

to the young man with an expression of happy reflectiveness. As to the members in general, they divided their attention between father, uncle, and nephew. Everybody had temporarily forgotten Home Rule, and for once in a way politics were far from the minds of all.

Mr. William Archer Redmond, the member for East Tyrone and the son of Mr. John Redmond, Nationalist leader, was invited to make a confession of his emotions during his maiden speech in the House of Commons (says the *Daily Mail* of February 17).

'Was I nervous? To tell you the plain truth, I was not. I am not nervous by temperament, and the occasion was one which compelled me to forget all about myself. I was full of my subject—perhaps too full. You see, I was born in the great war of 1885, so I became a Home Ruler in my cradle. Then, from early boyhood, I have been so much at the House of Commons with my father that the atmosphere of it is quite familiar to me.'

#### Friendly Advice.

'But what would have happened if I had followed the advice of all my friendly counsellors I fail to imagine. "Don't be too cocky," said one; "the House likes modesty in a new member." "Whatever you are, don't let yourself become nervous," said another. "Don't shout!" said a third; and a fourth told me to keep my voice up.'

'I decided to forget it all. The difficulty was not to get going, but to stop; not what to say, but what to leave out. That quality comes from practice. Think of the compression of Mr. Asquith's speech that night, and (if I may add this) of my father's. I made my first political speech in the election of last January, and when I tell you that it was Mr. Devlin I was assisting you will see that I had a good master. I was called to the Bar last year.'

## IRISH AFFAIRS

### THE IRISH LEADER REPLIES TO TORY CHARGES

On the House of Commons going into Committee of Supply on March 8 Ulster Unionist members moved a reduction of the vote for law charges in Ireland, and accused the Irish people of all sorts of crimes.

Mr. John Redmond in replying expressed the hope that the committee would take notice, and that the public outside would take notice, of the true meaning of the speeches that had been made. They were approaching a time when matters of most grave importance to Ireland would be submitted to the decision of the English people, and a campaign was being engineered by those who were opposed to the concession of liberty to Ireland to blacken the name of Ireland and to misrepresent the action of her people. The meaning of the speeches to which they had listened that afternoon—and they had two evident meanings and motives—was, first, to show that there had been an unfortunate recrudescence of religious animosity in Ireland, and, second, to show that there had been a recrudescence of violence and crime in Ireland. There had, on the contrary, been no recrudescence of religious animosity and hatred, but the effect of speeches such as those to which they had listened might be to lead to such recrudescence, and he hoped the motive of those speeches was not to lead to that effect. He believed that those who were opponents to Irish freedom thought that

#### THEIR ONLY CHANCE

of inducing the British people to take an unfavorable view of the proposals to be made would be by inducing them to believe that religious animosity was becoming so acute again that it would be dangerous to trust the Irish people. That was the meaning of the speech of Sir Edward Carson, and it was always the meaning of the speeches of Mr. Moore, whose whole object in this House seemed to be the endeavor to show that the Irish people were really a race of uncivilised savages, fighting with one another for the love of God, and tearing each other to pieces for religious objects. A more ignoble mission was never undertaken by those who were engaged in the campaign of calumny of Ireland which they hoped would prevent her obtaining freedom in the near future. They would fail in that campaign. So far from there being a recrudescence of religious animosity and hatred in the country, religious hatreds which had been the disgrace of Ireland in the past were softening and disappearing, and so far as those who sat on the Nationalist benches were concerned, they had said, and would say, nothing which would lead to a renewal of those religious discords. Who was it who constantly in this House talked of the iniquities of the Catholics? Was it not hon. gentlemen above the gangway? The Nationalists had never attacked the Protestants by assaults or riots of any kind. They had remained very often silent rather than challenge such attacks. He believed these

