitute the League itself a combination to encourage resistance to payment of rent then language has no meaning, and beyond doubt sooner or later as such the Government will be forced to suppress it.

But it is most earnestly to be hoped that the tenantry will not be so ill-advised as to listen to such insidious promptings; let them pause and well consider before they allow themselves to be misled into taking up a position of unreasoning hostility to their landlords; let them reflect how many victims of the "no rent" manifesto there are at present with their families starving in exile who lost their farms by following the counsel of the same men who are now urging them to place themselves in position to invite a similar fate.

It is no doubt possible to "abolish" landlordism by purchase, and there is nothing to be said against it. But the process will of necessity be slow in working. In a remote future—say in a century or so—a large proportion of the present landowners will be replaced by occupying proprietors, who in their turn, however, may become landlords. But pending the completion of their purchases by the payment of the whole of the instalments of the price, the tenants will, to all intents and purposes, be tenants of the State. Their annual payments, however, will be less than their present rents, and will cease after a long term of years, and the land become their own or their descendants'; but they will be liable for the taxes now paid by the landlords. The Land Purchase Bill is indeed a great boon to Irish tenants and no doubt will be extensively availed of, but it is a curious fact that, despite the outcry against the Land Act and the judicial rents, farms, the rents of which have been fixed by the Land Commission, have sold, and are still being sold, for prices that would purchase the fee-simple thereof.

But all the same there is no royal road to landlord abolition; it will take time. However, it is a safe cry for the Irish leader wherewith to "go to the country," like the shibboleth, the "land for the people," that succeeded it, and on which the late Mr. A. M. Sullivan, before he permitted himself to be induced to join the

Parnellite ring, made these suggestive comments:—"The land of a country may be, indeed, said to belong to the people in this sense, that only such a system or measure of ownership in the soil can, without violation of natural right, be allowed, as shall on the whole be deemed most conducive to the advantage and welfare of the general community. But I fear that this is not what is understood by many who hear the cry, 'the land for the people.' What people? All the people? Is each man to have his share? Is each woman to have hers? How often is the division to take place, and the six million lots partitioned out between the six millions of 'people'? There would be a cruel batch of evictions, thousands and thousands of our farmers would be swept away from their homes to make way for the newcomers from the cities and towns, if this doctrine of 'the land for the people'—*i.e.*, for the ownership occupation of the whole people—were put into force."

But Mr. Parnell is on his "last plank," Ireland's legislative independence, and it behoves us well to consider what that signifies. Such a Parliament as that which the Irish leader wants would practically constitute Ireland an independent nation, and a standing menace to England. Being independent of the British Parliament, its legislation would as likely as not be hostile to British interests. For example, in the event of England going to war with any other country, this Irish Parliament would in all probability refuse to vote supplies, and even invite England's enemy to take over the country, to be used as a *point d'appui* for operations against the empire: that such is no impossible contingency will be evident when we reflect that the Irish Parliament would be dominated by the very men who have, in furtherance of their own especial aims, brought this unhappy country within more easily measurable distance of utter ruin than it has ever stood since the connection with England became an accomplished fact. Beside this ever-present danger the fact that the Irish Parliament could place a prohibitive tariff on British wares seems of not much account, but without doubt it would be considered by the English people as a strong reason for resisting the Irish demand. And there are other well-founded objections which will have to be met before the Government and people of Great Britain can be induced to give heed to any suggestion that an Irish Parliament is a possibility, or that the demand for it is within the domain

of practical politics, not the least of which is that there is really no certainty whatever that the whole Irish people are desirous of the establishment of a native Parliament, or that they are not on the whole fairly well content, since they cannot fail to have realised that the British Parliament has gone quite as far in the way of legislating for their country in accordance with the wants and wishes of its people as an Irish Parliament could have gone. As regards the—in every sense of the word—most respectable, and influential classes of the Irish community there can be no doubt whatever that they are quite reconciled to the rule of the Imperial Parliament. The North, for instance, has prospered exceedingly, and is still prospering under "alien" rule, and has not only no desire to witness the setting up of an Irish Parliament, but would in all likelihood refuse to give allegiance to it, with the result that Ireland would be the theatre of a prolonged and bloody Civil war.

