

HOME RULE.

GREAT DEMONSTRATION IN SYDNEY.

As reported briefly by cable a great Home Rule demonstration took place in Sydney, on Monday evening, July 7. No more representative meeting (says the *Freeman's Journal*) was ever held in Australia. The demonstration was organised under great difficulties. It was ascertained that the large hall was only available on Monday night, having been booked after that to the 28th August. To have postponed the gathering till the later date, while it might have been the means of securing speakers from other parts of the Commonwealth, would have been unwise. The organisation committee did what was right, secured the hall for July 7, and called upon the people to support them. The result was, as we have said, a triumph. It must have been a pleasure to the various speakers to have looked at that sea of faces, animated by the enthusiasm of a great purpose; to have felt the cordiality of the crowded meeting reacting upon them as they spoke its mind and expressed the emotions of its heart.

When the Mayor of Sydney (Alderman Thomas Hughes) opened the meeting he was addressing an audience of quite 5000 people. The floor of the great hall presented a perfect sea of masculine heads, while the galleries were crowded with patriotic ladies and their friends. A more respectable-looking, more intelligently-featured, or more orderly gathering could not be conceived. The Mayor received a perfect ovation when he appeared, and the discriminating enthusiasm of the audience asserted itself at various stages of the evening's proceedings—notably when Senator O'Connor gave dignified utterance to the political faith that belongs to him; when Mr O'Sullivan once more asserted the genuine democratic instincts, that have carried him into the affection of the people; and again when 'The Dean of Newtown' spoke like the true Irishman and the true Australian citizen he is. Irish sentiments, it goes without saying, appealed to the audience; but the respectful and hearty manner in which it rose to acclaim its sympathy with King Edward in his illness might have been an object lesson to many an audience which is as perfunctory as it is insistent upon 'loyalty.' But to get on with the record.

A large extended platform had been added to the usual stage, and seated about the chairman were some 300 citizens. It was impossible from any given point to take in anything like a complete list of these, but one might see amongst others—Hon. R. E. O'Connor, K.C. (Vice-President of the Federal Executive), the Hon. John Toohey, M.L.C., the Hon. John Meagher, M.L.C., the Hon. T. M. Slattery, M.L.C., Sir William Manning, the Hon. E. W. O'Sullivan, the Hon. John Hughes, M.L.C., Messrs J. G. Carroll, M.L.A., D. O'Connor, M.L.A., P. E. Quinn, M.L.A., R. D. Meagher, M.L.A., Neil Neilson, M.L.A., A. J. Kelly, M.L.A., W. A. Holman, M.L.A., P. J. Clara, M.L.A., M. J. McMahon, M.L.A., T. Rose, M.L.A., W. Daley, M.L.A., J. R. Dacey, M.L.A., J. J. Fowler, M.L.A., Major Freehill, Alderman J. D. Fitzgerald, Alderman P. Nolan, Alderman G. Perry, Alderman T. Fanning (Mayor of Redfern), Alderman M. O'Riordan (Mayor of Alexandria), Alderman J. Sutton, Dr. Charles W. MacCarthy, Very Rev. P. Le Rennelet, S.M., Very Rev. Dean Slattery, Very Rev. Dean Healy, Very Rev. T. A. Fitzgerald, O.F.M., Rev. J. P. Moynagh, Rev. J. J. Carroll, Rev. P. Dowling, Rev. J. Collins, Rev. J. Hyland, Rev. M. Kirby, Rev. J. P. Considine, Rev. J. J. Murphy, Rev. J. Collender, Rev. J. O'Reilly, Rev. J. Egan, Rev. P. J. Walsh, Rev. P. J. Moore, Rev. E. O'Brien, Rev. M. Fitzpatrick, Rev. J. Barry, Rev. J. Grace, Rev. Father Rohan (Moss Vale), Rev. Father Rohan (Annandale), Rev. Father Morris, etc., etc.

His Grace Archbishop Kelly wrote to the secretary as follows: 'I am in receipt of your invitation to speak at the meeting on next Monday. Official duties long since appointed keep me away. I should be happy in making any effort to re-enlist public confidence in the cause of justice to Ireland. I may be permitted to express my hope that earnestness, moderation, and good statesmanship will shine forth from the addresses, and permanently impress the assembly. If a subscription list be opened, please have me inscribed for £10 10s.'

Apologies were received from the following:—Right Hon. C. C. Kingston, P. C. Hon. Sir William Lyne, K.C.M.G., Hon. T. Waddell, Senators Higgs, Thomas Glassey, and Messrs F. Clarke, J. C. Watson, J. Gormly, and other members of the State and Federal Parliaments.

After a brief opening speech by the Mayor of Sydney Senator O'Connor moved the following resolution which was carried with great enthusiasm, the audience rising and cheering loudly: 'That this meeting records its deep sympathy with the King in his illness, and earnestly wishes him speedy restoration to health, and a peaceful and prosperous reign.'