#### RELIGIOUS DISCORDS WERE DISAPPEARING

in Ireland, and with all his heart and soul he hoped the object which those gentlemen had in view, to influence religious discords in Ireland, would fail, and that they would find Ireland in the near future just as they found in Quebec, where the majority was Catholic, a Protestant

minority dwelling in their midst with their rights and liberties safeguarded and their persons and property protected, and living with overwhelming goodwill with their Catholic neighbors. The second object of those speeches was to show that Ireland was the scene of violence, disorder, and crime. Lord Castlereagh ought to hesitate before he adopted the role which he seemed to have taken up. He did not wish to say anything that could be taken as personally offensive to the noble lord, but Lord Castlereagh bore a name associated with deadly crime in Ireland—a name associated with the vilest crime committed against the nation, and his descendant and namesake should shrink from adopting the role he now appeared to be going to take up. The noble lord never lost an opportunity, in season and out of season, of attacking his country and saying something to its discredit. That came badly from any man calling himself an Irishman. It was an ignoble role to take up, and he was afraid that role was hereditary. Lord Castlereagh was trying to create an impression that there was crime and outrage in Ireland. He had said there was murder in broad daylight. Was there any country in the world in which murder did not occur? How many murders occurred in England? When last discussing this question, he quoted the cases of murder, attempted murder, violence, and outrage, and showed that they were

#### TENFOLD IN ENGLAND

what they were in Ireland, as was also the case of every crime. A murder was committed recently in Ireland, a deplorable one, which attracted a great deal of interest and caused some sensation in this country. There had not been one before for many years, yet one murder caused more sensation owing to the methods of gentlemen above the gangway and other people than scores of murders in this country. He deplored crime and outrage from his heart. He deplored it even more than the noble lord. The noble lord had everything to gain from murder and outrage in Ireland. The Nationalists had everything to lose. They knew that, and every influence they had at their command was used, and would be used, to prevent anything of the sort. Ireland was in a state of profound peace, far more so than she was when 'twenty years of resolute government' was in operation. The noble lord's complaint was this, that the Executive Government in Ireland did not administer the law fairly and with a firm hand, but when he had his own firm hand and his 'resolute government for twenty years' I say that those twenty years of coercion in Ireland were marked with crime in England of ten times the amount which existed in Ireland. Only the other day—within the last three or four weeks—the criminal statistics of Great Britain were published, with the report of the Commissioners, and what did they say? Why that, unfortunately, for the last ten years, there had been a large and progressive increase in every kind of violent crime in England, and they went on to consider what they thought were the causes which led to the increase. Of criminal statistics last published in Ireland there has been a decrease in these crimes, everyone of them; and it was a monstrous perversion of the truth to suggest to the committee that Ireland was not in a state of absolute crimelessness as compared with any other part of Britain. There was a good spirit abroad in Ireland to-day, a spirit full of hope. That spirit was leading to the softening of religious hatred and discord and was leading to the maintenance of peace; and his part and that of his friends would be to promote that spirit, to promote religious tolerance and good feeling and peacefulness, and to put down violence and crime in every way. The spirit they desired in Ireland was one of hope—hope that the future administration of the law would be viewed with greater confidence by the mass of the people of the country, without which it could not be, in Ireland or in any other part of the world, either effective or respected.

#### AN AGRARIAN REVOLUTION.

Mr. Birrell.—In all the judges' charges here there are Meath, Waterford, Limerick, South Tipperary, Longford, and Monaghan. I did not come here prepared to meet the charge which has been raised; but I would ask the noble lord generally to read these reports, and ask himself whether on the whole he does not think that they represent the country as being in a very satisfactory and a growingly satisfactory condition. There is one point I would like to make. There are, of course, in parts of Ireland, arising out of the operation of the Land Acts, offences such as boycotting, firing at the person, and firing into houses, which, of course, show a lamentable and very sad state of things; but I do ask hon. members to remember that we are trying in Ireland, and have been for many years, an extraordinary agrarian revolution and experiment. The whole of the agricultural land of Ireland is in the market. Everybody knows that it has got to be sold, and sold to the tenants in every village and district in Ireland. The lands are to be divided among a land-loving and land-hungry people, who have lived for years looking forward to the time when they would have a bit of land of their own, and, it may be, have been thinking out what particular bit of land it is to be. All these things you have done, and you have placed British credit at their disposal for the purpose of allowing them to be done. I ask you to put yourselves—you who know village life in England—where the land hunger is by no means what it is in Ireland—what would happen? Can you suppose that there