We may take it, therefore, as a settled thing that Great Britain will never willingly sanction the practical severance of the connection between the two countries involved in the establishment of such a Parliament in Ireland as the Parnellites ask for: to do so, they well know, would entail on themselves the unpleasant duty of re-conquering the country by force of arms at a future time. There can be no mistake about this. The fact has been recognised and admitted by every sincere Irish patriot of modern times, from John Mitchel to James Stephens, and John O'Leary—that so long as England remains a great Power—so long as she has a fleet on the seas, or an army on land—she will never consent to repeal the union that constitutes Ireland part of her Empire, or agree to the restoration of the Irish Parliament. But short of that there is no feasible measure of self government that in time the British Parliament will not concede to the Irish; for there can be no denying that the people of Great Britain are sincerely desirous of effacing the memory of the great wrongs inflicted on Ireland under their rule in the past, by generous concessions in the present. All the leading statesmen of England, in fact, irrespective of party agree that the administration of Ireland needs reform in the direction of placing the management of purely local affairs under the control of Irishmen in Ireland.

When, therefore, Mr. Parnell proclaims that he is going to dis-

integrate the British Empire out of hand, and obtain for Ireland such a Parliament as he may choose to dictate to British Ministers for their acceptance, he knows perfectly well that he professes to accomplish that which he is aware is impossible of achievement—in other words, a miracle. But, needless to say, his real motive is to keep up the agitation, which he has found so personally profitable, to the pitch of intensity necessary to keep the coffers of the League well filled, and to secure the tenure of his own power and influence ; or failing in either of these things, to have a fair pretext for retirement while yet the fame of his former achievements is undimmed by subsequent failure.

Not, however, that he has in reality done much to make a boast of. He takes all the credit to himself and party for the Land Act, though the fact is notorious that it would have been enacted had there been no Parnellite party in Parliament at all. It is on record that two Select Committees took evidence bearing on the question of land tenure and made recommendations, which were embodied in a bill that was drafted before the General Election of 1880, and was ready for introduction to Parliament before the late Government took office. The only credit that can fairly be given to the Parnell ites, therefore, is that they caused the Land Bill to be brought in at an earlier stage of the Session than probably would have been the case under other circumstances. But they did little to accelerate its passage through Parliament—they voted indeed against it on the second reading ; and when it was passed they sought to prevent its being availed of—but happily in vain—by the tenantry. Then as regards the Arrears Act, for which they also claim credit, so little was thought of it, that Mr. Michael Davitt, "the father of the Land League," did not hesitate to denounce it as "one of the most disastrous measures ever passed for Ireland. The inducement held out to poorer tenants to wipe off arrears of rent which they never could possibly pay, and which it is simple robbery to exact for such land as had been solely reclaimed by their own labour, has caused them to rush with their scanty earnings to the landlords. This will bring about exactly what the English Government want—the emigration of the smaller class of tenant-farmers and the gradual extermination of the Celtic race." This, of course, is sad nonsense : as a matter of fact, the Act was availed of by over 100,000 of the

smaller tenant-farmers, who were enabled to relieve themselves of arrears amounting to £812,000; but it demonstrates that no amount of concessions will placate the professional "patriots" of these days. On the contrary, every concession given is an indirect but, in the long run, effective blow to their influence.