Senator O'Connor then proceeded to speak of the progress of the Irish movement. He said that they were met there to take practical action in aid of the Irish Parliamentary Party. They had met at a time which, of all occasions for some years past, was the most propitious. Ireland itself was united; the Parliamentary Party itself was united, under a leader of great experience and patriotism; Irishmen in America had consolidated themselves to aid the United Irish Party; Canada had done the same; the movement was spreading throughout Australia, and in Melbourne last Friday there was a magnificent demonstration of Irishmen and the friends of Irishmen to aid the Parliamentary Party; and he was certain that those before him would show that their generous assistance and moral power would always be at the service of Ireland. Another circumstance which made the meeting opportune was this: The Liberal Party, which so nearly carried the Home Rule Bill under the great Gladstone was now divided, and they found Lord Rosebery, who never had anything more than an intel-

lectual sympathy with Home Rule, coming forward, and, with several erstwhile Liberals, telling them that they were going to throw away the alliance; that they were going to wipe the slate clean. The slate of Great Britain could never be wiped clean of Ireland. It was very fitting that the Liberal Party should know now that Australia ranged herself behind Morley and Bryce and Campbell-Bannerman, and that whoever was with Ireland would have Australia's voice with them, and whoever was against Ireland would have Australia's voice against them.

AUSTRALIA AND IRELAND.

Why should they in Australia concern themselves with the question of Irish self-government? In the first place, they took that action as Irishmen—not only those who had the privilege of having been born on that sacred sod, but also the descendants of Irishmen to the second and third generations—in whose blood there lingered the memory of what their fathers had endured for centuries. As Irishmen they wished to take a practical step. They had to complain of seven centuries of misgovernment, of wrong and injustice, which culminated in the extraordinary position that of all the portions of the King's Empire to-day there was none in which the relations of Government and people were so unsatisfactory as in Ireland. As Irishmen they said that they were willing that all that should be buried in oblivion, because they recognised that whatever might have been the case in the past—and although years ago it was perhaps the best and strongest step that could be taken by many of those whose names would live for ever in Irish history, to take the step of freeing themselves from the union by means of physical force—they honored them because in their time they did what was right to do. But history had moved and conditions had changed, and they recognised now that it was only their enemies who said that they wished to become independent of England, that they would ever conceive such an impossible situation as an Ireland absolutely independent of Great Britain. The situation was that they should remain portion of the British Empire; but a portion with equal rights and privileges, a portion with the same rights of making laws in accordance with the wishes of the people as every other portion of the British Dominions possessed. In Ireland to-day trial by jury could be taken away, trial of any kind could be taken away, laws for the protection of property and liberty could be suspended. And when such a proclamation took place in any district in Ireland that district went back 200 years in political development. In no country of the world was there so little sympathy between the laws, the administration of the laws, and the people who had to obey them as in Ireland.

THE RIGHTS OF EMPIRE.

There was one remedy: that Ireland should be granted self-government. This was a right not so great as that of which she was robbed a hundred years ago; it was a right taken away by treachery and corruption almost too rank and gross to be believed. Some things had improved in Ireland during the last thirty or forty years. The land laws had improved; local administration had been widened; many small reforms had been given, after the strongest agitation, to pacify the people;—but never would Ireland be satisfied until she had the right which Irishmen all the world over claimed to exercise—the right to make the laws, regarding purely Irish affairs, which they were expected to obey. They held to this right, not only as Irishmen, but as citizens of the British Empire. They should hold to it in no uncertain or hesitating way, but as men who had done their share in building up the Empire in every part of the world. They had done more than their share in defending it in every part of the world; and they held that the pride of the Empire was not the pride of England alone, but the pride of Ireland and Scotland and Wales. They had, therefore, the right to say to England, that while aiding to develop her Empire, and while pouring out her life's blood in developing it, they were at least entitled to that kind of legislation and policy which would give them something of the prosperity and well-being which England herself enjoyed. The greatness of empire did not depend alone on territory or the number of its fighting men, or the wealth of its inhabitants: it depended upon the solidity, the happiness, and internal peace of every portion of the Empire. The British Empire could not be truly great and prosperous until it had removed this cause of discontent and unhappiness and discord. He sincerely hoped that Ireland before long—nay, during the reign of the present King—would have conferred upon her that internal peace and prosperity and contentment which was the lot of every other portion of the British Empire. He moved—That this meeting of citizens of the Commonwealth of Australia expresses its earnest desire that the Imperial Parliament should satisfy the national aspirations of the Irish people by granting them a Constitution based on the principles of self-government, which has produced the happiest results throughout the Empire.

Mr E. W. O'Sullivan, M.L.A., in seconding the motion, said it was one that could be supported by every liberal man. Home Rule was simply a movement for equal rights by Ireland. As free constitutions had been granted all over the British Empire with the best results, what was there to fear that the same results would not follow in the case of Ireland? It was said it would not be safe to grant Home Rule to Ireland because there were so many people there of a different religion to that of England. But Home Rule had been given to Frenchmen in Canada and the majority of her people, of a different religion to that of Englishmen, had become most loyal subjects of the British Empire. This movement should receive general support. Why did it not receive general support? It was because there were class interests standing in the way. The King and Queen had not blocked the movement. It was blocked by the House of Lords, or Landlords and others who had their own greed and self-interest to serve.

The Hon. John Hughes, M.L.C., supported the resolution. As had been said before—once a Home Ruler, always a Home Ruler, He saw no reason in the present, or any possible, state of affairs why