Another of Mr. Parnell's legislative triumphs was the Tramways' Act—that is to say, he claims to have added some clauses to it that secured its passing, but at the same time it is undoubted that Mr. O'Connor Power, an anti-Parnellite member, is the original author of the clauses which Mr. Parnell appropriated. It has not been conspicuously successful in the main purpose which it was intended to serve. But few tramways, or light railways, have been undertaken from various causes; and the migration clauses must be pronounced to have failed. Under these latter Mr. Parnell formed a Company styled the "Migration and Land Purchase Company" which was heralded by great flourish of trumpets. It was to work wonders—to "lift" tenants from congested districts and place them in other districts that were not congested. The required capital was quickly subscribed, and the Government lent the company one of their Land Commissioners, Professor Baldwin, in order that they might have the benefit of his great experience of Irish farming. It has been nearly two years in existence, but it has migrated no one—it is even itself at a standstill. One property was purchased for £40,000, which was provided by the Government, but all that is known about the purchase is that no migration has been effected upon it, and that some of the tenants of grazing farms were evicted, and the land let to others at an increased rent. The "occupying proprietary" of small farmers "migrated" from other places, amongst whom it was to be divided, have yet to be found. Possibly, however, the Company will make a good thing of it.

There is indeed not a solitary concession alleged to have been obtained by the Parnellites that may not with more truth be said to have been made in spite of them. Their policy was admirably calculated to estrange the sympathies of fair-minded Englishmen who are sincerely desirous of doing the fullest justice to Ireland from the Irish cause. It was truly a policy of exasperation designed in reality to prevent reforms rather than obtain them, so that the agitation whereby they have been so long enabled to "live and thrive"

might endure as long as possible. And that policy is to be still maintained.

THE PARNELLITES IN THE NEXT PARLIAMENT.

The League leader confidently counts on having his Parliamentary tail lengthened in the new Parliament very considerably. He expects such an accession of numbers that he will have a following of from eighty to eighty-five members pledged to implicit obedience to his behests—bound, every man of them, to do his bidding unquestioned, or else surrender his seat. This is certainly a new departure in the history of Parliamentary representation, and shows pretty clearly that the "uncrowned king" considers that his subjects are born helots who are incompetent and unworthy to be entrusted with the privileges of freemen. The constituencies will not even be permitted to select their own members, be their choice ever so willing to subscribe to the Parnellite pledge: they are required to take the men he sends them, and be thankful. To be sure he graciously permits them to choose candidates on condition that they are withdrawn should he desire it. The so-called Conventions are therefore elaborate shams called together to register foregone conclusions—to humbly bow and give effect to the commands of the Dictator. The delegates meet, and put forward the men of their choice; then the elect of the leader is "sprung upon" the Convention, without any previous warning, and, as a matter of course, is selected. In this way unknown people from England, America, and Australia have been forced upon Irish constituencies which had previously themselves selected local candidates.

But will eighty Parnellites be any more likely to gain for Ireland an independent Parliament and an act for the confiscation of the property of the landlords than forty? Not in the least; on the contrary, it is far more likely that they will really succeed in exasperating the British Parliament and people, for their leader is bound to give the Irish at home and abroad at least some value for their money—more especially as he designs to collect a good deal more of it—with the not by any means impossible result of the disfranchisement of Ireland and its government henceforward as a Crown colony.

House of Lords Offices

But in any event Mr. Parnell is expected to give the British Parliament much trouble. Personally, he is said to be weary of the strife, and would be glad to make an end of it somehow, retire, and live afterwards on the fame of his former achievements, and the £40,000 with which his country endowed him. He knows that he is *not* going to win repeal; he is aware that though he may overturn many Ministries in succession; make all English legislation impossible —for a time; refuse to permit Ireland (as he threatens) to be at peace; exasperate and embitter the English people: he may do all these things and more. But in vain: all that will come to an end; he will not, he knows, induce or compel the British Parliament to allow the Irish to set up an independent and rival legislature. Still, all the same, he must make the attempt. And if he holds to his bargain with separatists, the new Parliament will not be long in existence before he finds favourable opportunity for following the example of the Hungarian deputies, and withdrawing from the Parliament of the Empire, with as many of his party as he can induce to follow his example.

Such a termination of his leadership is looked forward to with confidence by the chiefs of the Fenian organisation. Their contention that the freedom of Ireland can only be won by fighting will have been triumphantly established. Their argument that the British Parliament, despite any given amount of outside pressure, cannot be got to legislate in any direction that does not tend, directly or indirectly, to consolidate and strengthen British rule over Ireland, and make the union between the two countries still closer and more intimate, will also be seen to be incontrovertible. And they are not without hope that it will be demonstrated as well that as there is no half-way house between separation and submission, and as separation can only be brought about by successful rebellion under conditions that are now, and likely long to continue to be, non-existent, further attempts to impede, or delay, the well meant efforts of the dispensers of a rule that we cannot shake off to improve the condition of our people socially and politically, by making demands that cannot be complied with, would be foolish, and conduce to no good end. The realisation of such hopes, however, being solely based on the downfall of Parnellism which seems to be approaching is, of course, dependent upon that very desirable consummation, and it can only be averted

Houses of the Oireachtas

by the steady increase and long continuance of the contributions to the League fund from America and Ireland that is being appealed for and confidently expected. Already a fresh flow of the tide of dollars from the United States seems to have set in.

The League organisation in the United States has languished since the Presidential election, in consequence of divisions caused by the interference of its managers in the contest—especially of its president, Mr. P. Egan, who was openly accused of having sold his influence for "current coin" to the Republicans—and in consequence but little money has come from there until lately to the Parnellites. But it is no doubt hoped that the new departure will change all that; that the collection will gain a new impetus as soon as it is realised that the final struggle for the recovery of Ireland's legislative independence is at hand. Already arrangements are being made to bring about so entirely welcome a result. A convention of the Irish-American League is to be held in January next, at which Mr. Parnell, with all the glory of his confidently expected triumphs at the polls fresh upon him, will attend.

Meantime an address has been issued to the Irish in America calling upon them to contribute liberally to sustain the man who "will be able to throttle English legislation, and thus to compel the English to allow them to return from the atmosphere polluted by royal and aristocratic bestiality, and to establish a free Parliament for the government of a free people in Ireland."

But should Irish America respond to this fresh levy on its superfluous resources the subscribers will have absolutely no sort of assurance that their money will be applied to the purposes for which it is pretended it is required. They will be given no account of it whatever. Moreover, as we have seen, the resources of which the Leaguers should now have command on their own showing, should be fully sufficient to meet all expenditure for a considerable time to come. To be sure if people are weak enough to permit themselves to have dust thrown in their eyes that is their own affair, and possibly no one has a right to object, but if they could only realise the fact that they are doing positive injury to the cause they are endeavouring to serve, by the sustainment they are giving to professional agitators whose whole duty is to make sure of their own aggrandisement socially and politically, they would, we do not doubt,

resolutely determine to turn a deaf ear to further appeals from the same people for more money. There cannot be the slightest doubt that the only obstacle to prevent the Parliament of Great Britain doing the fullest justice to Ireland, and conceding to her the largest measure of Home rule consistent with the preservation of the Union, is the Parnellite parliamentary party, which by making demands that cannot by any possibility be granted creates new grievances, and fosters, and perpetuates ill feeling between the English and Irish people; tends to drive to despair those English statesmen who are animated with none save the friendliest feelings for Ireland and its people, and are endeavouring to obtain the removal of every possible political and economic disability with which our unhappy land is afflicted; and cause them to abandon further effort in that direction.

Said the Catholic Bishop of Meath the other day in a public address;—"I love, esteem, reverence, and respect the mass of the English people. I think they are naturally honest, industrious, truthful, generous, and brave as lions in the battle field, and I believe that if the English and the Irish people were left alone to their own natural instincts they would live in peace, and hardly require a divine precept to make them love one another." Surely this is no more than the truth, and is none the less worthy of consideration that it comes from an ultra Parnellite ecclesiastic of distinction. Yes, if the two peoples would only be left alone they could not fail to come to understand each other; but unhappily they will not. The Irish are taught by their "patriots" and their press to believe that the English are their deadly enemies; while it is but too true that the Dynamite and "Invincible" fiends, and the murderous "moonlighters" as well as the cowardly outragemongers, the despicable "Boycotters," and the sordid and mercenary agitators are believed by the great mass of the British people to be average types of Irish character. Needless to say, the people of England are not enemies of Ireland; neither are the Irish as criminally vile and unreasonably unamenable to fair treatment as the English are led to believe; but the enlightenment of both on these points can only come when Parnellism is exploded.

That vile system has proved disastrous to the material interests of the Irish people. Politically they have gained something, and the

agricultural classes have profited in spite of it; but their trade languishes, their commerce declines, and their numbers continue to decrease steadily from the exhausting exodus that shows no sign of ceasing; in fact the statistics of Ireland during the entire reign of the "uncrowned king" present an unvarying record of continuous decay. And all this might have been expected. It is intended to benefit and exalt a few at the expense of the many; its operations proceed on the assumption that the people of Ireland are mostly fools who are amenable to the most undisguised *exploitation*. Its leader can hardly be said to be an Irishman, and he took to the profession of patriotism because he had no other career open to him. He is at the head of a movement which professes to seek the abolition of landlordism, but he is a landlord himself. He vowed undying hostility to the late Government, yet he did not hesitate to assist in dispensing some of their patronage in Ireland. And, according to Mr. Richard Pigott,[1] he was suspected of intriguing with the Radical section of the Liberal party for the supercession of the Irish Viceroyalty by himself as Secretary of State for Ireland.

He has, moreover, triumphed signally over all his political rivals and opponents. Not to speak of the artifices and intrigues by which he contrived to supersede the late Isaac Butt in the leadership of the Parliamentary party, the success with which he managed to bring Mr. Dwyer Gray, who was at one time a very formidable opponent of his policy, to his knees is very striking. The politics of the *Freeman* editor have, however, always been protean in their liability to change according to circumstances, but never more conspicuously so than was seen in the *volte-face* of his attitude to Parnellism. He made a determined effort to put an extinguisher on Mr. Parnell early in his career, and failed ignominiously in the attempt. In the year 1879 he supported the candidature of Crown Prosecutor (now Judge) O'Brien for the representation of the borough of Ennis against Mr. Finnegan, Mr. Parnell's nominee, who was elected. The Parnellites were naturally very indignant with the *Freeman* editor, and one of them, Canon Doyle, of Wexford, soundly rated him in this wise:—

[1] Article in the *Fortnightly Review*, on the Parnellite programme.

Houses of the Oireachtas

"The first question I have to ask is, how it came to pass that Mr. Edmund Dwyer Gray—himself a professed Home Ruler, and even a supporter of the active policy of the party—could advocate and champion the candidature of Mr. O'Brien, a Government official and a Crown prosecutor? . . . . The second question is: What defence has Mr. Gray to offer for the deliberate persistent attacks made by himself, and through his journal, on Mr. Parnell since his victory in Ennis? Third question: What motive had Mr. E. D. Gray in his headlong attempt to damage and ruin the reputation of Mr. Parnell? Let Mr. Gray apply himself to these questions, and answer them satisfactorily. . . . . If not, though a huge hydrant were attached to the Vartry main, and the great reservoir were exhausted in one immense ablution of your person, you will still remain begrimed and black in the estimation of every honest man. You may abuse me; you may caudle the Archbishop (of Cashel); you may attack your contemporaries and rivals. All in vain. Answer these questions, or your name will stink in the nostrils of every *Irishman* on the face of the globe; no respectable man will touch you, even with the sole of his boot."

What Mr. Parnell himself thought of Gray at this time may be gathered from this extract from one of his speeches at a Land League meeting:—"I would point out that the *Freeman's Journal* —(a Voice—'Down with it!')—has from the commencement impeded and obstructed the National Land League in carrying out its objects. I can recollect the land meeting, of which this is the anniversary, the second meeting in the West, at which I appeared and asked you to hold a firm grip on your holdings (loud cheers). We were denounced in the leading article of this same *Freeman's Journal* as Communists—(groans, and cries of 'Down with the Whig journal!' and 'No one will read it')—for asking for a reduction of rents for the tenantry, which, I say, we have been successful in obtaining wherever the tenantry of Ireland had the courage to follow up our advice." But the *Freeman* soon after unreservedly "caved in," and is now abjectly servile in its assumed adoration of the League leader. Any public man who ventures to hint that there was or is anything verging on Communism in the League teachings calls down on his devoted head its most scathing anathema. And this gentleman, as well as his leader, has so sublime a contempt for the intelligence of his fellow-countrymen, that he disdains to conceal patent evidences of his inconsistency—makes no mystery of the fact

that his preaching is in direct conflict with his practice. For example, in the *Freeman* he vehemently condemned Dublin Castle as a sink of iniquity, social and political, and was mainly instrumental in collecting the money which went to reward Mr. W. O'Brien, M.P. for unearthing the so-called "Castle scandals;" but he is himself personally on excellent terms with the chiefs of the gang; and it is on record that he entertained recently the Castle under-secretary and other distinguished personages. He also endeavoured to excite the populace in Dublin against the Prince of Wales on the occasion of the late Royal visit to Ireland; but he was amongst the guests invited to Belfast to do honour to their Royal Highnesses at the Mayoralty ball, and had the offices of his Belfast paper decorated with flags by way of welcome to the Royal visitors.

And the League leader has met and vanquished his rival Davitt at all points, whenever and wherever that immaculate patriot attempted to instigate revolt against his authority and influence. At the League Conference of October, 1882, it was resolved that an Executive Council should be elected, upon which every county in Ireland would be represented, so that all Ireland should have a voice in its deliberations; but the resolution remained a dead letter, presumably because it would not answer the purposes of the leader to even appear to submit his projects and his authority to any revision or limitation save that of the select circle of his creatures constituting the Organising Committee of the ludicrously misnamed "National" League. Over and over again has Davitt protested against this breach of faith, but the leader kept contemptuously never heeding, and the Executive Council has yet to be elected. Every single suggestion of Davitt's on this important matter has been steadily ignored, and the result is that Parnell himself is in truth and fact the National League. As was pointed out at the Tipperary Convention in 1884, by the Rev. D. Humphries, the evicted tenants all over the country have been neglected and their claims for relief disregarded, because there are no county representatives on the Council to look after their interests. Then when Davitt launched his pet project for the nationalisation of the land, the League leader lost not a moment in criticising it with severity, and in a speech at Drogheda in April, 1884, he gave it its quietus. When the Ulster branches of the League summoned a Convention to urge,

Houses of the Oireachtas

amongst other things, that Davitt's complaints regarding the constitution of the League Executive Council should be considered, Mr. Parnell at once interposed with his veto, and the Convention was not held. In like manner, when Davitt denounced the buying, by Parnell's Migration Company, of the Kilcrowley property for twenty years' purchase as an attempt to "bolster up" landlordism, the leader paid no heed to his "rival's" strictures, and the purchase was carried out. Finally, when quite recently he ventured on a mild remonstrance as to the manner in which it was proposed to select the Parliamentary candidates, and generally found fault with the Parnellite Parliamentary tactics, he was compelled, by some occult influence acting in the Parnellite interests, to make public and abject recantation and submission.

All this shows how widespread and potent is the authority of this man. He has, in truth, almost all Ireland at his feet, and imposes upon it a coercion more odiously stringent and unendurable by right-minded and liberty-loving men than any under which our country groaned in the worst days of English misrule. The slaves of Parnellism can call neither their souls or their money their own; the League claims and compels surrender of both. They are not *men* who submit to such odious tyranny, and most assuredly are not worthy of freedom. And it is a sad thing to have to say, but it is true all the same, that even the Catholic clergy permit themselves to be used as instruments of this abominable system; they not only do not raise their voices in denunciation of the unchristian and immoral practice of boycotting, and the deliberate dishonesty it is used to enforce, but in too many instances commend it by precept and example. Is there any law, human or divine, that constitutes it a crime to pay one's lawful debts when able to do so? Surely not; but yet the law of the League treats that eminently just act as a heinous crime—that is to say, the tenant who is too honest to join other tenants in demanding a reduction of rent without adequate reason for the demand is treated as a traitor, is boycotted by his friends, and his life made miserable ever after. And ministers of the Gospel of Peace and goodwill to man, not only do not censure such infamy, but give it their sanction and applause.

Not even will the Catholic clergy be allowed to exercise the

influence in politics that legitimately belongs to them, unless it be exerted in blind acquiescence in Parnellite decrees. The newly-appointed Archbishop of Dublin, however, has given indications of a desire to resent this easy renunciation of authority, and has recommended the clergy to exercise their influence as co-ordinate, but still apart from that of the Parnellites, when not in harmony with their own. He stated in a speech, concerning the Wicklow Convention for the selection of Members for that County, that "priests had an inalienable and indisputable right," independent of all human organisations, "to guide the people in every proceeding where the interests of Catholicity, as well as the interests of Irish nationality, are involved." And his instruction to his own clergy was that they should insist that the procedure of each Convention, as well as the names of the candidates to be submitted to it, should be promulgated and canvassed before the Convention met, in order, no doubt, that unknown men should not be chosen without full time being given to canvass their claims for the honour they sought. But the Parnellites said "No" to this very reasonable recommendation. A circular from "head quarters," stating that "It is not the wish of the Parliamentary party that there should be any public discussion of the merits or demerits of the candidates before the Convention meets. When the Convention actually assembles, and the press is excluded from the proceedings, the delegates can canvass the merits or demerits of the candidates as they think best," was sent to all the League branches. That is to say, the way was to be left clear for the selection of the Member-maker's choice, whose name had been kept dark in order not to permit time for inconvenient inquiries as to his antecedents. And, as a matter of fact, at all the Conventions held up to the time of the present writing, despite Archbishop Walsh's advice, most of the unknown carpet-baggers chosen for county constituencies were selected in this way.

Talk of the Coercion of the British Government after this! Is it more heinous to coerce the consciences, the minds, the wills of men born to the image of their Maker, and endowed with the God given gift of reason, than to put some curb on the operations of the gangs of murderers, outrage-mongers, and terrorists with which our country is infested? What warrant is there for saying that what British coercion has been in force in Ireland is not the direct consequence

Houses of the Oireachtas

of Parnellism?—was not, in fact, invited by that degrading and abominable conspiracy against liberty in Ireland? Is it not notorious that no one except offenders in act and intent against the laws of God and man were in the least coerced by either the Crimes Act, or the Peace Preservation Act that preceded it?

And it is to prolong and perpetuate the tyranny of Parnellism that the Irish people at home and abroad are again asked to subscribe their money, and to continue subscribing. They may take it as Gospel truth that whatever the Irish members of the future led by Parnell, and bound to do his bidding, may effect in the way of obstructing the passing of good measures for Ireland, they can do —will do—nothing whatever to help their enactment, since every concession to Ireland is an obstacle to their designs and tends to spoil their game. Ireland's most urgent need now is release from this galling tyranny of Parnellism—surcease from the oppression of her patriots and their aiders and abettors amongst English statesmen who hanker after the Irish vote for the party which they lead, and give them the encouragement that vague promises can be interpreted to convey.

Even Mr. Devoy, the Head-centre of the late Land League system, is opposed to further appeals for money in Ireland, and he is of opinion that Ireland has been over-agitated. He wrote recently:—"The country is in a deplorable condition, and we must not take our views of it from the speeches of politicians or the glowing accounts supplied by interested newspapers. We have thousands of our countrymen arriving from Ireland; and what is the account they give us? The farmers, even those who have not paid their rents, have no money; the small country shopkeepers are unable to collect their bills, and their credit with Dublin houses is gone. Trade is at a standstill, and the country is exhausted. It requires a little repose —a breathing spell—after the great strain it has gone through; and any policy based on the supposition that it can continue that strain much longer is doomed to utter failure." This is true; the country wants peace, and that it can only have when its people resolutely resolve to present a united and determined resistance to the further exactions of the Parnellites.

Houses of the Oireachtas